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Abstract—A little volume of lower extremity amputees needs hip disarticulation prostheses (HDPS). This situation makes it hard to invite hip amputees for prosthe...
prostheses [23], [24]. Cao et al. [25] tested a speed adaptive control method for a prosthetic knee during swing flexion with a robotic function simulation and evaluation platform. The platform had two main functions: 1) simulation of velocity changes and the real-time detection of knee angle and 2) imitation of the hip drive of the prosthetic knee to evaluate the swing performance [25]. Davis et al. [13] developed a tibia robot to test transfemoral prosthetic limbs [26]. The robot accurately simulated the motion of a human tibia and could test prostheses under different terrains. Unlike human tests, the robot provides a kind of testings in which prostheses could be tested under repeatable conditions. The robotic tests avoided liability and risk issues, which were common in the prostheses tests with amputees [13].

Beyond that, compared with the previous studies on the testing platforms for prosthetic knee and ankle [13], [23], the performances of prostheses were studied through standard quantitative parameters, and the problems of lower limb prosthesis could be proposed to advance down design improvements. Kim and Oh [23] and Davis [13] each developed their prosthetic test platforms for knee prosthetic research. The leg simulator designed by Kim and Oh [23] was used to test the joint position and velocity of an above-knee prosthesis. The simulator had only three DOFs, including the hip flexion/extension and the knee joint angle, which ignored that the human body gravity center changes had effects on lower extremity movements. However, normal walking not only consists of the movement of the extension and flexion of the thigh but also includes the movement of the hip joint with the connection to the pelvis in the space. The movement of the thigh can be taken as a composition of these two movements. Therefore, in the process of ground interactive prosthesis testing, it was not comprehensive to only consider the hip joint as a fixed swing joint but neglect the change of human body gravity center. The trunk applies the force to legs during walking affected the kinetic performances of the tested prostheses. Our research suggested that the human body gravity center’s movement should not be neglected during the lower limb prostheses tests. A tibia robot was used to optimize the GRF of transfemoral prosthetic limbs by the research team of Davis et al. [13]. Their research solved such an unknown nonlinear dynamic system and took the interface force/torque as optimization references of robotic HDPs.

The objectives of this research are to solve the problems in the current HDPs research and tests, including: 1) lack of amputees for the prosthetic tests; 2) the safety of the hip disarticulation subjects could not be guaranteed at the preliminary research stage; and 3) quantitative and repeatable parameters could not be obtained systematically with the hip disarticulation subjects. Therefore, we developed a prosthetic gait simulation and evaluation (GSE) system that could simulate the pelvic track in natural human gait and drag the HDPs to walk on a treadmill. An adaptive neural network (ANN) control method was proposed to solve the problem of unstable motion and large trajectory tracking error when the manipulator was disturbed by the dragged HDPs.

### II. METHODS

#### A. Gait Simulation and Evaluation System

The GSE system, as shown in Fig. 1, contains a prosthetic thigh simulation robot (PTSR), a six-axis force sensor, and a pressure measuring treadmill. The treadmill was used to analyze the GRF. The PTSR for pelvic trajectory reproduction was six degrees of freedom (DOFs) manipulator (RT-Sim simulator, Beijing Links Co., Ltd.) and its D-H parameters were listed in Table I. In the structure of the system, as shown in Fig. 2, the trajectory data collected by the camera-based motion analyzer are smoothed by a Gaussian smoother. The smoothed trajectory is mapped into the PTSR workspace with an alignment of PTSR’s initial position. The tested HDP and the end-effector of PTSR were connected rigidly with a six-axis force sensor (M3713B, Sunrise Instruments Co., Ltd.). The force sensor could monitor the interface force/torque between the tested HDP and the PTSR. The direction of six forces/torques was presented in Fig. 3. A pressure measuring treadmill (FDM system, zebris Medical Gmbh, German) was used to set constant speed and measured the GRF of the prostheses. Finally, the final joints’ information of PTSR is reordered by the ANN controller to improve the stability of the end-effector. As the lengths of the whole measured prosthetic legs (including the thigh, shank, and foot), were not the same, a column elevator was used to adjust the PTSR’s basement height.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>θ (rad)</th>
<th>d (m)</th>
<th>a (m)</th>
<th>α (rad)</th>
<th>m (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>θ₁</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>−π/2</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>θ₂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>θ₃</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>−π/2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>θ₄</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>π/2</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>θ₅</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>−π/2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>θ₆</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Compositions of the GSE system. The tested prostheses (HDP, prosthetic knee, and foot) are in the blue dotted oval.
ANN controller to improve the stability of the end-effector. The trajectory is mapped into the PTSR workspace with an alignment of PTSR initial position. Finally, the final joints’ information of PTSR is reordered by the ANN controller to improve the stability [27]. Except for the original data smoothing, such as machining and grinding on the industrial production line, and trajectory planning in autopilot, in order to obtain better stability [27]. Except for the original data smoothing, an ANN tracking control was proposed to solve prosthetic kinetics uncertainties and improve PTSR’s robustness.

Considering the dynamic equation of the six-DOF PTSR to a lumped disturbance and delayed states described by the following nonlinear differential equation:

\[ M_j(q)\ddot{q} + C_j(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + G_j(q) = \tau - \tau_{ds} \]  

(1)

where \( M_j(q) \) is the symmetric positive definite inertial matrix, \( C_j(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} \) is the vector of coupled Coriolis and centripetal torques, \( G_j(q) \) is the vector of gravitational torques, and \( \tau \) is the vector of joint torques, \( \tau_{ds} \) is the vector of external disturbance torques, and \( q, \dot{q}, \text{and} \ddot{q} \) are the vectors of the joint displacement, velocity, and acceleration, respectively. The forward kinematics can be written as

\[ \ddot{\xi} = \Phi(q), \quad \dot{\xi} = J(q)\dot{q}. \]  

(2)

Thus, the backward kinematics can be written as

\[ \dot{q} = J_1(q)\ddot{\xi} \quad \ddot{q} = J^{-1}(q)\dddot{\xi} + J_1(q)\dot{\xi} \]  

(3)

where \( J(q) \) is the Jacobian matrix of PTSR, \( J_1(q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) is the generalized inverse matrix of \( J(q) \), and \( \dot{\xi}, \ddot{\xi}, \dddot{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m \) represent the displacement, velocity, and acceleration in the task space. According to the abovementioned transformations, the dynamics (1) is converted as

\[ M_1(\xi)\dddot{\xi} + C_1(\xi, \dot{\xi})\dddot{\xi} + G_1(\xi) = u - f \]  

(4)

where \( M_1(\xi) \) is the symmetric positive definite inertial matrix, \( C_1(\xi, \dot{\xi})\dot{\xi} \) is the vector of the coupled Coriolis and centripetal torques, \( G_1(\xi) \) is the vector of the gravitational torques, \( u \) is the force of the manipulator end-effector, and \( f \) is the disturbance from the tested HDPs. From the joint space to the task space, the related matrices are formulated as

\[ M_1(\xi) = J_1^T(q)M_j(q)J_1(q) \]
\[ C_1(\xi, \dot{\xi}) = J_1^T(q)[C_j(q, \dot{q})J_1(q) + M_j(q)\dot{J}(q)] \]
\[ G_1(\xi) = J_1^T(q)G_j(q) \]
\[ u = J_1^T(q)\tau. \]  

(5)

Considering that the robot dynamics model is known and \( x_1 = q \) and \( x_2 = \dot{q} \) are defined, (2) is converted to state space form

\[ \dot{x}_1 = x_2 \]
\[ \dot{x}_2 = M_j^{-1}(x_1)(\tau - \tau_d - C_j(x_1, x_2)x_2 - G_j(x_1)). \]  

(6)

Define the Cartesian space signals as

\[ e_1 = x_1 - x_d \]
\[ a_1 = -K_1e_1 + \dot{x}_d \]
\[ e_2 = x_2 - a_1. \]  

(7)

(8)

(9)
\[ \hat{e}_1 \text{ and } \hat{e}_2 \text{ are derived by (7) and (9) as} \]
\[ \hat{e}_1 = e_2 + \alpha_1 - \hat{x}_d \]
\[ \hat{e}_2 = M^{-1}_f(x_1)(\tau - \tau_d - C_j(x_1, x_2)x_2 - G_j(x_1)) - \hat{a}_1. \]  
(10)

During the HDP testing, the inertia matrix \( M_j(q) \) and the vector of coupled Coriolis and centripetal torques \( C_j(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} \) are uncertain [16]; here, we use \( M_{jd}(q) \) and \( C_{jd}(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} \) to represent the defined reference matrix. The uncertain inertia and Coriolis parts \( M_{ju}(q) \) and \( C_{ju}(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} \) are as follows:
\[ M_j(q) = M_{jd}(q) + M_{ju}(q) \]
\[ C_j(q, \dot{q}) = C_{jd}(q, \dot{q}) + C_{ju}(q, \dot{q}). \]  
(11)

Taking the interaction torque between the PTSR and the test HDPs into consideration, the Cartesian space dynamic neural network based on adaptive control is modified, supposing the dynamic model, by adding the \( \tau_{\text{HDP}} \), to \( \tau_f = -e_1 - K_2 e_2 + \hat{e}_d + \hat{\kappa}^T \psi(Z) + C_{jd}(x_1, x_2)\alpha_1 + \tau_{\text{HDP}} \)  
(12)

where \( \psi(Z) \) represents the radial basis function (RBF) neural network, \( \kappa^T \) is the weight estimation, and \( Z = [x_1^T, x_2^T, \hat{e}_2^T, \hat{\kappa}^T]. \) The optimal weight \( \kappa^* \) is constructed for easy deduction
\[ \kappa_i^* = \arg \min_{\kappa_i \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sup_{z \in \Omega_z} |\psi_i(Z)| \right\} \]  
(13)

where \( \psi_i(Z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the estimation error and \( \hat{\kappa} = \kappa^* - \tilde{\kappa} \) is the weight error. Here, we estimate \( \hat{\kappa}^T \psi(Z) \) by \( \hat{\kappa}^T \psi(Z) \)
\[ \kappa^T \psi(Z) = M_j(x_1)\hat{a}_1 + C_{ju}(x_1, x_2)x_2 + G_j(x_1) + M_{ju}(x_1)\hat{e}_2 - \psi(Z) \]  
(14)

and the adaptive law of neural network \( \hat{\kappa}_i \)
\[ \dot{\hat{\kappa}}_i = -\Gamma_i(\psi_i(Z)e_{2,i} + \sigma_i \hat{\kappa}_i) \]  
(15)

where \( \sigma_i \) is a small positive constant and \( \Gamma_i \) is a symmetric positive matrix; considering (10) and (14), we have
\[ \dot{e}_2 = M^{-1}_f(x_1)(\tau_f - \tau_d - C_{jk}(x_1, x_2)x_2 - \kappa^T \psi(Z) - \nu(Z)). \]  
(16)

Another assistive variable \( e_3 \) is defined as
\[ e_3 = \chi(e_2) + \tau_d. \]  
(17)

Take the derivative of \( e_3 \) to get
\[ \dot{e}_3 = \dot{\hat{\kappa}}_d + R(e_2)\dot{e}_2 = \dot{\hat{\kappa}}_d + R(e_2)M^{-1}_f(x_1) \times (\tau_f - \tau_d - C_{jk}(x_1, x_2)x_2 - \kappa^T \psi(Z) - \nu(Z)) \]  
(18)

where \( R(e_2) \) is the derivate of \( \chi(e_2) \) with respect to \( e_2 \)
\[ \dot{\hat{\kappa}}_d = R(e_2)M^{-1}_f(x_1)(\tau_f - C_{jk}(x_1, x_2)x_2 - \hat{\tau}_d) \]  
(19)

where \( \hat{\tau}_d \) is the estimation of \( \tau_d \) and could be get from
\[ \hat{\tau}_d = \hat{e}_3 - \chi(e_2). \]  
(20)

From (24) and (27), we have
\[ \hat{\tau}_d = \tau_d - \hat{\tau}_d = e_3 - \hat{e}_3 - \hat{\kappa}_d. \]  
(21)

From the abovementioned analysis
\[ \hat{\tau}_d = \dot{\hat{\kappa}}_d - R(e_2)M^{-1}_f(x_1)(\dot{\hat{\tau}}_d + \kappa^T \psi(Z) + \nu(Z)). \]  
(22)

The error signals, \( e_1, e_2, \hat{\tau}_d, \) and \( \hat{\kappa} \), are proved to be semiglobal uniform bounded as Proof 1 in the Appendix.

III. EXPERIMENTS

The subject test was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Shanghai University of Medicine and Health Science (No. 2019-ZYXM1-04-420300197109053525); the experimental nature and possible risks were informed of the subjects; and the final consent was obtained from the subjects.

A. Gait Test With Amputee

The purpose of testing hip disarticulated subject’s gait was to adjust whether the gait and pelvic trajectory data were suitable for the GSE system to evaluate the performance of different HDPs (refer to Table II). Here, we use symmetry index (SI) of the gait to estimate the gait of hip disarticulation subject [28]
\[ SI = \frac{2(X_R - X_L)}{X_R + X_L} \times 100\% \]  
(23)

where \( X_R \) is the right limb data and \( X_L \) is the corresponding data for the left limb. The prosthetic leg side was \( X_L \), and the healthy side was \( X_R \) in this work. \( X_R \) and \( X_L \) represented different kinds of the lower limb data (including the joint angle, velocity, torque, and GRF) for different SI calculations but not an isolated parameter that is measured by a sensor. SI = 0 represents the perfect symmetry and ± showing limb dominance.

In each gait cycle, the average hip angle SI was less than 0.2, and the average knee angle SI does not exceed 0.15, which was an acceptable gait symmetry range for the GSE system. First, we collected the gait parameters of a hip disarticulated subject by a real-time motion analysis system (Jiangsu NEUCOGNIC MEDICAL Co., Ltd.) and the FDM system. The experimental sense of amputee testing on the treadmill can be seen in Fig. 4. During the walking experiments, the prosthetic leg for the amputated subject consisted of a prosthetic foot (1C10 Terion, Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D), a prosthetic knee (3R60, Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D), and a traditional hip prosthesis (7E7, Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D). From the analysis of the gait data, the mean SI values of the amputated subject’s bilateral hip joints in the stance and swing phase were 35.8% and 23.7%, respectively, which exceeded the acceptable symmetry range. The gait of the amputee wearing the original uniaxial hip amputation prosthesis was asymmetric pathologic according to the gait symmetry measurements. Therefore, it was ineffective to test the HDPs with the gait data of the amputees.

We studied the possibility of taking the gait data of a nonamputee instead of the amputees. The recruitment standard was that the body shape of the nonamputees should be similar to the amputated subject (including the height and weight). This system’s ultimate goal is to train the newly developed and intelligent prosthesis based on a standard trajectory test.
reproducing so that it can help the amputee recover a more symmetrical gait. Moreover, if those trajectories are used to train the prosthesis and optimize the intelligent prostheses’ parameters, the optimized prostheses cannot approach the athletic performance of the sound side. The previous experiment by the HD subject is to illustrate that it is inadvisable to test the prostheses with the trajectory of the amputated side. The healthy data would be more suitable for exploring the control strategy of the prosthesis. The basic gait parameters of healthy subjects under constant speed were obtained through experiments. In the nonamputee gait data collection experiments, two subjects were recruited, and the detailed information of them was shown in Table III.

The pelvic trajectories of nonamputees were collected by the camera-based motion analyzer (Vicon, Oxford, U.K.). After the calibration of the test system, the markers were attached to the measurement points (skin) of the subjects, respectively, on the toe, heel, ankle, calf, knee, thigh, anterior superior iliac spine, and posterior superior iliac spine (see Fig. 5).

The subjects were required to walk on the test platform several times, and their gait data were collected after they adapted to the platform. During the experiments, the nonamputees were instructed to walk on the treadmill at speeds of 0.5, 1, and 1.2 m/s, respectively. The data collected from the motion analyzer often contain unwanted noise. This noise was generated by the process being monitored and the measurement system itself. To eliminate the noise of joint velocity and acceleration, the Gaussian scale space was employed to smooth the raw data.

The human pelvic trajectories reproducing method proposed in this study is based on position-time information. Given the influence of human body weight on the parameter assessment, the authors agree that, under some same experimental conditions, such as walking speed, human body weight would inevitably cause the change of motion parameters of prostheses. However, this study aimed to compare different HDPs under the same experimental conditions (including the human body weight) as possible. Therefore, as long as the bodyweight of the tested subjects is in the maximum support range of HDPs, this research’s experimental requirements will be met.

### B. HDPs Tests by the GSE System

In the experiments, the kinematic, kinetic, and mutual parameters of the tested HDPs were collected. Three different HDPs: 1) Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D; 2) Helix3D (Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D); and 3) RCM HDP (from the authors’ research team) were tested by the GSE system at the speeds of 0.5, 1, and 1.2 m/s, respectively. The parameters of the three HDPs were listed in Table II. Considering the significance of the experiment to the later adaptation of the HDPs, 1C10 Terion (Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D) was selected as the foot, and 3R60 (Otto Bock HealthCare GmbH, D) was selected as the knee for the measurements. During the test of three HDPs, the prosthetic knee joint and ankle joint are fixed. In order to ensure that the overall sizes of the
three prosthetic systems are consistent with each other, three
thigh tubes that were used to connect the HDPs and prosthetic
knee were customized with different sizes. The parameters
including pelvic trajectory, kinematic parameters of the HDPs
(joint angle and velocity), kinetic parameters of hip torque,
interface force/torque between PTSR and the HDPs, and GRF
with pressure testing treadmill were collected for analysis.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

1) Pelvic Trajectory: Fig. 6 indicated the position tracking
of the pelvic trajectories in direct position mode and ANN
compensating mode in space under the walking speed of 1
m/s. Compared with the direct position control, the tracking
error of the pelvic trajectories under ANN compensating mode
was decreased by 45.2%, 37.1%, and 39.3% ($p < 0.05$) in
sagittal, coronal, and frontal planes, respectively. The average
position tracking error under the speed of 0.5 and 1.2 m/s was
also decreased by 34.9% and 41.6%, respectively.

Fig. 7 indicated the velocity tracking of the pelvic trajec-
tories in direct position mode and ANN compensating mode
in space under the walking speed of 1 m/s. Compared with
the direct position control, the tracking error of the pelvic
velocity under ANN compensating mode was decreased by
38.9%, 27.6%, and 40.5% ($p < 0.05$) in sagittal, coronal,
and frontal planes, respectively. The average velocity tracking
errors under the speed of 0.5 and 1.2 m/s were also decreased
by 29.3% and 38.2%, respectively.

2) Gait Symmetry: Fig. 10 shows the mean symmetry index
of gait parameters. The symmetry index of the measured
prosthesis is the degree of symmetry between kinematic and
dynamic parameters of the prosthesis and the original tra-
jectory acquisition experiment by the able-bodied subjects.
The symmetries of the prostheses’ kinematic parameters were
improved in different scales. The mean symmetries of the
joint angle and angular velocity are increased by 10.5% and
11.7% ($p = 0.009$), respectively. The mean symmetries of
the joint torque and GRF were significantly increased by 8%
and 6% ($p = 0.013$), respectively. It was found that the ANN
method for pelvic trajectory simulation effectively improved
the symmetry of kinematic and kinetic performances of the
tested HDPs compared with the direct position control.

3) Kinematic and Kinetic Parameters of the HDPs: Fig. 8
shows the angles and joint velocities of three tested HDPs. Due
to little damping of the passive HDPs, the joint accelerations
of those HDPs were larger than RCM HDP at the beginning of
the stance phase by 20%–33%. The joint angle and velocity
of RCM HDP were more similar to the gait of the nonamputees.
The mean joint angle of RCM HDP was significantly bigger
than 7E7 and Helix3D by 21.5° and 17.3° ($p = 0.013$),
respectively. The maximum extension of RCM HDP reached
55% of a whole gait cycle. This was approximately close to
the nonamputees (at 60%) rather than other HDPs (at 21%).
Until the flexion was initiated after 70% of the gait cycle,
the hip angle of 7E7 and Helix3D changed to the extension.
However, the flexion started at the end of the maximum
extension straight away with the RCM HDP at 55% of the gait
cycle on average. For power saving, the maximum extension
of RCM HDP was limited to 110°, which satisfied the amputees’
walking requirements. The moments from $-0.15$ (flexion)
to $0.46$ Nm/kg (extension) produced by RCM HDP during
stance mostly were active moments (as shown at the bottom of
Fig. 8). This kind of active moment represented the robustness
of the prosthesis. Due to limitations of the prosthetic system
dynamics model, the passive moments of 7E7 and Helix3D
were not achieved by the GSE system.

4) Interface Force/Torque Between PTSR and HDPs:
The mean (and standard deviation) values of the interface
force/torque collected by M3713B under different walking
speeds were listed in Table IV. From the test results, both
interface force and torque increased with the increase in the
walking speed, especially the mean force of the z-axis, $F_z$,
and the mean torque around the y-axis, $\tau_y$. The mean force of the z-axis, $F_z$, in a gait cycle ranged from 50 to 62 N, which was the maximum force direction of the interface. The mean torque around the y-axis has changed in the biggest range from...
1.54 to 4.67 Nm because the main motion of the tested HDPs was in the sagittal plane.

5) Ground Reaction Force: Fig. 9 shows the mean GRF of Otto 7E7 collected by zebris pressure measuring treadmill, at speeds of 0.5, 1, and 1.2 m/s, respectively. The maximum GRF in common practice could be found in the middle of the stance phase. Under the ANN control, the mean GRF between 7E7 and treadmill was significantly larger than the GRF in common practice could be found in the middle of the stance phase. Under the ANN control, the mean GRF in the sagittal plane was in the middle of the stance phase.

From the results of GRF (see Fig. 9) and symmetry index (see Fig. 10), this study found that the ANN control was effective in handling the unknown nonlinear dynamic system. When the end-effector of the PTSR was in a rigid connection with the tested HDPs, the ANN control had a better performance than direct position control and significantly improved the GRF and symmetry of the tested HDPs. From the GRF analysis, the ANN method for PTSR increased the swing phase initiation compared with the direct position control. The ANI method made the proportion between two gait phases closer to standard data of GCI references than direct position control. The GRF of prosthetic legs characterized the walking stability of the amputees. It was required to be symmetric to the intact side as well. The low plantar pressure indicated that the stability of the stance phase was insufficient, and it was prone to fall and other safety problems. Excessive plantar pressure showed that the vibration absorption capacity of each joint was insufficient during the contact between the prosthetic side and the ground. Without considering the prosthetic knee and ankle, for the nondynamic hip prosthesis, the hip joint damping could be adjusted to reduce the GRF, whereas, for the dynamic hip prosthesis, the impedance control was needed to improve the flexibility of the active hip joint by replacing the position-velocity control. The SI of the optimized active HDP GRF was still up to 31.5%, which was difficult to meet the target value.

There were still some limitations of this research to be solved. First, the stance phase of the tested prostheses was longer than the reference data from the GCI data set in the GRF results’ aspect. The main reason for the asymmetry was that the trajectory reproducing based on the position-velocity control and the track acceleration in the sagittal plane is different from the normal human body’s actual acceleration. Normal walking consists of the movement of the extension and flexion of the thigh and includes the movement of the hip joint with the connection to the pelvis in the space. The movement of the thigh can be taken as a composition of these two movements. Therefore, in the process of ground interactive

---

**TABLE IV**

<p>| Mean Interface Force/Torque (and Standard Deviation) Between PTSR and 7E7 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>speed (m/s)</strong></th>
<th><strong>fx (N)</strong></th>
<th><strong>fy (N)</strong></th>
<th><strong>fz (N)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.51(0.81)</td>
<td>11.42(0.91)</td>
<td>12.39(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.39(2.63)</td>
<td>13.91(3.09)</td>
<td>17.30(2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>50.26(4.54)</td>
<td>55.63(3.35)</td>
<td>61.47(3.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**B. Discussion**

This study developed a GSE system that could simulate the pelvic track in human natural gait and drag the HDPs as pelvic does to test the HDPs. The experimental results proved the feasibility of testing prostheses with the robotic system instead of amputees only.

The pelvic trajectory reproducing was proven to be stable in the position and speed loop, as shown in Figs. 6 and 7. In comparison with the previous tests, the proposed GSE system precisely solved the problems: low repeatability [11], [12], time-consuming [13], qualitative assessment [14], and difficulties in HD subjects recruitment [15], [16]. The stable repetition of the pelvic trajectory indicated that our approach for testing prosthetic components was effective and valid. The kinematic and kinetic parameters of the tested HDPs during the tests could be easily collected, as shown in Figs. 8 and 9. These safety and dynamic parameters of the prostheses could be utilized to verify and optimize the tested HDPs before the tests participated with amputated subjects.

From the results of GRF (see Fig. 9) and symmetry index (see Fig. 10), this study found that the ANN control was effective in handling the unknown nonlinear dynamic system. When the end-effector of the PTSR was in a rigid connection with the tested HDPs, the ANN control had a better performance than direct position control and significantly improved the GRF and symmetry of the tested HDPs. From the GRF analysis, the ANN method for PTSR increased the swing phase initiation compared with the direct position control. The ANI method made the proportion between two gait phases closer to standard data of GCI references than direct position control. The GRF of prosthetic legs characterized the walking stability of the amputees. It was required to be symmetric to the intact side as well. The low plantar pressure indicated that the stability of the stance phase was insufficient, and it was prone to fall and other safety problems. Excessive plantar pressure showed that the vibration absorption capacity of each joint was insufficient during the contact between the prosthetic side and the ground. Without considering the prosthetic knee and ankle, for the nondynamic hip prosthesis, the hip joint damping could be adjusted to reduce the GRF, whereas, for the dynamic hip prosthesis, the impedance control was needed to improve the flexibility of the active hip joint by replacing the position-velocity control. The SI of the optimized active HDP GRF was still up to 31.5%, which was difficult to meet the target value.
prosthesis testing, it is not comprehensive to only consider the hip joint as a fixed swing joint but neglect the change of human body gravity center. The inertial movement in the center of gravity of the human body’s sagittal plane should be considered to counteract the different accelerations caused by the previous trajectory reproducing method. Second, the pelvic trajectories collected from the camera-based motion analyzer should be smoother for reproduction.

V. CONCLUSION

This article developed a GSE system that can simulate the pelvis motion to test different HDPs with a PTSR. The proposed ANN solved the unstable motion and large trajectory tracking error when the simulation robot was disturbed by the tested HDPs. The performance of the simulation robot was consistent with the proof of the closed-loop system stability and convergence. The GSE system provided a safe test environment that cannot be obtained with human subjects.

The robotic testing opened up new possibilities for prosthetic tests under controlled conditions. In particular to the hip disarticulated amputees, the personal customized HDP for them was an open research question in further work. This simulation method of the human body feature point movement can be utilized to repeatedly evaluate multiple wearable types of equipment under the same testing environment without real subjects.

APPENDIX

Proof 1: Consider the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_1 = \frac{1}{2} e_1^T e_1 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_d^T M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) e_2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa_i^T \Gamma_i^{-1} \kappa_i + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_d^T \tilde{\tau}_d. $$  

The time derivative of $V_1$ is

$$\dot{V}_1 \leq -e_1^T K_1 e_1 + \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) e_2 - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \kappa^T \psi(Z) + \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \kappa^T \psi(Z) + e_2^T (-K_2 e_2 + \tilde{\tau}_d + \tilde{\tau}_d^T \psi(Z) - \kappa^T \psi(Z) + v(Z)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa_i^T \Gamma_i^{-1} \dot{\omega}_i.$$

Before scaling the derivation of the Lyapunov function $\dot{V}_1$ [29], we have

$$e_2^T \tilde{\tau}_d \leq \frac{1}{2} e_2^T e_2 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_d^T \tilde{\tau}_d - \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) e_2$$

and

$$\| \tilde{\tau}_d \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| \kappa^T \psi(Z) \|^2 - \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) e_2$$

$$\leq \frac{\| R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \|^2}{2} \| \tilde{\tau}_d \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| v(Z) \|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa_i^T \sigma_i \kappa_i$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i \left( \| \kappa_i \|^2 - \| \kappa_i \|^2 \right)$$

(27)

where $\zeta$ is the maximum of $\| \tilde{\tau}_d \|$ and $\iota$ is the arbitrary positive number that enables $R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) - (1 + ((\| R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \|^2)/\iota)) > 0$. Therefore

$$\dot{V}_1 \leq -e_1^T K_1 e_1 - e_2^T (K_2 - I) e_2$$

$$+ e_2^T (\tilde{\tau}_d^T \psi(Z) - \kappa^T \psi(Z)) + \frac{1}{2} \| v \|^2$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa_i^T (\psi(Z) e_2 + \sigma_i \kappa_i) + \tilde{\tau}_d^T \tilde{\tau}_d$$

$$- \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \psi(Z) - \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \tilde{\tau}_d$$

$$- \tilde{\tau}_d^T R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} \kappa^T \psi(Z) + \frac{1}{2} \| \kappa \|^2$$

$$\leq -e_1^T K_1 e_1 - e_2^T (K_2 - I) e_2 + \frac{1}{2} \| v \|^2$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i \| \kappa_i \|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i + \iota \| \kappa \|^2$$

$$- \tilde{\tau}_d^T \left( R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) - \left[ 1 + \frac{\| R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \|^2}{I} \right] \right)$$

$$\tilde{\tau}_d + \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\iota}{2} \right] \| v \|^2$$

$$\leq -\rho_2 V_2 + C_2 \leq 0$$

(28)

where $\rho_2$ and $C_2$, respectively, represent

$$\rho_2 = \min \left( \frac{2 \lambda_{\min} (K_1)}{\lambda_{\max} (M_{jd} (x_1))} \right),$$

$$2 \lambda_{\min} \left[ \frac{R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1)}{I} - \left( 1 + \frac{\| R(e_2) M_{jd}^{-1} (x_1) \|^2}{I} \right) \right],$$

$$\min \left[ \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda_{\max} (\Gamma_i^{-1})} \right]$$

(29)

$$C_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i \| \kappa_i \|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| v \|^2 + \frac{\iota}{2} \| \kappa \|^2$$

(30)

$$\lambda_{\min} (K_1) > 0, \quad \lambda_{\min} (K_2 - I) > 0. \quad (31)$$

From the abovementioned analysis, we proved that error signals, $e_1, e_2, \tilde{\tau}_d$, and $\kappa$, are semiglobal uniform bounded.

Under the control of (19), all the condition parameters could be measured and the initiation $(x_1(0), x_2(0), \tilde{\tau}_d(0), \kappa(0)) \in$
where $D = 2(V_2(0) + C_2/p_2)$, and $l$ is the number of train nodes in neural network.
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