

**An evaluation of the interstitial beat  
across multi-sensory modalities for  
characterization of a meaningful haptic  
enviro-sensing metronome**

Nick Pourazima

May 19, 2018



Music and Technology  
College of Fine Arts  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA

**Thesis Committee:**

Professor Stephen Neely  
Professor Thomas Sullivan  
Professor Jesse Stiles

*Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Masters of Science in Music and Technology.*

Copyright © 2018 Nick Pourazima. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** sensorimotor synchronization, vibrotactile perception, haptic, metronome, modality, entrainment

*To my grandmother, for instilling in me a thirst for knowledge and the joy of learning.*



# Abstract



# Todo list

This is sounding more like an introduction, maybe hold off on the abstract until you have your data results? . . . . .	vii
Revise and reword . . . . .	7
Revise and reword . . . . .	8
Revise and reword . . . . .	8
add HESM design to bio for citations . . . . .	17
Fill method intro in with more detail . . . . .	25
Expand the reasoning for the musical tests . . . . .	29

The interstice is an intervening space. When applied to a rhythmic context, the interstitial beat can be represented by two distinct states; whether energy exists within this small moment in time or if it does not.

Does filling the space provide an added awareness or preparation for upcoming onsets? Can the gestural motion of the conductor be justified scientifically?

Nevertheless, the underlying question when applied to either the daily practice of a trained musician or the innate entrainment (external rhythmic synchronization) of the average human being, is whether the space between the beat matters.

The objective of this work is to display whether a continuous wave,

This is sounding more like an introduction, maybe hold off on the abstract until you have your data

one which leads up to the maximum amplitude of the beat and trails off into a smooth decay, exhibits differentiation from its instantaneous counterpart in communicating regular or irregular pulses. To quantify this differentiation, an expansive set of analog and discrete tap synchronization test cases spanning the modalities of sight, sound, and touch will be conducted across groups of musicians, amateurs, and non-musicians.

Ancillary to this work, a haptic wearable design is prototyped and evaluated for optimization of physical spacing with an overarching goal of communicating dynamic changes more effectively.

Although rhythmic accuracy is proven to be most effective through discrete audible means, the work hypothesizes that there will be improvement shown when the interstitial beat is occupied with a continuous wave across the modality of touch at slower tempi, where space between successive beats is significantly spread apart, as well as throughout the occurrence of unpredictable or dynamically changing events.

Furthermore, the wearable haptic will provide an inconspicuous yet meaningful gestural system key towards future entrainment studies in expressive performance.



## Acknowledgments

First and foremost to whom ideation credit is due, my advisor Professor Stephen Neely. Our weekly discussions kept me on the right path. Thank you for the guidance and experience you brought to this project. I hope this proves to be exemplary to your design research as well as the framework for future work to come.

To Professor Sullivan and Stiles for their accessibility, open-mindedness, and overall support from both a creative and technical standpoint.

To Professor Riccardo Schulz for taking the time to read through this paper and for the unending care and devotion you show to all of your students. You truly are one of the most kind spirited and genuine people I will ever meet.

To my roommates and close friends, Mike and Craig. For those long nights of brainstorming possibilities and troubleshooting. Thank you for not only being my think tank but for keeping me inspired and grounded.

To my fellow colleagues Anirudh and Garrett for the drive, motivation, and camaraderie we have been able to experience these past two years.

Last but not least, a special thank you for the undying love and support of Rachel, for keeping the light at the end of the tunnel shining and maintaining my focus toward the end goal.



## **Funding**

This work was supported by Professor Stephen Neely.



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation . . . . .	1
1.2	Background . . . . .	2
1.2.1	Brief metronome history . . . . .	2
1.2.2	The conductor . . . . .	2
1.2.3	Jacques Dalcroze . . . . .	2
1.2.4	Entrainment . . . . .	2
1.2.5	The field of sensorimotor synchronization . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Previous Work</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Sensorimotor synchronization . . . . .	5
2.1.1	Terminology . . . . .	5
2.1.2	Findings . . . . .	6
2.2	Auditory Advantage . . . . .	6
2.3	Rhythmic Perception . . . . .	6
2.4	A Continuous Visual Metronome . . . . .	7
2.5	The Tactile Modality . . . . .	7
2.5.1	Multisensory Cues . . . . .	7
2.5.2	Haptic Drumkit . . . . .	8
2.5.3	Vibrotactile Metronome . . . . .	8
2.5.4	Commercial Introspection . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Haptic Design</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Brief introduction to haptics . . . . .	11
3.1.1	Haptic Considerations . . . . .	12
3.1.2	Vibrotactiles . . . . .	14
3.2	Design requirements . . . . .	16
3.3	Initial Prototypes . . . . .	17
3.3.1	Solenoid bracelet . . . . .	17
3.3.2	Single vibrotactile . . . . .	19
3.4	Vibrotactile Haptic Array . . . . .	22
3.4.1	Hardware . . . . .	22
3.4.2	Software . . . . .	23
3.5	Design Challenges . . . . .	23

3.6	Optimization . . . . .	24
3.6.1	Future Implementation . . . . .	24
<b>4</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1	Test Plan . . . . .	25
4.1.1	Audio File Generation . . . . .	26
4.2	Test Suite . . . . .	32
4.2.1	Software Development . . . . .	32
4.2.2	Tap Onset Hardware . . . . .	33
4.2.3	Delay Evaluation . . . . .	33
4.2.4	Setup . . . . .	33
4.3	Expectations . . . . .	34
<b>5</b>	<b>Data Analysis</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1	Motivation . . . . .	35
5.2	Organization . . . . .	35
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>37</b>
6.1	Future Work . . . . .	37
6.1.1	Beat Tracking . . . . .	37
6.1.2	Extra-musical Applications . . . . .	37
<b>A</b>	<b>Stuff I forgot</b>	<b>39</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>41</b>

# List of Figures

3.1	Solenoid Schematic . . . . .	18
3.2	Solenoid Wristband Prototype . . . . .	18
3.3	Prototype 2 - Single vibrotactile, wireless connectivity . . . . .	20
3.4	Final prototype wiring mockup . . . . .	23
4.1	Default metronome . . . . .	27
4.2	Modified click parameters for interstitial tests. . . . .	28
4.3	Metronomic waveform comparison . . . . .	29
4.4	Musical waveform comparison . . . . .	31
4.5	Dynamic audio tempo automation patterns . . . . .	32
4.6	Test Suite Flow Chart . . . . .	34

# List of Tables

3.1	Vibrotactile Haptic Array Parts List . . . . .	22
4.1	Test Plan . . . . .	26



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Motivation

While it is clear that nearly every professional musician has honed technique over countless hours of practice to an audible metronome, it is not directly obvious whether he/she has ingrained a true sense of rhythm at the foundational level with the primary instrument of expression, the body itself.

Intrinsic awareness to subtle nuances of tempo remains a subject commonly unexposed to a student in training. Yet this ability, to perform in the spaces surrounding the beat, defines the difference between a rigid performance and one that flows with an elasticity and musical expression.

Is there missing information from the daily practice of a trained musician to an audible metronome? Although an excellent tool in establishing a sense of musical time and precision, the danger in use of such a mechanical object lies within the mathematical exactitude according to American composer and music critic Daniel Gregory Mason. Therefore manifesting a lifelessness where instead a living and breathing musical entity should exist with its own “ebb and flow of rhythmical energy.”[? ]

The practice of Dalcroze Eurhythmics has sought to fill this knowledge gap as a curriculum developed by composer and educator Emile Jaques-Dalcroze to integrate natural musical expression via movement.

From nearly two decades of work as a licensed Dalcroze teacher and faculty at

Carnegie Mellon University, Professor Stephen Neely has sought to further explore interstitial design. Through his research he imparts the question: what is gained when attempting to fill the space between the crasis (click moment of the beat) with a natural analogue wave, one that provides a build up and decay common to natural happenings, much like the gestural motion of a conductor?

This research is an expansion of the existing sensory motor synchronization findings to the haptic modality with the intent to resolve the inquiry as to whether filling in the space between the beat, the interstitial, has an impact on rhythm awareness with the potential to impact future metronome implementations.

## **1.2 Background**

### **1.2.1 Brief metronome history**

In a traditional sense, the audible click of Maelzel’s metronome minimizes the interstitial space with an instantaneous (or discrete) impulse signal. However this representation is only half of the puzzle since the pendulum motion exhibited seeks to convey meaningful rhythmic information through the visual , much like the gestural motion of a conductor.

### **1.2.2 The conductor**

The conductor “fills 100% of the space between the crasis (the click moments of a beat) with a natural analogue wave that provides the build-up and decay common to natural happenings.” [Haptic Enviro-Sensing Metronome, 5]

### **1.2.3 Jacques Dalcroze**

### **1.2.4 Entrainment**

Humans are one of the few species who exhibit the ability to synchronize to a beat. From a neurological perspective, it has been thought to be connected with the capacity for vocal learning. [CITE]

REWORD THIS:! The capacity to entrain motor behaviors to a beat is predictive (i.e., on average, taps slightly precede event onsets when tapping to a beat) and flexible (i.e., synchronization to an auditory beat is accurate for inter-beat intervals ranging from 300 to 900ms, with the most preferred inter-beat intervals being approximately 600ms). [4]

### 1.2.5 The field of sensorimotor synchronization

The realm of research surrounding the psychology of rhythm is grounded within the framework of *sensorimotor synchronization* (*SMS*); defined as the coordination of rhythmic movement to an external rhythm.

**NOT IMPORTANT? SMS studies, conducted by Van Noorden and De Bruyn, of 600 children aged 3-11 has shown that adaptation to tempo was evident from 5 years and up. [4]**

SMS research historically identifies what is known as an auditory advantage, or the dominance of auditory/motor connection within the task of beat synchronization. The auditory advantage is discussed in detail in **Section 2.1**. However, recent studies have proven given meaningful spatiotemporal information, as in the bouncing ball example discussed in **Section 2.2**, synchronization is almost as good as an auditory metronome.

This work will focus on the expansion of this claim into the tactile realm, hypothesizing that:

## *1. Introduction*

# Chapter 2

## Previous Work

### 2.1 Sensorimotor synchronization

#### 2.1.1 Terminology

The main method of data collection for SMS tap based tests involve collection of the time delta between the tap and event onset, called the *asynchrony*. The mean of the asynchronies is typically negative (*NMA*), indicative of the participants anticipation of the beat rather than reaction. Positive asynchronies within the shortest reaction time window (150 ms) are arguably an anticipation of the preceeding stimuli.

The standard deviation of the asynchrony ( $SD_{asy}$ ) is an index of stability; lower values indicative of a better synchronization. [4]

Other important metrics include the variability and mean of the inter tap interval (*ITI*) and the inter onset interval (*IOI*), or the time between successive beats - measured in milliseconds. Mismatch between the ITI and IOI implies poor synchronization skill from the participant.

When a participant is instructed to tap on the beat, this is termed 1:1 synchronization. 4:1 synchronization, for example, is a beat subdivided into four with one tap on the beat. Subdivision tests typically yield lower mean ( $SD_{asy}$ ) values. [4]

### 2.1.2 Findings

Professional musicians exhibit a lower ITI variability with percussionists as well as pianists. Surprisingly, both amateurs and non-musicians had no  $SD_{asy}$  difference. From a paper presented at the Music Perception and Cognition in 2012:

Stoklasa, Liebermann, and Fischinger reported that musicians playing their own brass or string instrument in synchrony with a metronome showed a negligible NMA (2 ms), unlike their tapping (13 ms). [4]

Furthermore, as the duration of the IOI increases, or slower beats per minute, ( $SD_{asy}$ ) increased in a non linear fashion.

Isochronous vs. nonisochronous [? ]

## 2.2 Auditory Advantage

Decades of research into sensorimotor synchronization presents a clear advantage of the discretely timed auditory stimulus implying that the neural and evolutionary mechanisms underlying beat synchronization are modality-specific. [2] The stability of beat synchronization to discrete visual modalities (a flash of light) has been shown to be less stable than its auditory counterpart.

Concrete examples/figures?

## 2.3 Rhythmic Perception

Though seemingly a separate realm of study, the field of rhythmic perception is an important contribution to the overall understanding of sensorimotor synchronization. The work involves measurement of the ability to recognize different rhythmic patterns to different stimuli in a listen and respond type of fashion. Researchers from the human computer interaction group at the University of Tampere, Finland, conducted an experiment in 2008 to confirm that the instantaneous auditory modality dominates rhythmic perception. Tactile follows close suit with the visual modality being the least suitable for accurately perceiving rhythmic information as well as the most mentally demanding. Rather than the traditional tap based test, users were given two rhythmic sections and asked to determine whether they were identical or not across

modalities as well as combinations of each. [3] Even though it yielded less correct results the tactile modality was, from the users point of view, almost as good as the auditory modality. Exploration of pulse length was called upon for further insight.

## 2.4 A Continuous Visual Metronome

In a novel advancement challenging the auditory advantage and perhaps paving the way towards a more meaningful gesture, researchers in the Psychology department at Sun Yat-Sin University in Guangdong found continuous motion of a bouncing ball to be as stable as synchronization to an auditory metronome. [2]

Bouncing ball paper discussion.

## 2.5 The Tactile Modality

A 2016 study by the Department of Psychology at Ryerson University considered whether the auditory advantage persisted across the tactile modality. The experiment was a tap test of non musicians put through a series of simple and complex rhythmic sequences with a varied area of haptic stimulation. In conditions involving a large area of stimulation and simple rhythmic sequences, tactile synchronization closely matched auditory. They proved that if made salient enough, the accuracy of synchronization to a tactile metronome can equal synchronization to an auditory metronome, further challenging the idea of an auditory advantage over all other modalities for synchronization to discretely timed rhythmic stimuli. However, auditory won out for synchronization of complex rhythmic sequences. [1]

### 2.5.1 Multisensory Cues

Revise and reword

Maintaining synchrony with a periodic event requires that the central nervous system (CNS) compensate for timing variation arising from sensory, decision and motor processing noise. Keeping in time with a pacing source (metronome) requires continual corrections based on the timing error (asynchrony) between the metronome

## 2. Previous Work

and performed actions The Central Nervous system can alternate between cues depending on the demand of the task or combine info from different senses. In the context of rhythmic cues the brain will weight signals according to the relative reliability in the timing of the events across modalities, ensuring optimal movement production to the underlying event extracted from the signals.

asynchrony variability for unimodal tactile cues was lower than for the visual metronome ( $F_{1,9} = 6.929$ ,  $P = 0.027$ ) and only slightly higher than that for unimodal auditory cues. [? ]

### 2.5.2 Haptic Drumkit

Revise and reword

In 2010, this group at the Open University in the UK first thought of a haptic set which was purposed to enable a drummer to learn multi-limb coordination with the broader goal of polyrhythmic entrainment.

Drew up an important distinction between stimulus response and fostering entrainment.

Notes from test subjects: -commented that the haptic guidance was intimate and that you didnt have to work out the division of labor as in audio -drumming had a tendency to drown out signal from vibrotactiles - haptic masking -Blurring attack of haptics at high tempo -for looping patterns it was hard to discern whether the pattern would start [? ]

### 2.5.3 Vibrotactile Metronome

Revise and reword

[? ] The vibrotactile metronome is a thesis project of Patrick Ignoto of the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Music Media and Technology (CIRMMT) program at McGill University.

The work done has some fascinating parallels to this project and gave me some very tangible insights towards testing and overall procedure.

Patricks overall goal was to propose a device which uses tactile sense to provide similar functionality to a click track as its used for a contemporary classical music



conductor with the added benefit of not blocking the ear or interfering with the conductor's perception.

His guide for design requirements was the director and conductor of the contemporary music ensemble, Prof. Bourgogne. He gave him the constraint that the pulses should feel continuous and not discrete, even mentioning a pendulum motion as the descriptive feeling.

Another constraint was that the pulses peak amplitude line up with the audio track.

The input click track was converted to a vibrotactile click via some Matlab code. Allowed for simultaneity between audible and vibrotactile pulses.

Two ERMs and one pager buzzer

Transmitter connected to PC running Max initially: Real-time audio analysis using `bonk` object to find downbeats. Triggered vibrotactile envelope signal and control message transmitted to device. Redefined Inter-Onset Interval as half previous IOI (rise time) + half next IOI (decay time) for more precision to accommodate varying pulse lengths.

Had to move to post-processing in Matlab since couldn't keep up with buffering. Used `findpeaks` to find local maxima for each click, determined IOI. To synchronize with the audio click he triggered the haptic pulse midway between two audio clicks.

### 2.5.4 Commercial Introspection

Peterson tuner BodyBeat Sync (\$140) seeks to revolutionize the traditional metronome through its extensive coverage of all three modalities with a wearable pulsing vibration unit which claims to allow musicians to easily internalize the beat and develop a note value relationship both audibly and physically. [Peterson Citation]

Ramp up/down as well as proof via quantification of this rhythmic internalization are missing.

The Soundbrenner (\$99) is a vibration based metronome using an instantaneous pulse and claims that in freeing the ears, it has brought the rhythm closer to the body, making it more comfortable and natural to feel the beat and swing of the music instead of chasing the click. [Soundbrenner Citation]

Similarly, lack of ramp up/down as well as numerical proof.

## *2. Previous Work*

# Chapter 3

## Haptic Design

This chapter briefly touches on the field of haptics and delves into tactile research. This leads into a discussion of the overall design requirements, initial prototypes, and overall challenges overcome which led to the development of the final prototype, the vibrotactile array.

### 3.1 Brief introduction to haptics

**Haptics** are the field of research which concern the sense of touch as it applies to *kinesthetic* and *tactile* sensation. The tactile sense enables humans to perceive object properties through skin contact while the *kinesthetic* or *proprioceptive* sense lets one perceive the positions, movements, and forces on one's own body.

The skin is lined with an array of sensory receptors which respond to mechanical pressure and distortions such as skin deformation. The *lamellated* or *pacinian corpuscles* (PC) are responsible for sensitivity to vibration and pressure. These rapidly adapting receptors are responsible for vibrotactile perception in glabrous skin.


Sensitivity to a tactile stimulus grows with the area in contact with the skin and also improves with the stimulus duration until it reaches a point of saturation. When pressure is continuous an effect called *haptic masking* (also known as the *summation effect*) is possible. The overstimulation of the *pacinian corpuscles* causes the brain to ignore these messages with a mechanical filtering system which lowers the perception threshold in order to focus on other important happenings. If this was not the

case, a person could for example feel the pressure exerted by wearing clothing [? ]. This phenomena is important to consider when dealing with haptic placement. As mentioned in 2.5, when the vibrotactiles were placed over a larger area span haptic masking was avoided and the results closely matched the auditory modality.

#### 3.1.1 Haptic Considerations

The following questions arise based on extensive research done by Choi and Kuchenbecker [? ] and are crucial concepts underpinning the creation a meaningful haptic.

1. *Can the user feel it?* Perceptibility of vibrotactile stimuli is strongly dependent on the frequency of vibration. The minimum threshold is observed to be between 150-300Hz and can cover an area smaller than 0.1 micrometer. The absolute thresholds are dependent on factors such as body site, contact area, stimulus duration, stimulus waveform, contact force, skin temperature, presence of other masking stimuli, and age.
2. *Can the user distinguish between the different vibrotactile cues being displayed?* This is quantified by the discrimination or *difference threshold* also called the *Just Noticeable Difference* (JND). It is defined as the smallest amount a stimulus intensity much change to produce a noticeable change in sensory experience. The JND is measured as a *Weber fraction*:  $\Delta I/I = k$  or the ratio of difference threshold to the reference level. Research into experimental psychology has deemed a 20-30% difference in amplitude or frequency is necessary for robust discrimination between vibrotactile stimuli in practical applications.
3. *How strong does a certain vibrotactile cue feel to the user?* *Steven's power law* describes the relationship between the magnitude of a physical stimulus and its perceived intensity or strength. See Figure ??



When a stimulus intensity  $I$  is above its absolute threshold, humans perceives its magnitude as  $\Psi(I)$ (perceptual strength). The exponent (dependent on stimulation freq) determines growth rate of the perceived magnitude, ranges from 0.35 to 0.86 for vibrotactiles. Perceived intensity is a function of freq and amplitude of vibration (also affecting perceived pitch).

4. *How good are users at judging timing of vibrotactile cues?* Tactile perception is generally considered to have high temporal acuity. Vibrotactile temporal

resolution research cites a humans ability to distinguish successive pulses with a time gap as small as 5 ms (12000 BPM). This resolution is better than vision (25ms) but slightly worse than physiological experiments into the peripheral auditory system which cites a theoretical best case scenario of approximately 2 ms [?] [? ]

5. *Can Vibrotactile cues elicit any other perceptual effects?* Below 3 Hz is considered slow kinesthetic motion. Between 10-70Hz is the sensation of rough motion or fluttering and between 100-300Hz is the sensation of smooth vibration. Subjective quality of a vibrotactile stimulus can be controlled by modifying the envelope of the stimulus amplitude.

#### 3.1.2 Vibrotactiles

The exploration of touch actuation led to the evaluation of available vibrotactiles. The following is a thorough breakdown to inform design perspective.

1. Linear electromagnetic actuators
  - solenoid:
    - can leverage resonance, large output for small input
    - force dependent on position within magnetic field
    - influenced by device orientation relative to gravity
    - heats up during use
  - voice coil:
    - linear dynamics yields consistent output, relatively easy to model
    - *C2 tactor*:
      - 7.6mm contactor preloaded against the skin
      - suspension resonates at 250Hz for maximum perceptibility
    - *Haptuator*:
      - moving magnet design
      - not meant to touch the skin
      - optimized to render frequencies above 50Hz

2. Rotary Electromagnetic Actuators (ERM - eccentric rotating mass)

- simple, reliable, rotate continuously with a constant voltage/current applied
- off-center mass affixed to output shaft so that its rotation exerts large radial forces on the body of the motor
- couples freq and amplitude of the resulting vibration to the motors rotational speed
- small voltage yields weaker vibrations
- intrinsic spin-up time could cause delay at the start of the cue
- internal static friction can prevent motor from rotating when the applied voltage is very small

3. Nonelectromagnetic Actuators - Piezoelectric effect

- respond to inputs very quickly and can output arbitrary waveforms
- typically require input on the order of 100V
- high stiffness of skin creates a need for relatively heavy vibrotactile actuator
- most don't have power to move the skin without pushing off a cumbersome mechanical ground

4. EAP (electroactive polymer) actuators

- uses elastomers rather than ceramics
- can achieve larger deformations for lower drive voltages

5. SMA (shape memory alloy) actuators

- remembers original shape
- mechanical properties altered in response to temp changes
- slow response time, large hysteresis, high energy consumption

6. Pneumatic systems

- compact, light
- require high-pressure air source
- struggle to output high-frequency signals

7. Forced impact

- TacHammer - new technology, specs unknown, hard to acquire

#### Vibrotactile Constraints

1. Create consistent mechanical coupling between actuator vibrations and users skin
2. Slight changes to such a system drastically affect users ability to feel and comprehend the rendered signals.
3. For fixed actuator size/activation level, magnitude of created vibrations is inversely proportional to the mass of the object.
4. High bandwidth accelerometer can be used to measure vibration output performance. [? ]
5. When the application involves a large object, a wearable device, and/or multiple stimulation sites, the optimal vibrotactile rendering paradigm is to vibrate one or more small zones.
  - For example, in a tactile display application the localization accuracy of 250-Hz vibrotactile stimuli around the waist was 74% with 12 equidistant tactile actuators (tactors), 92% with eight tactors, and 97% with six tactors.[? ]

## 3.2 Design requirements

The initial requirement set forth by Professor Neely in the Haptic Enviro-Sensing Metronome (HESM) design draft is centered around an analogue wave that could squeeze and release. As the analogue wave approaches its crest it provides insight forecasting the approaching *crusis*, allowing the user to prepare for and rebound from the "click-moment" with rich entrainment.

This observation is in direct parallel to external vibrotactile metronome research as discussed in [2.5.3](#). The constraint was such that the pulses should feel continuous and not discrete, even mentioning a pendulum motion as the descriptive feeling to convey.

As the intention is to encourage entrainment of the human body to external forces,



the frequencies required are quite low, based on the tempi of slow walking to running gaits (40 bpm/.67 Hz to 180 bpm/3 Hz).

[? ]

add HESM design to bio for citations

## 3.3 Initial Prototypes

In order to capture the sensation defined in the design requirements, a series of prototypes were rapidly developed.

### 3.3.1 Solenoid bracelet

Initial introspection towards capturing the squeeze and release sensation led to the rapid prototyping of a simple solenoid bracelet.

#### Parts List

1. Adafruit Pro Trinket 5V 16MHz
2. N-channel MOSFET
3. 1N4004 diode
4. mini push-pull solenoid

#### Assembly

The design was inspired and assembled per *Adafruit* specification [? ]. The base of an N-channel MOSFET was connected through a 1K resistor to a digital i/o pin on the trinket per Figure 3.1. The collector was connected through the solenoid and diode in parallel to Vcc running at 5V.





Figure 3.1: Solenoid Schematic

## Method

As a voltage is applied the slug in the middle of the solenoid is pulled into the center of the coil. The actuation pulls a taught wristband attached to the chasis of the solenoid and as the voltage drops the solenoid retracts releasing tension in the wristband, shown in Figure 3.2.

This was controlled in the *Arduino IDE* through a simple PWM signal with increasing duty cycle which output through the digital I/O. The delay was hard coded proportional to the desired BPM.

Figure 3.2: Solenoid Wristband Prototype



## Outcome

Due to the linear relationship between current draw and pull force, the solenoid required high current and significant voltage thus isolation from the microcontroller was ideal. The necessary rigidity of the band was a cause of discomfort and the lack of positioning options was a detriment to musicians who relied on

availability of their hand. Additionally, heat dissipation was at times unsafe and unbearable since the chassis was in direct contact with the skin. Though it captured the tension and release sensation well, there seemed to be a lack of clarity with regards to communication of whether each push pull iteration was a beat length or if a single contraction was the downbeat (i.e. eighth note pulse rather than quarter note). Coupled with the bulky nature of the solenoid chassis, high power requirements and excessive heat dissipation, the solenoid prototype was quickly abandoned.

#### 3.3.2 Single vibrotactile

The subsequent prototype iteration was the first involving a vibrotactile motor. Since the goal was to run everything off of a single board, the voltage constraint was limited to the 5V maximum provided by the *Adafruit Pro Trinket* spec. An ERM motor was chosen for its working voltage range of 2-5V and minimal coin cell form factor (10mm diameter). Like the solenoid, higher applied voltage yield more current draw but stronger vibration. At 5V, a single motor draws 100mA. The specification was 1100 at 5V which roughly translates to 183Hz. Though not quite at the ideal 250Hz range optimal for skin sensitivity, this was deemed close enough.

To realize the spectrum of capability for vibrotactile sensation (beyond pulse width modulation of the signal) a haptic motor controller with a pre-installed library of effects was acquired.

The goal of this design was to test the ERM sensation on a portable wearable. The MCU was altered from the Pro Trinket to the Flora which ran at 3.3V and had less digital I/O pins, but supported external connectivity and took up less surface area.

#### Parts List

1. Vibrating mini motor disc
2. Adafruit DRV2605L Haptic Motor Controller
3. Flora Wearable Bluefruit LE Module
4. Flora Wearable electronic platform
5. LiPo Battery - 3.7v 1100mAh

#### Assembly

First, the ERM leads were soldered to the DRV2605 haptic motor controller and connected via I2C protocol to the complimentary pins on the Flora (SCL,SDA). To experiment with wirelessly triggering the vibrotactile, the bluetooth low energy module (BLE)was added and the send and receive (Tx/Rx) pins were connected as referenced in Figure 3.3. The battery was connected via the built-in terminal clip and last the entire prototype was fitted into the space of a sports wristband with the vibrotactile on the inside touching the skin.




Figure 3.3: Prototype 2 - Single vibrotactile, wireless connectivity

#### Method

Once the hardware was setup, the haptic library was iterated through for selection of the most influential effect. The optimal sensation chosen was a queue of two chained effects according to the [DRV2605 datasheet](#):

- 83 - Transition Ramp Up Long Smooth 2 - 0 to 100%
- 71 - Transition Ramp Down Long Smooth 2 - 100% to 0

Within the Arduino IDE the Bluefruit library and dependencies were imported and the bluetooth low energy connection configured via UART. On the client side,

the connectivity was validated via the publicly available Bluefruit application on an external Android device. The app would sent integer values representing the desired BPM to the connected haptic wearable. The code was written such upon setup and BT pairing, the main loop was constantly listening for sent packets. Once received, the new bpm value was parsed into a period value in milliseconds via equation 3.1

$$period = \frac{60,000}{bpm} \quad (3.1)$$

Since the highest operational bpm specified was 180, the shortest period would be an interval of 333.33 ms. This value divided in half gave the maximum allowed ramp up time for the motor, approximately 150ms. The new period value was fed into a state machine which set the on and off state of the motor based on a timer from half the calculated period as well as the 150ms off state.

## Outcome

The singular ERM prototype granted key insight into the capability of a vibrotactile to create the desired awareness and fill the interstitial space; though it was found to be lacking the ability to fully command the wearers attention. This was primarily due to the fact that it was driven by a 3.3V board which inhibited the vibrational strength. The next iteration needed to operate at higher voltage to get a stronger vibration. It was also deemed necessary to increase the number of vibrotactiles to work in an array format in complete synchronicity to explicitly communicate the necessary ramp up and decay sensation.

Though the haptic motor controller was a critical evaluation tool for selecting the vibration effect, it was crucial for the final prototype to be able to turn on the motors at full voltage as quick as possible in order to minimize ramp up time. Spacing out the motors would also optimize ramp up time in allowing a motor the time to fully spin back down while the adjacent was spinning up.

Furthermore, the *delay()* function added in the BLE section of code was causing the haptic to drift slightly in tempo beyond five minutes of runtime due to the programmatic halting and resumption of dependent timers. The next prototype would have to move away from the delay function which halted program execution.

## 3.4 Vibrotactile Haptic Array

The final prototype was an array of four vibrotactiles. Several hardware advancements were implemented in order to solve design challenges which arose as discussed in Section 3.5. The overall process is detailed below.

### 3.4.1 Hardware

The main board was reverted back to that used in the solenoid prototype, the 5V 16MHz *Adafruit Pro Trinket* in order to provide maximum possible voltage to the motors. On the downside, this board did not have build in serial communication so an FTDI to USB cable was necessary in order to communicate with the device. Bluetooth connectivity was abandoned to minimize latency.

#### Parts List

Part Type	Properties	Quantity
Electrolytic Capacitor	capacitance 68F; package 0405 [SMD, electrolytic]; voltage 16V	1
Electrolytic Capacitor	capacitance 10F; package 200 mil [THT, electrolytic]; voltage 25V	4
Ceramic Capacitor	capacitance 100nF; package 100 mil [THT, multilayer]; voltage 6.3V	1
Diode	package diode-1n4001; variant pth	4
Vibration Motor	vibration motor 11000 RPM 5VDC	4
Adafruit Pro Trinket 5V 16MHz	variant variant 1; part # Adafruit #2000	1
2N7000 FET N-Channel	package TO92; type n-channel; part # 2N7000	4
220 Resistor	tolerance 5%; package 0805 [SMD]; resistance 220	5
10k Resistor	tolerance 5%; package 0603 [SMD]; resistance 10k	1
FTDI to USB	Adafruit FTDI Serial TTL232 USB Cable [ADA70]	1
Shrink wrap	Heat Shrink Pack	1

Table 3.1: Vibrotactile Haptic Array Parts List

Talk about the design choice for the caps and diodes here




Figure 3.4: Final prototype wiring mockup

### 3.4.2 Software

## 3.5 Design Challenges

Motor noise

Managing power dips

Debounce for tap tempo

## **3.6 Optimization**

### **3.6.1 Future Implementation**

Bluetooth/Wireless

Custom PCB

Experiment with other vibrotactiles such as tachhammer and LNA's



# Chapter 4

## Method

This chapter outlines each test case, describes the motivation behind the test plan, and delves into both the hardware and software design required to implement the methodology.

The overall test principle was derived from traditional sensorimotor synchronization tasks in which a user is asked to tap to a corresponding stimulus. The time delta between the tap onset and the stimulus onset is tracked and plotted for future analysis. Since the haptic domain is of primary focus, the auditory modality functions primarily as a benchmark or baseline foundation. The work presented in [2.4](#) extensively covers the idea of the interstitial beat occupying the visual domain and as such will not be re-evaluated here.

Each test case is defined and presented in [4.1](#). The overall software development is detailed in [4.2.1](#). The hardware setup and code re-purposing from TapArduino is discussed in [4.2.2](#).

### 4.1 Test Plan

Testing was divided into two major sections, **Steady** and **Dynamic**, implying either an *isochronous* beat or a *non-isochronous* pulse respectively. While structurally identical, the dynamic tests however focussed on rubato within a range starting at the predefined BPM and rising or falling within a specified window. The chosen tempi

Fill  
method  
in-  
tro  
in  
with  
more  
de-  
tail

## 4. Method

Steady							
Discrete		BPM	Runtime (sec)	Interstitial		BPM	Runtime (sec)
A1a	click	i. 45	20	A1b	legato chime (swing click)	i. 45	30
		ii. 90	20			ii. 90	16
		iii. 135	20			iii. 135	11
		iv. 180	20			iv. 180	8
A2a	staccato music (melody)	i. 45	32	A2b	legato music (melody)	i. 45	32
		ii. 90	16			ii. 90	16
		iii. 135	11			iii. 135	11
		iv. 180	8			iv. 180	8
H1a	poke / all on (instantaneous)	i. 45	15	H1b	oscillate down and back up	i. 45	15
		ii. 90	15			ii. 90	15
		iii. 135	15			iii. 135	15
		iv. 180	15			iv. 180	15

Dynamic							
Discrete		BPM	Runtime (sec)	Interstitial		BPM	Runtime (sec)
A3a	click	i. 45 +/- 15	20	A3b	legato chime (swing click)	i. 45 +/- 15	20
		ii. 90 +/- 15	10			ii. 90 +/- 15	10
		iii. 135 +/- 15	10			iii. 135 +/- 15	10
		iv. 180 +/- 15	10			iv. 180 +/- 15	10
A4a	staccato music (melody)	i. 45 +/- 15	30	A4b	legato music (melody)	i. 45 +/- 15	30
		ii. 90 +/- 15	15			ii. 90 +/- 15	15
		iii. 135 +/- 15	10			iii. 135 +/- 15	10
		iv. 180 +/- 15	10			iv. 180 +/- 15	10
H2a	poke / all on (instantaneous)	i. 45 +/- 10	15	H2b	oscillate down and back up	i. 45 +/- 10	15
		ii. 90 +/- 5	15			ii. 90 +/- 5	15
		iii. 135 +/- 3	15			iii. 135 +/- 3	15
		iv. 180 +/- 1	15			iv. 180 +/- 1	15

Table 4.1: Test Plan

parallels slow walking to running gaits spanning a range of 45-180 beats per minute.

Each section had three subsections centered around either an audible metronome tone (**A1**, **A3**), musical note (**A2**, **A4**), and lastly the haptic modality (**H1**, **H2**). Subsections were further broken down into **a** and **b** sections, denoting either *discrete* or *interstitial/continuous* mode of operation. A breakdown of the test plan is shown in Figure 4.1.

As discussed in Chapter 3, the haptic was designed with two operating modes in mind, discrete and continuous. These modes were programmatically controlled to match the desired test cases, extensively explained in section 4.2.1

### 4.1.1 Audio File Generation

All tracks were rendered using the digital audio workstation (DAW) *Logic Pro X* as .wav files at a 44.1kHz sample rate with 16 bit resolution.

### Metronomic click and legato chime

**A1a** and **A3a** required a standard metronomic pulse. This was accomplished using the default Klopfggeist (metronome) plugin from Logic Pro X. No additional tuning was modified and the tonality was left at 0.83 of unity as shown in 4.1.




Figure 4.1: Default metronome

**A1b** and **A3b** however required a swing or legato type of chime in order to convey filling the interstitial space. To capture this effect the Klopfggeist tonality was increased to unity and tuned -27 semitones lower which served to both soften diminish the discrete click, provided an elongated or continuous audible sensation. To give the impression of a sound that was ramping up in amplitude and decaying after the peak, a tremolo effect which mimics a sawtooth wave was added to the signal chain as seen in 4.2. Last, a multi-band EQ was placed at the end of the signal chain with a bandpass filter from 95Hz-750Hz to remove unwanted frequency presence and a 3.5dB high-Q peak at 220Hz to emphasize the tonality.

#### 4. Method

Figure 4.2: Modified click parameters for interstitial tests.


(a) Modified metronome



(b) Superimposed tremolo




(c) Equalized tone



The resultant waveform encapsulated the occupation of the interstitial space. A comparison of this waveform in contrast to its discrete counterpart is shown in 4.3. Note the envelope of signal (b) follows a natural build up and decay.

Figure 4.3: Metronomic waveform comparison



### Stacatto and legato melody

As a specific musical listening task, test cases **A2a**, **A4a** and **A2b**, **A4b** involve synchronization to a simple melodic sequence of notes. The music chosen was the nursery rhyme *Pat-A-Cake*. The initial mockup was drafted in Sibelius and exported to Logic Pro X for bpm adjustment.

Each quarter note represents a beat and therefore a tap onset. In order to emphasize a discrete event for test cases **A2a** and **A4a**, notes were input as stacatto, shown below: ??.

### Pat-a-Cake

Piano

Pno.

Expand  
the  
rea-  
son-  
ing  
for  
the  
mu-  
si-  
cal  
tests

#### 4. Method

The interstitial counterpart of these test cases (**A2b**, **A4b**) underwent crescendo and decrescendo after every note onset with forte notes surrounded by mezzopiano to give the impression of amplitude build up and decay, shown below: ??


### Pat-a-Cake

The musical score for "Pat-a-Cake" consists of two staves: Piano and Pno. (Piano). The Piano staff is in 3/4 time and features a series of eighth notes. Above the staff, there are dynamic markings: *mp mp* above the first two notes, *mp mp* above the next two, *mp mp* above the next two, *mp mp* above the next two, *mp mp* above the next two, *mp mp* above the next two, and *mp mp* above the final two. Below the staff, there are crescendo and decrescendo symbols: *>>>* above the first two notes, *>>>* above the next two, *>>>* above the next two, *>>>* above the next two, *>>>* above the next two, *>>>* above the next two, and *>>>* above the final two. The Pno. staff is in 3/4 time and features a single eighth note. Above the staff, there is a dynamic marking: *f* above the first note. Below the staff, there are crescendo and decrescendo symbols: *>* above the first note and *<* below the first note.


Note below in 4.4 the gradual, nearly exponential decay displayed in the interstitial tone as a result of the legato input.

Figure 4.4: Musical waveform comparison

(a) A2a1: stacatto melody




(b) A2b1: legato melody



### Dynamic tempi manipulation - audio

Dynamic manipulation of tempo was accomplished in *Logic Pro X* through automation of the tempo parameter over the time period of the desired waveform. Each test case started on one of the pre-defined BPM's (45, 90, 135, 180) but traversed either sinusoidally or triangularly through time as peaks and troughs ranging plus or minus 15 bpm; shown in [4.5](#).

Figure 4.5: Dynamic audio tempo automation patterns



## 4.2 Test Suite

High precision data acquisition and the minimization of delay were the central foci of the test suite design. Due to the extensive amount of publicly available libraries, multithreading capability, and plot integration via matplotlib, *Python* was chosen as the development environment. Complementary to the software platform was the implementation of a tap onset detection mechanism via force sensitive resistor (FSR) and the *Arduino Uno*.

### 4.2.1 Software Development

Discuss code breakdown

- GUI

- Haptic onset detection

- Tap onset detection

- Multithreading

- Audio onset detection

- Plotting



## 4.2.2 Tap Onset Hardware

### Tap Onset Latency Evaluation

A sensorimotor synchronization experiment was conducted to discover how auditory feedback to a tap onset could be presented with minimal latency and responses recorded with the most accuracy. It was found that not only was the auditory response latency the least for the Arduino system using a force sensitive resistor (mean = 0.6 ms, sd = 0.3), but it had missed the fewest taps and recorded the least superfluous responses as compared to a percussion pad with the FTAP and Max MSP systems [Tap Arduino, 1].

### 4.2.3 Delay Evaluation

Overall strategy to minimize delay maximize accuracy/precision

Sources of potential error:

\*FTDI/USB -¿ Pro Trinket (16MHz) -¿ Laptop

\*USB -¿ Arduino -¿ Laptop

\*Serial write to haptic to motor spin up

\*FSR analog read/mentioned debounce

Sol: python threading

Evaluation with scope:

### 4.2.4 Setup

To initialize setup, the user is seated and given a pair of closed-back headphones. The FSR is situated to their preference, either dominant or non-dominant hand, and secured into place. Unlike a keyboard or button the FSR gives no feedback or rebound;psychologically ensuring a confident tap on each onset while providing no tactile response. This approach avoids intrinsic lag as there are no mechanical components involved. The delay limit is defined by the threshold applied in the software to avoid debounce, as discussed in Section ??

The user will input their name, read the instructions, agree to the conditions of the test suite, and commence with the test. The order every user encounters will

#### 4. Method

differ as the tests are scrambled. Upon completion, the users are asked to fill out a survey and the results are displayed.




Figure 4.6: Test Suite Flow Chart

#### Example Output

### 4.3 Expectations

If it can be proven for nonmusicians that NMA does not exhibit a linear increase as the IOI increases with the haptic...than, x

According to prior research, expect musicians NMAs to be small and nearly constant as IOI is increased.[4? ]

# Chapter 5

## Data Analysis

### 5.1 Motivation

I was motivated to write a Phd thesis because I did not want to work directly after finishing my study

### 5.2 Organization

This thesis is organized as follows, ...



# Chapter 6

## Conclusions

### 6.1 Future Work

#### 6.1.1 Beat Tracking

Max Patch based on THIS RESEARCH  
does this  
for the purposing of testing this

#### 6.1.2 Extra-musical Applications

Parkinson's research

Stroke gait rehabilitation research [? ]

Through their research they discovered the extension of the application towards those with restricted mobility and morphed the project into the haptic bracelet 4 years later.

Stroke survivors usually suffer from for the purpose of gait rehabilitation. The results were promising.

Paper discusses the prior research of audio stimulation and how it yields immediate improvement through entrainment but that they are not lasting

Focussed on triggering the tibialis anterior which contrasts the principles of entrainment, which would utilize rhythmic beats in any sensory modality, regardless

## *6. Conclusions*

of placement. Also haptic masking from leg-to-floor-impact

One patient who was a veteran mentioned that it put a marching sense back into his mind and helped remind him of that sensation of even walking.

# Appendix A

## Stuff I forgot

Robots are really, really great.

*A. Stuff I forgot*



# Bibliography

- [1] E. C. Fitts, *The New Music Review and Church Music Review, 1901-1935: Keyword-author index: A capella-English text*, vol. 3. Nisc, 2008.
- [2] B. H. Repp and Y.-H. Su, “Sensorimotor synchronization: a review of recent research (2006–2012),” *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 403–452, 2013. [1.2.4](#), [1.2.5](#), [2.1.1](#), [2.1.2](#), [4.3](#)
- [3] R. Polak, J. London, and N. Jacoby, “Both isochronous and non-isochronous metrical subdivision afford precise and stable ensemble entrainment: a corpus study of malian jembe drumming,” *Frontiers in neuroscience*, vol. 10, p. 285, 2016.
- [4] L. Gan, Y. Huang, L. Zhou, C. Qian, and X. Wu, “Synchronization to a bouncing ball with a realistic motion trajectory,” *Scientific reports*, vol. 5, p. 11974, 2015. [2.2](#), [2.4](#)
- [5] M. Jokiniemi, R. Raisamo, J. Lylykangas, and V. Surakka, “Crossmodal rhythm perception,” in *International Workshop on Haptic and Audio Interaction Design*, pp. 111–119, Springer, 2008. [2.3](#)
- [6] P. Ammirante, A. D. Patel, and F. A. Russo, “Synchronizing to auditory and tactile metronomes: a test of the auditory-motor enhancement hypothesis,” *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 1882–1890, 2016. [2.5](#)
- [7] M. T. Elliott, A. Wing, and A. Welchman, “Multisensory cues improve sensorimotor synchronisation,” *European Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 1828–1835, 2010.
- [8] S. Holland, A. J. Bouwer, M. Dalgelish, and T. M. Hurtig, “Feeling the beat where it counts: fostering multi-limb rhythm skills with the haptic drum kit,” in *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on Tangible, embedded, and embodied interaction*, pp. 21–28, ACM, 2010.
- [9] P. Ignoto, I. Hattwick, and M. M. Wanderley, “Development of a vibrotactile metronome to assist in conducting contemporary classical music,” in *International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics*, pp. 248–258, Springer, 2017.

- [10] S. Choi and K. J. Kuchenbecker, “Vibrotactile display: Perception, technology, and applications,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 101, no. 9, pp. 2093–2104, 2013.
- [11] A. Fishbach, I. Nelken, and Y. Yeshurun, “Auditory edge detection: a neural model for physiological and psychoacoustical responses to amplitude transients,” *Journal of Neurophysiology*, vol. 85, no. 6, pp. 2303–2323, 2001.
- [12] T. D. Parsons, “Neurobiology: auditory fidelity,” *Nature*, vol. 444, no. 7122, p. 1013, 2006.
- [13] Adafruit, “Mini Push-Pull Solenoid,” 2018.
- [14] S. Holland, R. L. Wright, A. Wing, T. Crevoisier, O. Hödl, and M. Canelli, “A gait rehabilitation pilot study using tactile cueing following hemiparetic stroke,” in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare*, pp. 402–405, ICST (Institute for Computer Sciences, Social-Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering), 2014.