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# Introduction

A powered exoskeleton, or exoskeleton, is wearable technology the amplifies and augments the pilot’s physicality. Through direct mechanical assistance via actuators, the pilot’s effective strength may be increased. By supplementing the strength required to complete a task the energy requirements of the task may be reduced; effectively increasing the pilot’s endurance. Possible applications for exoskeletons include: military operations, emergency & rescue, physical/manual labour, and medical applications.

Two major factors impact the viability of exoskeleton technology: power supply, and control. This thesis shall address one facet of the difficulties or exoskeleton control. Current exoskeleton control methods are inadequate due to mechanical constraints and the limitations of the control methods. Imperfections in mechanical design may result in a limited range of movement affecting the suits utility (e.g. A rigid spine in a confined space). Current methods of control use either force-based sensors or preprogramed movements. Finite sets of preprogramed movements are insufficient for dynamic environments and are only suitable for applications where the pilot is incapable of properly piloting the system kt. Force based methods encounter stability problems and may increase the exertion required to complete a task kt.

Instead this thesis will focus on the development of a novel power exoskeleton control method based on detecting the pilot’s position relative to the suit to maintain a constant offset; specifically focusing on the development of the controls and perception systems required to direct an exoskeleton.

An offset-based control system, by maintaining a constant offset from the user, may exist as a concentric outline (or *bubble*) of the user, mirroring their actions. Thus, to control the system the pilot simply needs to assume the desired position of the suit, and the suit shall mimic them. By mimicking the user’s actions, the suit is more intuitive that force based and preprogramed methods. The resulting system requires no physical contract with the pilot to control. With no physical contact required to operate the system the energy required from a pilot to complete a task with a load is effectively the same as completing the task with no load. Therefore, with any arbitrary load the user has the endurance to perform the task as if there no load at all.

# Background and Problem breakdown

## Existing Technologies and limitations

Exoskeleton technology began in 1890 kt, with Nicholas Yagin, with the development of a passive device that used compressed gas to assist in human movement. However, it was not until the 1960s that the first attempt at a practical power exoskeleton was developed. The Hardiman kt, created by General Electric, was ground-breaking but non-viable due to its extreme weight (double its maximum load) and control problems. The suit, when used as a complete system instead of in parts, was subject to dangerous violent uncontrolled movements and the master-slave control system suffered debilitating lag.

Prospective uses for exoskeletons usually involve a scenario where a human user may require the strength and endurance of a machine, but circumstances result in wheeled vehicles are undesirable. Examples of possible applications include:

Military Operations: kt

Rescue and evacuation missions: kt

Medical Systems: kt

Construction & Physical Labour: kt

Since the Hardiman, exoskeletons have been plagued by the same two major problems that have prevented their use in real world applications: power to weight ratio/power supply and control. The following outlines current developments in exoskeleton technologies.

### HULC kt

The Human Universal Load Carrier (HULC) is battery-powered lower extremity exoskeleton initially developed by Berkeley Robotics and Human Engineering Laboratory, before entering an exclusive licensing agreement with Lockheed Martin in 2009. The system uses hydraulics to amplify the pilot’s knees and hips while supporting a load of 90kg. Designed for military applications it claims six hours of battery and uses force-based sensors for control.

The HULC was abandoned as” it proved impractical, exhausting users instead of supercharging them” kt and has been succeeded by the TALOS project kt.

### EskoGT kt

In 2010 the original developer of the HULC, Esko Bionics revealed the Exoskeleton Lower Extremity Gait System (eLEGS). With a maximum battery life of 6 hours and maximum gait of 3.2m/s kt, the system uses pushbuttons and force-motion sensors for control. Specially design for medical applications, the exoskeleton uses preprogramed movements to aid the mobility of stroke and spinal injury patients.

The suit is ill suited for dynamic environments, with its finite range of movements prohibiting stairs and uneven surfaces. While the suit may assist those with “upper extremity motor function of at least 4/5 in at least one arm”, the suit is slower than a wheelchair and is not an improvement on standard human movement

### Raytheon XOS Exoskeleton

The 2008 Raytheon XOS Exoskeleton developed by Raytheon is a full body exoskeleton that can support up to 23kg on each arm kt. The suit uses force-based sensors for control. Despite claims that the exoskeleton would be ready for production by 2016, they have made no public comments on progress since 2011.

### Warrior Web

The Warrior Web non-rigid exoskeleton was first demonstrated at the 2016 DARPA Demo Day. Developed by DARPA, it used preprogramed commands to assist with the user’s ankle motions. However, it was unpredictable in uneven terrain, malfunctioned, and could not transition readily between a walking and running state. kt (Cornwall, 2015).

### Hybrid Assistive Limb (HAL)

In 1997 Cyberdine unveiled the Hybrid Assistive Limb (HAL). The HAL’s iterations include a battery-powered lower extremity exoskeleton and a full body exoskeleton. Through a combination of bioelectrical sensors and force sensors the HAL measured muscle contracts to trigger preprogramed movements.

The system has had mixed success, and despite applying for USA FDA approval in 2014, the HAL is yet to be permitted for use in the US kt

## Preprogramed Control

Preprogramed control methods consist of a set of specific movements that are triggered in one way or another. HAL measures contractions in the arms of patients to trigger as the swing them back and forth to trigger left-foot right-foot walking motions. Warrior Web applies torque to the ankle of the user (assisting them walk) when movement is detected.

These systems are inherently limited in their utility. By having a finite or procedurally generated set of movements there will always be scenarios or circumstances where the set of movements is not applicable. In real dynamic environments (e.g. military, resuce & evacuation, and physical labour) dynamic controls are required.

As noted by Dunietz (2017) kt when using an exoskeleton with preprogramed controls, the ”human does try to join in the motion, the two get in each other’s way, cancelling out the gains for all but the most extreme disabilities.” Though this we seem the limited applicability of preprogramed movements; in circumstances where the movement of the pilot is so limited and restricted (e.g. via disability) that any system is an improvement. For an able bodied pilot preprogramed movements are” a bit like being a marionette with four wires controlling my legs” (Cornwall, 2015) kt and inadequate.

## Force Based Control

Force based control systems use force applied to the internals of a suit to determine the users desired position. The force applied indicates the direction and magnitude of movement. Force based systems are often inadequate for practical applications due to the sensitivity of force input. Systems which are too sensitive may develop jitter, and lags between sensing and movement combines with physical inertia may result in the system applying force to the user, creating an unstable feedback loop. Systems with are insensitive are slugging and require the pilot to push and move against the suit. Using these systems can be sluggish, cumbersome, and exhausting to use.

As the only mechanism for detecting position for a force-based system is the user making contact with the suit misalignments in sizing can result physical dead bands when users are unable to touch the suit and the control system is effectively blind. Additionally, suits which maintain constant contact with asymmetrical body parts may interpret asymmetry as force input and therefore require constant active resistance from the user to control.

Finally, force-based systems do not distinguish between the force output of the system and the speed desired. If a user wishes to move quickly they must apply a large amount force to the system, if the suit encounters and obstacle this movement is then interpreted as a large amount of force applied to the object. There is no mechanism for quick safe movements.

For exoskeletons in dynamic real-world environments to be viable, responsive, and safe improvement on the existing force-based sensing methods are required.

## Proximity as a solution

Consider the following:

1. For controlling the suit, it may be assumed that the user is inside the suit during operation;
2. The users desired position for the suit may be treated as their personally bodily position;
3. Thus, the positional error between the desired configuration of the suit and the actual configuration of the suit is the difference between the configuration of the pilot and the configuration of the exoskeleton;
4. If the position of the pilot relative to the suit is measured and known, then the position of the suit relative to the pilot can be known; and,
5. Therefore, the suit can be controlled accurately (that is to say, error can be known at any time) by observing the position of the pilot relative to the suit; with no abstraction between measurement type (given in position) and desired state (given by position).

It is proposed to develop a proof of concept for an exoskeleton control system based on measurement of the pilot’s position/proximity the suit. By maintaining a constant offset from the user, the exoskeleton may exist as a concentric outline (or *bubble*) of the user, mirroring their actions.

Consider the following:

1. In a circumstance where the exoskeleton encounters an obstacle it is desirable to regulate and control the force output of the system;
2. It is desirable to decouple the control of force output and speed (a noted flaw with force-based control methods);
3. If the force output of the system is monitored by sensing its interactions with the environment, then the force output of the system can by regulated by then regulating the actions of it actuators; and,
4. Therefore, to ensure safe movement that does not apply undue for to the environment the force output of the system should be measured and regulated at external contact points.

It is proposed that for a position-based exoskeleton control system that the force output is directly measured (at contact points) to ensure safe and controlled operation.

Consider the following:

1. If the system applies force up

### Less exhausting

### Intuitive

### Won’t flail out of control and be unstable

## Cases for use

### Justification of capabilities (tested movements)

### Stand still under standard conditions

Steady state

Info required by system

* Pilot location
* Suit location
* Force applied by pilot to suit
* Force applied by suit to environment

### Actuation of movement

Movement

Info required by system

* Pilot location
* Suit location
* Force applied by pilot to suit
* Force applied by suit to environment

### Walking

Real time movement

Info required by system

* Pilot location
* Suit location
* Force applied by pilot to suit
* Force applied by suit to environment

### Up stairs

Force application

Info required by system

* Pilot location
* Suit location
* Force applied by pilot to suit
* Force applied by suit to environment

### Sitting

Regulated force application

Info required by system

* Pilot location
* Suit location
* Force applied by pilot to suit
* Force applied by suit to environment

## Justification of demo scope (lower body only)

## Task division between participants

## Justification of controls and perception systems required

### Detecting the pilot’s proximity

### Detecting the suit’s position

### Force application of the system by the pilot to the environment

### Control system for decision making

### System communication from control & perception software to actuation system

# Scope

## Assumptions

## Equipment

## Demonstrable capabilities

How to demonstrate on the demo rig the capacity to complete the below activities:

* Standing still
* Walking
* Stairs
* Sitting

## Stuff out of scope

## Variation on original scope

# Pilot’s proximity

## Requirements

## Possible solutions

## Justification of chosen solution

## Components list of chosen solution

## Performance

# Force application from pilot to system to environment

## Requirements

## Possible solutions

## Justification of chosen solution

## Components list of chosen solution

## Performance

# Control system for decision making

## Requirements

## Possible solutions

## Justification of chosen solution

## Components list of chosen solution

## Performance

# Communications

## Requirements

## Possible solutions

## Justification of chosen solution

## Components list of chosen solution

## Performance

# Holistic integration of requirements

# Demo

# Recommendations and further research

# Conclusion

# References

# Appendices

## Code

* Firmware in C
* Matlab

## PCBs

## CAD drawings