Dealing with time-varying recruitment and length in Hill-type muscle models

Hamouda, A, Kenney, LPJ and Howard, D

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.08.030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dealing with time-varying recruitment and length in Hill-type muscle models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Hamouda, A, Kenney, LPJ and Howard, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL</td>
<td>This version is available at: <a href="http://usir.salford.ac.uk/40045/">http://usir.salford.ac.uk/40045/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Date</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: usir@salford.ac.uk.
Original Article

Title: Dealing with time-varying recruitment and length in Hill-type muscle models

Authors’ Names: Ahmed Hamouda¹, Laurence Kenney¹ and David Howard¹

Affiliations: ¹ University of Salford, United Kingdom.

Contact Information for corresponding author:
Professor David Howard
School of Computing, Science & Engineering
University of Salford
Salford, M5 4WT
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)161 295 3584
d.howard@salford.ac.uk

Keywords: multiple-motor-units; muscle model; FES

Word count (Introduction through Discussion): 3130 words
Abstract

Hill-type muscle models are often used in muscle simulation studies and also in the design and virtual prototyping of functional electrical stimulation systems. These models have to behave in a sufficiently realistic manner when recruitment level and contractile element (CE) length change continuously. For this reason, most previous models have used instantaneous CE length in the muscle’s force vs. length (F-L) relationship, but thereby neglect the instability problem on the descending limb (i.e. region of negative slope) of the F-L relationship. Ideally CE length at initial recruitment should be used but this requires a multiple-motor-unit muscle model to properly account for different motor-units having different initial lengths when recruited. None of the multiple-motor-unit models reported in the literature have used initial CE length in the muscle’s F-L relationship, thereby also neglecting the descending limb instability problem. To address the problem of muscle modelling for continuously varying recruitment and length, and hence different values of initial CE length for different motor-units, a new multiple-motor-unit muscle model is presented which considers the muscle to comprise 1000 individual Hill-type virtual motor-units, which determine the total isometric force. Other parts of the model (F-V relationship and passive elements) are not dependent on the initial CE length and, therefore, they are implemented for the muscle as a whole rather than for the individual motor-units. The results demonstrate the potential errors introduced by using a single-motor-unit model and also the instantaneous CE length in the F-L relationship, both of which are common in FES control studies.

Notation

\( a, b, a' \) and \( b' \) constants defining the CE’s F-V relationship
**CE** contractile element

\( Eff \cdot f_{iso} \) effective isometric force produced by all recruited motor units

\( f_{CE} \) instantaneous force produced by the contractile element

\( f_{iso} \) isometric force produced by a single-motor-unit CE model

\( f_{iso,j} \) isometric force produced by the \( j^{th} \) motor unit

\( f_{iso,max} \) maximum isometric force produced by a single-motor-unit model

\( k_{PE} \) stiffness of parallel passive element (PE)

\( k_{SE} \) stiffness of series passive element (SE)

\( l_{CE} \) instantaneous length of the contractile element

\( l_{mt} \) instantaneous length of muscle-tendon unit

\( l_{o} \) initial length of the contractile element

\( l_{o,j} \) initial length of the \( j^{th} \) motor unit

\( l_{opt} \) optimum length of the motor-units (for all models)

\( l_{PE} \) length of parallel passive element (PE)

\( l_{SE} \) length of series passive element (SE)

\( l_{rest} \) resting length of CE (length at zero \( f_{SE} \) and zero \( f_{PE} \))

\( M \) number of recruited motor units
1. Introduction

Hill-type muscle models are often used in muscle simulation studies and also in the design and virtual prototyping of functional electrical stimulation (FES) systems. These models all incorporate some representation of the muscle’s force-length (F-L) relationship which is usually assumed to be a function of the instantaneous contractile element (CE) length (Lynch and Popovic, 2008; Riener and Fuhr, 1998; Ferrarin et al, 2001; Veltink et al, 1992; Schauer et al, 2005), rather than the initial CE length when recruited.

However, as Epstein and Herzog, 1998, have pointed out, using the instantaneous CE length for simulation will lead to instability on the descending limb of the F-L curve (i.e. in the region of negative slope or stiffness). This can be explained by considering a situation where equilibrium exists between a constant externally applied force and the resisting muscle force. Any infinitesimal increase in muscle length will lead to an unstable situation where there is a runaway increase in muscle length because the muscle force reduces with increasing length.
Similarly, any infinitesimal decrease in muscle length will lead to an unstable situation where there is a runaway decrease in muscle length because the muscle force rises with decreasing length.

The reason for this apparent anomaly is that the F-L relationship is simply made up of a series of static (isometric) measurements and, as such, the apparent negative stiffness of the descending limb does not reflect the true dynamic behaviour of muscles, many of which often operate on the descending limb of the F-L curve without exhibiting unstable behaviour. Indeed, on the descending limb, when an already activated muscle fibre is further stretched, the force it exerts will increase (Rassier et al, 1999; Edman et al, 1978), which is the opposite of what would occur if instantaneous length is used in simulation.

Using initial CE length ($l_o$) in the F-L relationship overcomes this problem and Hill-type models then exhibit stable behaviour when operating on the descending limb. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that the physics of muscle recruitment would be different on the ascending and descending limbs of the F-L curve. Therefore, to be consistent in modelling approach, it is reasonable to assume that initial length should be used for the entire F-L curve and, hence, the consequences of this will apply at all CE lengths (i.e. on both the ascending and descending limbs of the F-L curve). Therefore, the question of whether initial or instantaneous CE length should be used in the F-L relationship is critical to the correct modelling of muscle behaviour at all CE lengths.

However, as almost all muscle models used in FES control studies treat the muscle as a single contractile element (i.e. one large motor-unit), there can only be one value for $l_o$, which corresponds to first recruitment. But, in both normal human movement and FES control applications, it is reasonable to assume that the recruitment level ($R$) and the CE length ($l_{ce}$) change continuously and, hence, different motor-units are recruited at different lengths.
Therefore, models that treat the muscle as a single-motor-unit and, hence, use a single value for $l_o$ would result in an over- or under-estimation of muscle force $F_m$. This problem could be overcome by using a multiple-motor-unit muscle model which properly accounts for different motor-units having different initial lengths when recruited.

Whilst various multiple-motor-unit models have been reported in the literature, none of these have used initial length $l_o$ in the F-L relationship. In some cases, the motivation has been to create more complex physiologically based models that are capable of simulating the summation of individual motor-unit twitches (Riener and Quintern, 1997; Fuglevand et al, 1993). These models are valuable for simulating muscle force generation at different activation frequencies, both tetanic and sub-tetanic, and also EMG generation. However, in the vast majority of FES applications, the stimulation frequency is constant and sufficiently high to produce tetanic contraction. Furthermore, these models are usually for isometric conditions only. Therefore, for the purposes of developing FES control schemes, these models are more complex than necessary and don’t cover the dynamic conditions of interest (continuously varying recruitment and CE length).

Another reason for using multiple-motor-unit models is to simulate the sequential recruitment of different muscle fibre types (Brown and Loeb, 1999, 2000a, 2000b; Brown et al, 1999; Cheng et al, 2000; Hawkins and Hull, 1992; Xia and Frey Law, 2008; Liu et al, 2002; Tang et al, 2005; Biewener et al, 2014; Wakeling et al, 2012) including their different fatigue properties, which is of greater relevance to FES control. This was one of the motivations behind the work of Brown and colleagues, which led to their Virtual Muscle modelling package (Cheng et al, 2000). Although described in different manners, in most of these models each fibre type is effectively modelled as a single motor-unit. Again, this means that there can only be one value for $l_o$ for a particular fibre type, which corresponds to first
recruitment of that fibre type. These models all avoid this problem by using the instantaneous CE length, which leads to instability on the descending limb of the F-L curve.

In summary, none of the multiple-motor-unit models reported in the literature have used initial length $l_o$ in the F-L relationship, thereby neglecting the descending limb instability problem. Therefore, this paper addresses the problem of muscle modelling for continuously varying $R$ and $l_{CE}$, and hence different values of $l_o$ for different motor-units. A new multiple-motor-unit model is developed which considers the muscle to comprise a large number (1000) of individual Hill-type virtual motor-units. As the recruitment level ($R$) varies, these virtual motor-units are recruited at different times and each with its own initial length ($l_{o,j}$ for $j=1$ to 1000); thus overcoming the problem described above. It should be noted that the virtual motor-units in the model don’t correspond to real motor-units. Rather, the number of virtual motor-units used in the model is chosen to give the required force resolution.

Together with alternative models, the new model presented here has been used to demonstrate the scale of the potential errors involved in:

- Using instantaneous CE length instead of initial CE length in the F-L relationship.
- Treating the muscle as a single contractile element with just one initial CE length.

2. Methods

2.1 The multiple-motor-unit model

In the Hill-type single-motor-unit model described by Epstein and Herzog, 1998, it was assumed that the muscle remembers the initial CE length ($l_o$) at which it was first recruited.
for as long as it remains recruited (i.e. for as long as \( R > 0 \)). This is acceptable if the recruitment remains constant, but it is not accurate if \( R \) and \( l_{CE} \) are changing with time because different motor-units are then recruited at different lengths. To take this into account, we have replaced the isometric force \( f_{iso}(l_o) \) used in the single-motor-unit model by an effective isometric force \( Eff \cdot f_{iso} \), which is based on the multiple-motor-unit principle (Figure 1). For \( j=1 \) to 1000, the \( j^{th} \) motor-unit remembers the length \( l_{o,j} \) at which it was initially recruited and has an associated isometric force \( f_{iso,j} \).

The recruitment model determines the number of recruited motor-units \( M = 1000 \times R \), where \( R \) varies between 0 and 1, and \( M \) is rounded to the nearest integer. In FES applications, the input to the recruitment model is typically the pulse width (i.e. \( R = PW / PW_{max} \)). Referring to Figure 2, the inputs to each motor-unit model are the binary recruitment (\( R_j \)) and the instantaneous \( CE \) length (\( l_{CE} \)), where \( R_j \) can only be 0 or 1 (de-recruited or recruited). When \( R_j \) changes from 0 to 1, the \( j^{th} \) motor-unit is recruited and a new value of \( f_{iso,j} \) is calculated (from the F-L relationship) for the \( CE \) length at that particular time, and this is stored in the \( j^{th} \) motor-unit’s memory. When \( R_j \) changes from 1 to 0, the \( j^{th} \) motor-unit is de-recruited and its memory erased (\( f_{iso,j} = 0 \)).

By dividing by 1000 and using \( l_{o,j} \) instead of \( l_o \), the normalised parabolic F-L curve used by Epstein and Herzog, 1998, was adapted to calculate the isometric force exerted by a single virtual motor-unit as follows:

\[
f_{iso,j} = \frac{f_{iso,max}}{1000} \left[ -2.777 \left( \frac{l_{o,j}}{l_{opt}} \right)^2 + 5.554 \left( \frac{l_{o,j}}{l_{opt}} \right) - 1.777 \right] \tag{1}
\]
where: $l_{o,j}$ is the CE length at the time of initial recruitment of the $j^{th}$ motor-unit; $l_{opt}$ is the optimum CE length; and $f_{iso,\text{max}}$ is the muscle’s maximum isometric force which occurs at $l_{opt}$. This relationship produces the curve shown in Figure 3 (but multiplied by 1000 in the figure). Negative values are not allowed and, to implement this, appropriate logical conditions are included to set $f_{iso,j}$ to zero.

Finally, the effective isometric force of the whole muscle is the sum of the individual forces $f_{iso,j}$ produced by all recruited motor-units.

$$
Eff \cdot f_{iso} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} f_{iso,j}
$$

[2]

As mentioned above, $Eff \cdot f_{iso}$ replaces $f_{iso}(l_{o})$ in the Hill-type model described by Epstein and Herzog, 1998. The remaining components of this model (F-V relationship and passive elements) are not dependent on the initial CE length and, therefore, they are implemented for the muscle as a whole rather than for the individual motor-units. Figure 4 shows the structure of the overall model and, with the exception of the $Eff \cdot f_{iso}$ calculation described above, its implementation is similar to that described by Epstein and Herzog, 1998. The two passive elements, in parallel to and in series with the contractile element, are modelled as simple linear springs. The F-V relationship is as follows and produces the curve shown in Figure 5.

$$
f_{CE}(v_{CE}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } v_{CE} \leq -Eff \cdot f_{iso} \frac{b}{a} \\
\frac{Eff \cdot f_{iso} b + av_{CE}}{-v_{CE} + b} & \text{for } -Eff \cdot f_{iso} \frac{b}{a} < v_{CE} \leq 0 \\
1.5Eff \cdot f_{iso} - 0.5 \frac{Eff \cdot f_{iso} b' + a'v_{CE}}{v_{CE} + b'} & \text{for } 0 < v_{CE} \leq Eff \cdot f_{iso} \frac{b'}{a'} \\
1.5Eff \cdot f_{iso} & \text{for } v_{CE} > Eff \cdot f_{iso} \frac{b'}{a'} 
\end{cases}
$$

[3]
Where \( f_{CE} \) is the instantaneous force produced by the contractile element CE and \( a, b, a', b' \) and \( b' \) are constants.

### 2.2 Simulation study

MATLAB codes were developed for simulating the responses to open-loop stimulation protocols of two muscle models:

- The single-motor-unit model;
- The \( Eff \cdot f_{uo} \) multiple-motor-unit model.

Additionally, in both cases, the CE length used in the F-L relationship can be either the instantaneous length or the length at initial recruitment.

In order to demonstrate the need to use a multiple-motor-unit modelling approach when \( R \) and \( l_{CE} \) vary with time, input protocols are required that involve both \( R \) and \( l_{CE} \) changing over time. Two suitable protocols that have previously been used by Epstein and Herzog, 1998, were chosen as this allowed comparison with their simulation results for validation purposes (single-motor-unit model only). Details of the two protocols are as follows:

**Protocol-I (Figure 6):**

(i) 100% isometric recruitment at unique resting state (i.e. at \( l_{CE} = l_{rest}, \Delta l_{mu} = 0 \));

(ii) Stretch of 10 mm at a rate of 10mm/sec;

(iii) De-recruitment to 50%;

(iv) Shortening to \( \Delta l_{mu} = 0 \) at a rate of 10mm/sec;

(v) Re-recruitment to 100%.
Protocol-II (Figure 7):

(i) 50% isometric recruitment at unique resting state (i.e. at $l_{CE} = l_{rest}$, $\Delta l_{mu} = 0$);

(ii) Stretch of 10 mm at a rate of 10mm/sec;

(iii) Increase recruitment to 100% ;

(iv) Shortening to $\Delta l_{mu} = 0$ at a rate of 10mm/sec.

The following typical values for muscle parameters, obtained from Epstein and Herzog, 1998, were used: $f_{iso,max} = 45N$; $k_{se} = 10N/mm$; $k_{pe} = 1N/mm$; $l_{rest} = 125mm$; $l_{opt} = 100mm$. The constants in the F-V relationship were: $a = 10N$; $b = 40mm/sec$; $a' = 10N$; $b' = 30mm/sec$.

When using these protocols and muscle parameters, the authors’ MATLAB implementation of the single-motor-unit model produced the same force responses as those published by Epstein and Herzog, 1998.

3. Simulation Results

Simulation results are presented to compare the alternative muscle models and, in particular, to demonstrate the potential errors introduced by:

a) Treating the muscle as a single-motor-unit;

b) Using instantaneous CE length instead of CE length at initial recruitment.

3.1 Single versus multiple motor-units
Figure 8 provides a comparison of the simulation results using protocol-I for the multiple-motor-unit model versus the single-motor-unit model (both using initial CE length, $l_0$, in the F-L relationship). The force response for protocol-I was observed to be virtually identical over the first 5 seconds. This can be explained by considering the recruitment profile (Figure 6). At time zero, full recruitment occurs and the corresponding initial recruitment length is 125mm. Then recruitment drops to 50% at 3 seconds. Hence, for all active motor-units, the initial recruitment length remains the same (125mm) throughout the first 5 seconds and, therefore, both models produce the same force profile.

At 5 seconds the recruitment rises again to 100%. For the single-motor-unit model the initial CE length is still 125mm. But for the multiple-motor-unit model, the CE is already contracted and its length is therefore less than 125mm which results in a higher isometric force for the remaining 50% of motor-units. The difference is small in this protocol because the CE length is only slightly different in the two cases (overall muscle length being the same). However, it should be emphasised that the single-motor-unit model incorrectly uses the length at 0 seconds throughout.

Conversely, referring to Figure 9 with protocol-II and after the rise to full recruitment at 3 seconds, the multiple-motor-unit model produced a significantly different force profile. This is a direct result of the fact that the initial CE recruitment length for the motor-units recruited at 3 seconds is not the same as the length at 0 seconds which is used throughout by the single-motor-unit model. This clearly demonstrates the problem with using a single-motor-unit model when both recruitment and CE length are changing continuously as discussed earlier.

### 3.2 Initial CE length versus instantaneous CE length
This section compares the simulation results using the CE length at initial recruitment \(l_o\) as the input to the F-L relationship with those using instantaneous CE length \(l_{CE}\) as the input. This is done with both the single-motor-unit model and the multiple-motor-unit model.

Referring to the two recruitment protocols (Figures 6 and 7) and the muscle parameters given earlier, in both cases the muscle was at rest when recruitment started. Therefore the CE length at initial recruitment \(l_o = 125\text{mm}\) was used throughout the two protocols in the single-motor-unit model as this effectively consists of just one large motor-unit which is recruited immediately. Conversely the instantaneous CE length varies continuously throughout the two protocols.

During the first second after initial recruitment, the force responses for the two protocols (Figures 10 and 11) occur at constant musculotendon length. Nevertheless, the CE shortens and the tendon (SE) lengthens until the isometric CE force (at \(v_{CE} = 0\)) and the tendon force are equal. This shortening occurs quite quickly and the force reaches its steady state value. However, after CE shortening, the instantaneous length is different from the initial length; which explains why the force responses for the two cases are different during the first second, despite the constant length of the musculotendon complex (i.e. \(\Delta l_{mt} = 0\)). Similar differences in steady state forces can be observed throughout the two protocols.

When the muscle is stretching (between 1 and 2 seconds), the force increases because of the parallel element (PE) stiffness and also because a new equilibrium between the CE and the SE is established. Similarly, when the muscle shortens (between 4 and 5 seconds), the force decreases. However, the magnitudes of these changes depend on whether instantaneous or initial CE length is used in the F-L relationship because the instantaneous length changes as a new equilibrium between the CE and the SE is being established.
When instantaneous length is used, the results for the single-motor-unit and multiple-motor-unit models are exactly the same. This is because, in this case, there is no fundamental difference between the two models (they both use the same instantaneous length for the entire muscle at all times).

However, when using length at initial recruitment, the multiple-motor-unit results differ from those for the single-motor-unit model (Figures 10 and 11) because recruitment changes at different lengths (see Figures 6 and 7) and the multiple-motor-unit model properly accounts for this. In particular, the results diverge after recruitment rises from 50% to 100% at 5 seconds (Protocol I) and at 3 seconds (Protocol II) because the corresponding initial recruitment length for the remaining 50% of motor-units is different from that when the first 50% of motor-units were recruited at 0 seconds.

4. Conclusions

Open-loop stimulation protocols were used to compare single-motor-unit and multiple-motor-unit muscle models, using both the instantaneous CE length and the CE length at initial recruitment as the input to the F-L relationship. When instantaneous length is used as the input to the F-L relationship, the single-motor-unit model and the multiple-motor-unit model give the same results for any protocol. But, when initial recruitment length is used, both models produce results that differ significantly from those obtained using instantaneous length (as shown in Figures 10 and 11). Furthermore, when using initial length and if different motor-units are recruited at notably different lengths, the multiple-motor-unit model differs significantly from the single-motor-unit model (as shown in Figure 11). These results demonstrate the potential errors introduced by using a single-motor-unit model and also the
instantaneous CE length in the F-L relationship, both of which are common in FES control studies.

The main limitation of this work is that it is based on simulation comparisons and, therefore, can only indicate the potential errors that model assumptions may cause. To validate models such as ours, that are to be used in the design of FES systems, a comprehensive set of experimental muscle force data is required for scenarios where both recruitment and length are varying simultaneously. However, although there have been many studies on the behaviour of muscle while its length is changing; most of these were conducted at constant velocity and recruitment (e.g. Joyce et al, 1969). Where protocols include changes in recruitment, this occurs when the length is not changing (e.g. Scott et al, 1996). To the best of the authors’ knowledge, experimental muscle force data is not available for protocols where muscle length and recruitment are changing simultaneously as required for our study. For this reason we adopted the same simulation protocols as Epstein and Herzog, 1998.

The multiple-motor-unit model described here could readily be extended to deal with different muscle fibre types. In this case, each fibre type would have its own set of virtual motor-units, which would be recruited at different initial recruitment lengths. The sequence of recruitment could be pre-defined in a similar way to that described in, for example, Cheng et al, 2000. Secondly, the model could also be extended to model fatigue in a more sophisticated way than has previously been done because each virtual motor-unit is recruited at a different length and time. Therefore, the fatigue of each motor-unit could properly account for both its length at initial recruitment and the time for which it has been recruited. Thirdly, where muscle geometry means that, instantaneously, different muscle fibres have different lengths, the multiple-motor-unit model could be adapted to take this into account. In this case, the muscle’s length could be scaled by a factor that is specific to each motor-unit to obtain that motor-unit’s length.
In summary, we suggest that the realism of muscle models can be enhanced by adopting a multiple-motor-unit modelling approach and also by using the CE length at initial recruitment (the latter to avoid instability on the descending limb of the F-L curve). Because the calculation of isometric force in the multiple-motor-unit model presented here is based on the initial length of each motor-unit when recruited, the multiple-motor-unit model properly accounts for continuously varying recruitment level and CE length, as would usually be seen in normal human movement and closed loop FES control.
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Figure captions

Figure 1: Effective isometric force model. Every recruited motor-unit is treated as a separate fully recruited CE for the purposes of calculating the isometric force.

Figure 2: Isometric force for a single-motor-unit. The motor-unit remembers the isometric force corresponding to its length at initial recruitment for as long as it remains recruited. On de-recruitment the memory is erased.

Figure 3: The contractile element’s force-length (F-L) relationship. The normalised CE force is given by $f_{CE(normalised)} = -2.777(l_o / l_{opt})^2 + 5.554(l_o / l_{opt}) - 1.777$. The normalised CE length is given by $l_{CE(normalised)} = l_o / l_{opt}$ for a single-motor-unit model and $l_{CE(normalised)} = l_{o,j} / l_{opt}$ for an individual motor unit.

Figure 4: Structure of the Hill-type model.

Figure 5: The contractile element’s force-velocity (F-V) relationship. For the multiple-motor-unit model, $f_{Eff}$ replaces $f_{iso}(l_o)$.

Figure 6: Protocol-I.

Figure 7: Protocol-II.

Figure 8: Muscle force responses using protocol-I and initial CE length.

Figure 9: Muscle force responses using protocol-II and initial CE length.

Figure 10: Muscle force responses using protocol-I. Note that the two curves that result from using instantaneous length in the F-L relationship overlie each other.
Figure 11: Muscle force responses using protocol-II. Note that the two curves that result from using instantaneous length in the F-L relationship overlie each other.
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**Figure 8:** Muscle force responses using protocol-I and initial CE length.

*Figure 9:* Muscle force responses using protocol-II and initial CE length.
Figure 10: Muscle force responses using protocol-I. Note that the two curves that result from using instantaneous length in the F-L relationship overlie each other.

Figure 11: Muscle force responses using protocol-II. Note that the two curves that result from using instantaneous length in the F-L relationship overlie each other.