

Human Pose Estimation During Physical Human-Robot Collaboration

by

Richardo Khonasty

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

at the

Centre for Autonomous Systems
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
University of Technology Sydney

February 2020

Certificate of Original Authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signed: _____
Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: _____
22/02/2020

Human Pose Estimation During Physical Human-Robot Collaboration

by

Richardo Khonasty

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Abstract

Robotic systems designed for physical Human-Robot Collaboration (pHRC) are being increasingly used to augment the strength of a human co-worker by providing assistance during the collaboration. The pose of the human body greatly affects the physical strength of the human co-worker and is often difficult to measure in real pHRC applications due to factors such as poor illumination, air quality and the close proximity of the human co-worker to the robot. This thesis aims to address three research challenges in human pose estimation during pHRC in practical industry applications: (1) the effect of interaction between the human and the robot on the pose of the human; (2) whether the pose of the human can be estimated by exploiting the Human-Robot Interaction (HRI); and (3) if the estimated pose can be used to facilitate real-time appraisal of the human co-worker's physical strength.

The challenge in determining the pose of a human co-worker during pHRC was approached in two ways. Firstly, experiments were performed to observe the effect that the interaction between the human and the robot had on the adopted pose of the human upper limb. This study determined whether existing pose estimation methods can be used in real pHRC applications. The second approach was to exploit the HRI for estimating the pose of the human in applications where the hand poses of the human co-worker were able to be inferred from the interaction. Thus the nullPose method was developed to

estimate the pose of the human upper body in real-time. The nullPose method integrates sensor measurements and approximations to the pose of the upper body whilst ensuring the estimated poses are humanly possible. The nullPose method was then used to perform a real-time appraisal of the human co-worker's capability which was compared to a conventional batch-processed method of estimating the human strength.

Experiments were conducted in two different environments to verify the methods. The first environment was a motion capture lab which allowed the pose of the human to be recorded such that the effect of HRI on the upper limb pose was able to be studied. This environment also allowed the estimated pose from the nullPose method to be compared to the real pose of the human co-worker. The second environment was an abrasive blasting chamber where a real pHRC operation was performed. This environment was used to determine the suitability of the nullPose method for use in real challenging industrial environments where traditional methods of pose estimation were not able to be relied upon.

Acknowledgements

This work would not have been possible without the support from those around me.

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Dist. Prof. Dikai Liu who have given me the opportunity to work on this topic and the advice you have provided throughout. Your direction and motivation allowed me to accomplish this significant milestone in my life.

I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Dr. Marc Carmichael who have provided advice, expertise and support throughout my candidature. Your assistance was very helpful and contributed greatly to the completion of this work.

I am grateful for all of the assistance provided by all of the professors, researchers, engineers and students at the Centre for Autonomous Systems in UTS, especially the ANBOT team. I am glad to have had the opportunity to work in such a supportive environment filled with wonderful people who ensured that everything will be alright.

Finally I would like to acknowledge the encouragement provided by my family and friends. Over the past four years, your support have helped me work through this endeavour.

Contents

Declaration of Authorship	iii
Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xix
Glossary of Terms	xxiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Motivation	3
1.2 Research Questions	5
1.2.1 Research Question 1: Effect of Interaction Between the Human and Robot on the Pose of the Human	6
1.2.2 Research Question 2: Exploiting the Interaction in physical Human- Robot Collaboration (pHRC) for Estimate the Pose of the Human	6
1.2.3 Research Question 3: Appraisal of the Human Co-worker’s Physical Strength by using an Estimated Pose	7
1.3 Scope	7
1.4 Contribution	9
1.5 Publications	9
1.6 Thesis Outline	10
1.6.1 Chapter 2	10
1.6.2 Chapter 3	10
1.6.3 Chapter 4	11
1.6.4 Chapter 5	11
1.6.5 Chapter 6	11
2 Review of Related Work	13
2.1 Physical Human-Robot Collaboration	14
2.1.1 Traditional Robots	14

2.1.2	Autonomous Robots	15
2.1.3	Collaborative Robots	16
2.1.3.1	Collaborative Robots for Strength Augmentation	17
2.1.3.2	Collaborative Robots in Rehabilitation	17
2.1.4	Types of Assistance	19
2.1.5	Robots Providing Adaptive Assistance	20
2.2	Adaptive Assistance	21
2.2.1	Level of Assistance	21
2.2.2	Performance Based Assistance-as-Needed	22
2.2.3	Model Based Assistance-as-Needed	23
2.2.4	Assistance-as-Needed in practical pHRC applications	23
2.3	Human Pose Tracking	25
2.3.1	Existing Pose Tracking Technologies	25
2.3.2	Pose Tracking Through Models	26
2.3.3	Limitations of Common Pose Tracking Technologies	27
2.4	Human Physical Strength and pHRC	29
2.4.1	Physical Strength of the Human	29
2.4.2	Musculoskeletal Models of the Human Body	30
2.4.3	Estimation of Human Physical Strength	31
2.4.4	Muscle Fatigue	32
2.4.5	Physical Strength Estimation in Practical pHRC Applications	32
2.5	Summary	33
3	Effect of External Force and Bimanual Operation on Upper Limb Pose	35
3.1	Background Information	36
3.2	Overview	37
3.2.1	Redundancy in the Human Upper Limb and Pose Definition	37
3.2.2	Physical Interaction Between the Human and the Robot	39
3.3	Design of Experiments	41
3.3.1	Robotic Platform	41
3.3.2	Experiments	42
3.4	Results and Discussion	47
3.4.1	Experiment 1 - Unimanual Operation with No Force Applied	48
3.4.2	Experiment 2 - Bimanual Operation with No Force Applied	52
3.4.3	Experiments 3 and 4 - Unimanual Operation with 20N or 40N Force in the +X Direction	53
3.4.4	Experiments 5 and 6 - Unimanual Operation with 20N or 40N Force in the YZ Plane	59
3.4.5	Summary of Each Individual	64
3.4.6	Strength Comparison using a Musculoskeletal Model	65
3.5	Conclusion	67
4	nullPose: an Upper Body Pose Estimation Method	69
4.1	Overview of the Methodology	70

4.2	The nullPose Method	74
4.2.1	Upper Limb Kinematic Model	77
4.2.2	Task Composition	78
4.2.3	Task Prioritization	81
4.2.4	Joint Step Calculation	82
4.2.5	Mode 1 - Kinematic Chain Closed	84
4.2.6	Mode 2 - Kinematic Chain Open	86
4.2.7	Task Composition and Prioritization Example	87
4.3	Experiment Setup	89
4.4	Experiment 1 - Verifying the nullPose Method in an Ideal Environment	91
4.4.1	Pose Estimation Scenarios	93
4.4.2	Results and Discussion	94
4.5	Experiment 2 - Determining the Accuracy of the nullPose Method in a Practical pHRC	98
4.5.1	Pose Estimation Scenarios	99
4.5.2	Results and Discussion	102
4.6	Experiment 3 - Implementation of the nullPose Method in a real pHRC application	105
4.6.1	Pose Estimation Scenarios	106
4.6.2	Results and Discussion	107
4.7	Conclusion	110
5	Appraisal of Human Physical Strength Using the nullPose Method	113
5.1	Appraisal of Human Physical Strength	114
5.1.1	Musculoskeletal Model	116
5.2	Transforming the Upper Body Kinematic Model Pose to Musculoskeletal Model Joint Coordinates	117
5.3	Estimating the Physical Strength of the Human Co-Worker	122
5.4	Experiment 1: Comparison of Estimated Physical Strength Using the null-Pose Method to the Conventional Batch Processed Method	124
5.4.1	Pose Estimation Scenario	126
5.4.2	Results and Discussion	127
5.5	Experiment 2: Estimating the Strength of a Human Co-Worker in a Real pHRC Application	130
5.5.1	Pose Estimation Scenario	131
5.5.2	Results and Discussion	132
5.6	Conclusion	134
6	Conclusion	137
6.1	Summary of Contributions	139
6.1.1	Effect of the Physical Interaction Between the Human and the Robot on the Pose of the Human Co-Worker	139
6.1.2	nullPose: an Upper Body Pose Estimation Method for pHRC	140
6.1.3	Real-Time Appraisal of Human Strength Using the nullPose Method	141
6.2	Discussion and Limitations	142

6.2.1	Inferring the Hand Poses in the nullPose Method	143
6.2.2	The Combination of Targets Used by the nullPose Method	144
6.2.3	Upper Limb Models Approximating the Human Body	145
6.2.4	Human Capability in pHRC	145
6.2.5	Benefit of Assistance-as-Needed Paradigm in pHRC	146
6.3	Future Work	147
6.3.1	Accommodating the Rotation of the Human Co-Worker's Hands Around a Cylindrical Handle	147
6.3.2	Dynamic Task Allocation Based on Available Sensor Measurements for the nullPose Method	148
6.3.3	Determining the Minimum Combination of Tasks for the nullPose Method	148
6.3.4	Extending the nullPose Method for a Full Body Pose Estimation . .	149
6.3.5	Implementing Assistance-as-Needed in pHRC	149
 Appendices		151
Appendix A Additional Results From Experiments in Chapter 3		151
Appendix B nullPose method: Combinations of Targets		162
Appendix C Additional Simulation Results of the nullPose Method		165
Appendix D Shoulder Rotational Matrix Conversion		168
D.1	Rotational matrix between the scapula frame to the humerus frame of the right upper limb musculoskeletal model	168
D.2	Rotational matrix between the scapula frame to the humerus frame of the left upper limb musculoskeletal model	169
 Appendix E Distribution of Muscle Activation of the Musculoskeletal Mod- els		170
 Bibliography		174

List of Figures

1.1	An example of a pHRC application where the human and the robot collaborate to complete an operation.	2
1.2	The three components that are required to adapt the assistance to be provided to the human by the robot in a model-based Assistance-as-Needed (AAN) paradigm.	5
2.1	Industrial robots being used in the automotive industry. Cages are setup around the robot to ensure human workers do not accidentally enter the workspace of the robot [1].	15
2.2	Examples of human safe robots designed for collaborative applications: (A) Universal Robot UR10 [2] (B) Kuka LBR iiwa [3] (C) Rethink Robotics Sawyer [4].	16
2.3	A human wearing the BLEEX [5] used to support the human carry a heavy load.	18
2.4	An upper body exoskeleton the JEXO designed based on the range of motion of the human shoulder to be used in upper limb rehabilitation [6].	18
2.5	Motion capture suit worn to track a human using the OptiTrack system [7]	26
2.6	(A) The redundancy in the human upper limb. (B) An example of a model based upper limb redundancy resolution [8], based on the manipulability of the hand towards the head where poses of the shoulder and wrist are known.	27
2.7	A comparison of the point cloud data being observed by a Kinect for Xbox 360 camera (left) with the output of a skeleton tracking algorithm (right) showing that the upper limbs adopted a default pose due to self occlusion during collaboration with a robot.	28
3.1	A human co-worker working collaboratively with a robot in an abrasive blasting operation.	37
3.2	(A) The human upper limb showing the positions of the shoulder \mathbf{p}_S , elbow \mathbf{p}_E and wrist \mathbf{p}_W and the lengths of the upper arm U and lower arm L (B) Location of the swivel coordinate frame \mathbf{p}_C in relation to the subject's shoulder \mathbf{p}_S , elbow \mathbf{p}_E , wrist \mathbf{p}_W and the angle α . (C) Swivel coordinate frame $\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{v}$ showing the swivel angle ϕ and direction of gravity \mathbf{g}	38
3.3	The end effector of a pHRC robot showing the left and right handle to be held onto by the human co-worker.	40
3.4	The Assistance-as-Needed roBOT (ANBOT) platform with a human co-worker performing a collaborative abrasive blasting operation.	41
3.5	The field of view of the four Kinect v1 cameras on the ANBOT.	42

3.6	(A) Path of the end effector to be followed during each experiment with the coordinate system of the force to be applied by the human subjects. (B) Experimental setup showing a subject with markers attached to their upper limb and the ANBOT platform used for the experiment [9].	43
3.7	(A) Depiction of the force window applied by the human hand where the region in green satisfies the set constraint and the region in red will cause the robot to halt. (B) Visual aid used to display current Force/Torque sensor output alongside current experimental requirements such as the magnitude and direction of the force required from the subject and the current end effector motion.	44
3.8	The experimental setup showing the positions of the OptiTrack cameras as well as the seat placement.	48
3.9	Calculated swivel angles of Subjects (A) 5 and (B) 7 in Experiment 1.	50
3.10	Mean swivel angles of all ten subjects in Experiment 1.	51
3.11	Calculated swivel angles of Subjects (A) 7 and (B) 9 in Experiment 2.	52
3.12	Mean swivel angles of all ten subjects in Experiment 2.	53
3.13	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of Subjects (A) 4 and (B) 5 in Experiment 2 and Experiment 1.	54
3.14	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of Subjects (A) 8 and (B) 10 in Experiment 2 and Experiment 1.	55
3.15	Calculated swivel angles of Subject 4 in (A) Experiment 3 and (B) Experiment 4.	56
3.16	Mean swivel angles of all ten subjects in (A) Experiment 3 and (B) Experiment 4.	57
3.17	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of Subject 5 in (A) Experiment 3 and (B) Experiment 4 to Experiment 1.	58
3.18	Calculated swivel angles of Subject 5 in (A) Experiment 5 and (B) Experiment 6.	59
3.19	Mean swivel angles of all ten subjects in (A) Experiment 5 and (B) Experiment 6.	60
3.20	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of Subjects (A) 5 and (B) 10 in Experiment 5 and Experiment 1.	61
3.21	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of Subjects (A) 1 and (B) 9 in Experiment 5 and Experiment 1.	62
3.22	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of Subjects (A) 5 and (B) 9 in Experiment 6 and Experiment 1.	63
3.23	Comparison of the strength of Subject 5 during Experiment 1 and Experiment 4	66
4.1	Poses of the upper body estimated by the nullPose method.	71
4.2	Human-Robot interaction through a forearm cuff.	71
4.3	The right and left upper body halves.	72
4.4	A visualization of an elbow target and the corresponding task to move the elbow towards the target.	73
4.5	Flowchart of the nullPose method which updates the estimate to the upper body pose when new hand poses are received.	75

4.6	The nine DOF on each of the upper limb kinematic models.	78
4.7	Visualization of the shoulder girdle movement as the upper limb moves from (A) a downward elbow position to (B) an upward elbow position.	79
4.8	(A) The motion capture suit and handles used to track the human hands. (B) The collaboration between the human and the robot being simulated in Motion 3.	91
4.9	The poses being performed by the subjects in Motion 1.	92
4.10	The configuration of the two handles used in Motion 3.	93
4.11	Graphed result of the mean error with standard deviations of the upper body segments for Subject 1 in (A) Motion 1, (B) Motion 2 and (C) Motion 3. Errors are shown in meters for position and radians for rotation.	96
4.12	A snapshot of the recorded point cloud of the human subject (left) and the human pose obtained using skeleton tracking with the Kinect (right).	100
4.13	Box and whiskers plots of the error in the upper body pose from all subjects across the different scenarios in Experiment 2.	102
4.14	Box and whiskers plots of the torso position and orientation error compared against the two targets, the AR marker (AR) in Scenario 1 and the point cloud approximation (PCL) in Scenario 2.	107
4.15	A snapshot of estimated upper body pose with the two sets of torso targets used in Experiment 3 viewed from different angles.	108
4.16	Box and whiskers plot of the torso position and orientation error using the biomechanical limit vs no limit.	109
5.1	The real-time strength appraisal method using the nullPose method (left) and the conventional batch processed method (right).	115
5.2	Musculoskeletal model of the right upper limb [10] showing the different coordinates and their range of motion. (A) Elevation angle. (B) Shoulder Elevation. (C) Shoulder Rotation. (D) Elbow Flexion. (E) Pronation/-Supination. (F) Wrist Deviation. (G) Wrist Flexion/Extension	118
5.3	The musculoskeletal model of the right upper limb showing the thorax frame which grounds the musculoskeletal model as well as the scapula frame and the humerus frame.	119
5.4	Order of rotation for the right upper limb musculoskeletal model.	120
5.5	Visualization of the musculoskeletal model of the left and right upper limbs within the biomechanical model used by the nullPose method.	121
5.6	End effector of the ANBOT used in the experiments, showing the orientation and position of the handles and the direction of the force to be opposed by the human operator.	126
5.7	Estimated physical strength of the right (R) and left (L) upper limbs using the nullPose method (nP) and the batch processed method (BP).	128
5.8	Estimated strength of the right (R) and left (L) upper limbs using the nullPose method (nP) and the batch processed method (BP) of a subject with a large difference in estimated strength of left upper limb.	129
5.9	A human co-worker wearing a standard protective equipment for an abrasive blasting operation with the ANBOT.	131

5.10	The abrasive blasting chamber where the experiment was performed for Experiment 2.	132
5.11	Estimated strength of the left and right upper limbs in the abrasive blasting operation (Experiment 2).	133
6.1	Defined right and left hand poses on the end effector of the ANBOT.	143
6.2	The actual hand orientation in comparison to the cylindrical handle orientation.	148
A.1	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 1 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	152
A.2	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 2 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	153
A.3	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 3 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	154
A.4	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 4 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	155
A.5	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 5 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	156
A.6	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 6 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	157
A.7	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 7 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	158
A.8	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 8 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	159
A.9	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 9 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	160
A.10	Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of the swivel angles of subject 10 in (A) Experiment 2, (B) Experiment 3, (C) Experiment 4, (D) Experiment 5 and (E) Experiment 6 to Experiment 1.	161
B.1	The Hilbert-Schmidt Norm of the null space based on the different combination of tasks that can be implemented.	163
C.1	Graphed result of the mean error with standard deviations of the upper body segments for Subject 2 in (A) Motion 1, (B) Motion 2 and (C) Motion 3. Errors are shown in meters for position and radians for rotation.	166

C.2	Graphed result of the mean error with standard deviations of the upper body segments for Subject 3 in (A) Motion 1, (B) Motion 2 and (C) Motion 3. Errors are shown in meters for position and radians for rotation.	167
E.1	Estimated muscle activation of the right and left musculoskeletal model in Experiment 2.	171

List of Tables

3.1	Root mean square deviation of a subject’s mean swivel angle against the raw swivel angles of all subjects calculated for Experiment 1.	51
3.2	root mean square deviation (RMSD) of the swivel angles in different experiments, measured against the mean swivel angle of the same subject in Experiment 1.	65
4.1	Joints limits of the upper limb model used by the nullPose method.	78
4.2	Range of motion of each joint of the upper limb model	79
4.3	Scenario list with targets used by the nullPose method for Experiment 1 . .	93
4.4	Results showing the mean and standard deviation of error in the upper body pose estimates using different scenarios for each recorded data in Experiment 1.	95
4.5	The different combinations of targets used in Experiment 2.	99
4.6	Mean and standard deviation of the error of upper body poses for all subject in Experiment 2.	103
4.7	The two scenarios used in Experiment 3.	106
5.1	Table of the upper limb musculoskeletal model joint coordinates along with the conversion from the biomechanical model of the upper limb used by the nullPose method for both the right and left upper limbs of the human. . . .	121
5.2	The combination of targets used by the nullPose method for Experiment 1 set in the motion capture environment.	126
5.3	Estimated physical strength with the mean error and standard deviation using the nullPose method (nP) and the conventional batch processing method (BP)	128
5.4	Scenario list with targets used by the nullPose method for Experiment 2: Abrasive Blasting Chamber	131
B.1	A list of potential targets being used to resolve the redundancy of the upper body pose.	164
B.2	The combination of seven sets of information being used to obtain a fully constrained upper body pose where a 1 symbolize a target being used and a 0 symbolizes an information that is not used. Target # corresponds to the information shown in Table B.1	164
E.1	List of muscles in the musculoskeletal model and their abbreviations [10] pt.1.	172
E.2	List of muscles in the musculoskeletal model and their abbreviations [10] pt.2.	173

Acronyms & Abbreviations

1D	One-Dimensional
2D	Two-Dimensional
3D	Three-Dimensional
AAN	Assistance-as-Needed
ANBOT	Assistance-as-Needed roBOT
AR	Augmented Reality
CAS	Centre for Autonomous Systems
DOF	Degrees of Freedom
EMG	Electromyography
GH	Glenohumeral
HRI	Human-Robot Interaction
IAD	Intelligent Assist Device
IK	Inverse Kinematic
IMU	Inertial Measurement Unit
UTS	University of Technology Sydney
MoCap	Motion Capture
MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging

MTU	Musculo-Tendon Units
pHRC	physical Human-Robot Collaboration
pHRI	physical Human-Robot Interaction
RMSD	root mean square deviation
RMSE	root mean square error
ROM	range of motion
sEMG	surface electromyography
SE(3)	special Euclidian group representing a rigid transformation in a 3-dimensional Euclidean Space
SO(3)	special orthogonal group in 3 dimensions representing a rotation
SG	shoulder girdle
SNS	Saturation into the Null Space
WMSD	Workplace Musculoskeletal Disorder

Glossary of Terms

Assistance	The act of helping someone by sharing the work or load.
Bimanual	Requiring two hands.
Capability	The power or ability to perform a certain operation.
Collaboration	The action of working with another human or robot to complete an operation.
Fatigue	The decline in the capability of a human.
Human co-worker	The human collaborating with the robot to complete an operation.
Inverse kinematics	Calculation performed to determine the joint values given a pose in Cartesian co-ordinates.
Kinematic chain	An assembly of rigid bodies connected by joints.
Musculoskeletal	Relating to the musculature and skeletal structure of a body.
Operation	Work to be completed by the human and robot.
Real-time	Able to respond to input immediately.
Physical strength	The amount of force able to be generated or opposed at the hand of the human co-worker.
Pose	The position and orientation of an object such as the end effector of a robot or the hand of the human co-worker.
Redundancy	The ability to adopt a different configuration without affecting the end-effector pose.
Swivel angle	The angle between the vertical plane passing through the shoulder and the wrist and the plane containing the whole upper limb.

Task	Motion to be accommodated by the joints of the upper limb kinematic models.
Target	A kinematic constraint obtained through sensors or approximations, used by the nullPose method to generate a better upper body pose estimate.
Torso half	The upper body of the human divided vertically in half.
Unimanual	Using a single hand.
Upper body	The human human from the waist up including the upper limbs, torso and head.
Upper body half	The human upper body from the waist up divided vertically in half. Each upper body half consists of a torso half and an upper limb.
Upper limb	The human upper limb starting from the shoulder down to the hand.