

**Development of Monitoring,  
Modelling and Control Systems for  
Human Physiological Assessment  
with Wearable Devices**

by Hairong Yu

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for  
the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

under the supervision of Steven Su

University of Technology Sydney  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

June 2020



## Declaration

I, Hairong Yu, declare that this thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Production Note:

**Signature:** Signature removed prior to publication.

**Date:** 27/06/2020



## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor A/Prof. Steven Su for his continual support, guidance, help and encouragement during my Ph.D. study. A/Prof. Steven Su has brought me into the topics of physiological modelling and system identification, and provided brilliant insights in my research work. It is my honor to have a supervisor who always inspires me to achieve higher targets and overcome difficulties. His conscientious and meticulous attitude on research has significant influence on my work.

I am grateful to all the staff in the School of Biomedical Engineering, especially to Prof. Joanne Tipper and Prof. Gyorgy Hutvagner for their help on Ph.D. skills development. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Prof. Rob Duffield, Prof. Hung T. Nguyen (Swinburne University of Technology) and my external supervisor Dr. Ganesh Naik (Western Sydney University) for their kind support. Grate gratitude also for my supervisor during bachelor period, Prof. Rong Song (Sun Yat-Sen University, China), for his help in my Ph.D. period.

I am also grateful to my colleagues in A/Prof. Steven Su's research group, in particular, Lin Ye, Wenhui Chen, Yao Huang, Kairui Guo, etc., for their selfless help. Working together with them will be a good memory. I am also grateful to my friends in UTS, Zhichao Sheng, Ye Shi, Zhiyuan Shi, Hanjie Wu for their warm help.

My deepest gratitude goes to my parents for their immeasurable support and encouragement throughout my graduate studies.



## Abstract

Physiological signals play vital roles in studying the mechanism of human body reaction during exercise and human kinetics assessment. This thesis develops a wearable exercise monitoring system to monitor and regulate human cardiorespiratory responses to moderate exercise. To describe the relationship between the body's physiological reactions and the exercise, the modelling approach has been extensively explored in a range of applications. In this thesis, the cardiorespiratory signal responses to the exercise phase are comprehensively analysed through the means of different modelling approaches. A non-parametric kernel based modelling approach has been proposed to address the complexity of the model dynamics. This thesis also develops a novel Inclination based Calibration method to address the static nonlinear modelling problem for the calibration of the sensors in an Inertial Measurement Units.

The non-parametric model is the preferable method when the system structure information is insufficient, or the system is too complex to be described by a simple parametric model. Hence, the non-parametric modelling method with kernel-based regularisation is developed to estimate the physiological signal response to the exercise phase during different types of exercise. The kernel selection and regularisation strategies are discussed, and a series of simulations are performed to compare the fitness, sensitivity and stability of different kernels.

For detecting the exercise phase, the innovative in-field calibration method for the portable tri-axial sensor is developed to calibrate the Inertial Measurement Units data. Based on the fact that the angle between the local gravity and magnetic field is invariant, this thesis proposed a new in-field calibration approach, called Inclination Based Calibration, which can reliably estimate the model parameters of the sensor with a simple linear Least Square estimator. Based on optimal experimental design, a 12-observation Icosahedron experimental

scheme has been performed for micro Inertial Measurement Units. Both the calibrated results and the simulation comparison demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method.

This monitoring and control system could comprehensively study human kinetics and cardiorespiratory mechanism and help to make assessments. Some general approaches for physiological signal processing and modelling, parameters estimation, sensor calibration and experiment protocol control are proposed in this work. The effectiveness and benefits of different modelling approaches are demonstrated by a range of means. This system could be applied in strategic exercise design, athletic assessment, exercise enhancement and health monitoring.



## Publications

The contents of this thesis are based on the following papers that have been published, accepted, or submitted to peer-reviewed journals, conferences and book chapters.

### Journal Papers:

1. Hairong Yu, Lin Ye, Ganesh R. Naik, Rong Song, Hung T. Nguyen, Steven Su\*, "Nonparametric Dynamical Model of Cardiorespiratory Responses at the Onset and Offset of Treadmill Exercises." *Medical & biological engineering & computing*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 2337-2351, June 2018.
2. Hairong Yu, Lin Ye, Ying Guo, Steven Su\*, "An Innovative 9-Parameter Magnetic Calibration Method Using Local Magnetic Inclination and Calibrated Acceleration Value", *IEEE Sensors Journal*, doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2020.2995876, May 2020.
3. Lin Ye, Ahmadreza Argha, Hairong Yu, Branko G. Celler, Hung T. Nguyen, Steven Su\*, "Dynamic Characteristics of Oxygen Consumption.", *Biomedical engineering online*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 44, December 2018
4. Lin Ye, Ying Guo, Lei Dong, Hairong Yu, Hung Nguyen, Steven Su\*, "A Fast-Converge, Real-Time Auto-Calibration Algorithm for Triaxial Accelerometer." *Measurement Science and Technology*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 065010, February 2019.
5. Hairong Yu, Lin Ye, Hamzah M Alqudah, Kairui Guo, Branko G. Celler, Rong Song, Steven Su\*, "Prediction of Cardiac-respiratory Response to Treadmill Exercise by Using Non-Parametric Modelling with Stairs Exercise based Kernel Characterization", under submission to *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 2020.

- 
6. Hairong Yu, Lin Ye, Rong Song, Yuxi Luo, Hamzah M Alqudah, Steven Su\*, "Oxygen Consumption Response to Stair Exercise by Non-parametric Modelling", under review at *Biomedical Physics and Engineering Express*, 2020.
  7. Hairong Yu, Lin Ye, Ying Guo, Steven Su\*, "An Effective In-Field Calibration Method for Triaxial Magnetometers based on Local Magnetic Inclination", under review at *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 2019.

### **Conference Papers:**

1. Hairong Yu\*, Kairui Guo, Hung T. Nguyen, Steven Su, "The Classification for "Equilibrium Triad" Sensory Loss based on sEMG Signals of Calf Muscles." *2017 39th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, July 2017.
2. Kairui Guo, Hairong Yu\*, Rifai Chai, Hung Nguyen, Steven W. Su, "A Hybrid Physiological Approach of Emotional Reaction Detection Using Combined FCM and SVM Classifier." *2019 41th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, July 2019.
3. Kairui Guo\*, Henry Candra, Hairong Yu, Huiqi Li, Hung T. Nguyen, Steven W. Su, "EEG-based Emotion Classification using Innovative Features and Combined SVM and HMM Classifier." *2017 39th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, July 2017.
4. Yao Huang, Rong Song\*, Wenhui Chen, Hairong Yu, Ahmadreza Argha, Branko G. Celler, Steven Su, "The Effects of Different Tracking Tasks on Muscle Synergy through Visual Feedback." *2019 41th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, July 2019.
5. Kairui Guo\*, Hairong Yu, Yunzhu Chen, Rong Song, Steven W. Su "Puzzle-based Automated Upper Limb Functional Electrical Stimulation Strategy Using EMG Connectivity Analysis." *2020 42th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, July 2020.

### **Book Chapters:**

- 
1. Palayil Baby Jephil, Paras Acharaya, Lian Xu, Kairui Guo, Hairong Yu, Mark Watsford, Rong Song, Steven Su, “Estimation of ankle joint torque and angle based on S-EMG signal for assistive rehabilitation robots”, *Biomedical Signal Processing*, Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd, Copyright Year 2020.



# Table of contents

## List of figures

## List of tables

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation and Scope . . . . .	1
1.2	Problems in Physiological Assessment and Aerobic Exercise . . . . .	6
1.3	Problems in Physiological Signal Modelling . . . . .	8
1.3.1	Static Nonlinear Modelling Problems for Inertial Measurement Unit Calibration . . . . .	8
1.3.2	Dynamic Linear Modelling Problems for Physiological Signal Response with Exercise Phase . . . . .	10
1.4	Thesis Contribution . . . . .	13
1.5	Dissertation Outline . . . . .	14
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1	Human Physiological Assessment . . . . .	19
2.2	Static Nonlinear Modelling Problems for Inertial Measurement Unit Calibration	21
2.2.1	In-Field Calibration Method . . . . .	21
2.2.2	Experimental Design . . . . .	23

---

2.3	Dynamic Linear Modelling Problems of Cardiorespiratory Responses of Aerobic Exercise . . . . .	26
2.3.1	Cardiorespiratory Signal Modelling Method . . . . .	26
2.3.2	Development of Wearable Devices . . . . .	27
2.3.3	Non-parametric Modelling with Optimised Kernel-Parameter Selection . . . . .	27
2.4	Summary . . . . .	28
<b>3</b>	<b>An Effective In-Field Calibration Method for Inertial Measurement Unit based on Local Magnetic Inclination</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	29
3.2	Calibration Methodology . . . . .	33
3.2.1	Magnitude Based Calibration . . . . .	34
3.2.2	Inclination Based Calibration . . . . .	36
3.3	Experimental Design and Simulation . . . . .	42
3.3.1	Experimental Design . . . . .	42
3.3.2	Simulation for Inclination Based Calibration . . . . .	44
3.4	Results . . . . .	46
3.4.1	Simulation Study . . . . .	46
3.4.2	Experimental Results . . . . .	49
3.5	Discussion . . . . .	58
3.6	Conclusion . . . . .	60
<b>4</b>	<b>Non-Parametric Dynamical Model of Cardiorespiratory Responses at the Onset and Offset of Treadmill Exercise</b>	<b>63</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	63
4.2	Methods . . . . .	66

## Table of contents

---

4.2.1	Kernel-Based Estimation Method for the Modelling of Finite Impulse Response . . . . .	67
4.2.2	Kernel Selection . . . . .	68
4.2.3	Experiment . . . . .	70
4.2.4	Statistic . . . . .	71
4.3	Results . . . . .	71
4.3.1	Simulation and Kernel Selection . . . . .	71
4.3.2	Modelling of Onset Period . . . . .	74
4.3.3	Modelling of Offset Period . . . . .	76
4.3.4	Comparison between Onset and Offset Period . . . . .	78
4.3.5	Comparison of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ . . . . .	80
4.4	Discussion . . . . .	83
4.4.1	Comparison between Onset and Offset Period of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ . . . . .	83
4.4.2	Comparison of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ . . . . .	84
4.5	Conclusion . . . . .	84
<b>5</b>	<b>Non-Parametric Dynamical Model of Cardiorespiratory Responses of Stairs Exercise</b>	<b>87</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	87
5.2	Methods . . . . .	89
5.2.1	Experiment . . . . .	89
5.2.2	Kernel-based Non-parametric Modelling . . . . .	91
5.2.3	Pre-processing, Identification Strategy and Verification . . . . .	93
5.3	Results . . . . .	94
5.4	Discussion . . . . .	98
5.5	Conclusion . . . . .	100

---

<b>6 Prediction of Cardiorespiratory Response to Treadmill Exercise Using Non-parametric Modelling with Optimised Kernel-Parameter Selection</b>	<b>103</b>
6.1 Introduction . . . . .	103
6.2 Methods . . . . .	105
6.2.1 Non-parametric Modelling of Finite Impulse Response Based on Kernel . . . . .	106
6.2.2 Experiment . . . . .	106
6.2.3 Parameter Selection . . . . .	109
6.2.4 Statistical Analysis . . . . .	113
6.3 Results . . . . .	113
6.4 Discussion . . . . .	116
6.5 Conclusion . . . . .	118
<b>7 Conclusions and Future Work</b>	<b>121</b>
7.1 Conclusions . . . . .	121
7.2 Future work . . . . .	124
<b>References</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Appendix A List of Main Variables</b>	<b>137</b>



# List of figures

1.1	Functional block diagram. . . . .	5
2.1	The Structure of Central Composite Design (CCD). . . . .	23
2.2	The Structure of Box-Behnken Design (BBD). . . . .	24
2.3	The Structure of Icosahedron Design for TAs or TMs model. . . . .	25
3.1	The Inclination in Sydney New South Wales Australia ( <a href="http://www.magnetic-declination.com/Australia/Sydney/124736.html">http://www.magnetic-declination.com/Australia/Sydney/124736.html</a> ). . . . .	31
3.2	The IMU Device used in Experiment. . . . .	43
3.3	The Arrangements of MEMS IMU for 12-Observation DoE. . . . .	44
3.4	Normalized Magnitude Value before and after I-Calibration Simulation. . .	46
3.5	Scaled Range and Standard Deviation of Magnitude before and after I-Calibration Simulation, where "tolerance angles" is abbreviated as "TA" to save space. . . . .	48
3.6	Raw Data and Calibrated Data by I-Calibration Simulation with Measured Acceleration data and Calibrated Acceleration data. . . . .	49
3.7	Scaled Range and Standard Deviation of Magnitude after I-Calibration Simulation with Measured Acceleration data and Calibrated Acceleration data. .	50
3.8	Estimation Results of $\gamma$ and Convergence. . . . .	50
3.9	Results of Estimated $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{O}$ . . . . .	51

---

3.10	The Normalized Magnitude Value of the Measured Magnetic Fields before ( $H_0$ ) and after ( $H_M$ ) Magnitude Based Calibration. . . . .	52
3.11	The Normalized Magnitude Value of the Measured Magnetic Fields before ( $H_0$ ) and after ( $H_I$ ) Inclination Based Calibration. . . . .	53
3.12	Raw Data and Calibrated Data by M-Calibration and I-Calibration. . . . .	54
3.13	The Normalized Magnitude Value before and after I-Calibration with Calibrated Acceleration $A^c$ and Measured Acceleration $A^m$ . . . . .	55
3.14	Raw Data and Calibrated Data by I-Calibration with Calibrated Acceleration $A^c$ and Measured Acceleration $A^m$ (Front Review) . . . . .	56
3.15	Raw Data and Calibrated Data by I-Calibration with Calibrated Acceleration $A^c$ and Measured Acceleration $A^m$ (Back Review) . . . . .	57
4.1	Raw $\dot{V}CO_2$ and treadmill speed during the exercise. . . . .	66
4.2	An input and output pair of the simulated system. . . . .	70
4.3	The estimated IR by using the classical LS estimation. . . . .	72
4.4	Observation and estimation of three types kernels. . . . .	73
4.5	Box plots of the estimations by using the SS, DC, DI kernels (from left to right). . . . .	74
4.6	Comparison results of the kernel with different parameters: (A) SS kernel with different parameters. (B) DC kernel with different parameters. (C) DI kernel with different parameters. (D) The comparison of the three kernels with well selected parameters and true IR. . . . .	75
4.7	Average IR and individual IR from 20 participants during the onset period of treadmill. . . . .	75
4.8	Comparison between estimated $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and measurements from 20 participants during the onset period. . . . .	76
4.9	Average IR and individual IR from 20 participants during the offset period of treadmill. . . . .	77

List of figures

---

4.10	Comparison between estimated $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and measurements from 20 participants during the offset period of the treadmill. . . . .	77
4.11	The normalization of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ in onset and offset period (Partial magnification). . . . .	78
4.12	Comparison between average IR and SR of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ in onset period and offset period. . . . .	78
4.13	The comparison of individual gain(A) and Time Index(B) of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ in onset and offset. . . . .	79
4.14	(A)Comparison between average IR of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ during onset period. (B)Comparison between average estimation output of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ during onset period. (C)Comparison between average SR of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ during onset period. (D)The normalization of estimated $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ in onset period (Partial magnification). . . . .	80
4.15	(A)Comparison between average IR of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ during offset period. (B)Comparison between average estimation output of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ during offset period. (C)Comparison between average SR of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ during offset period. (D)The normalization of estimated $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ in offset period (Partial magnification). . . . .	81
4.16	The comparison of individual gain (A) and Time Index (B) between $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ in onset. . . . .	81
4.17	The comparison of individual gain (A) and Time Index (B) between $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ in offset . . . . .	82
5.1	The Scene, Application Interface and Equipment of the Stairs Experiment. . . . .	90
5.2	Measured $\dot{V}_dO_2$ and Exercise Phase of One Participant during Stairs Exercise. . . . .	91
5.3	Impulse Response and Estimated ( $\dot{V}_dO_2$ ) of Three Participants (0.5 period). . . . .	95
5.4	Impulse Response and Estimated ( $\dot{V}_dO_2$ ) of Three Participants (1 period). . . . .	95
5.5	Impulse Response and Estimated ( $\dot{V}_dO_2$ ) of Three Participants (2 periods). . . . .	95
5.6	Fitness of Estimated Output of Different Number of Periods from Non-parametric Model. . . . .	96

---

5.7	Fitness of Different Methods of 10 Participants with One Period or Two Periods. . . . .	96
5.8	The Fitness of Period Verification by Different Model Method. . . . .	98
5.9	The Boxplot for Fitness from Different Models and Different Periods. . . .	99
6.1	Scenes of Experiments, the Equipment and Application Interface. . . . .	107
6.2	Measured $\dot{V}_dO_2$ , $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and Exercise Direction of One Participant during Stairs Experiment. . . . .	108
6.3	Measured $\dot{V}_dO_2$ , $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and Speed of One Participant during the Treadmill Experiment. . . . .	108
6.4	Impulse Response from SS kernel Compared to the True Value of Impulse Response in the Simulation. . . . .	111
6.5	IR and Estimated $\dot{V}_dO_2$ Comparison with Different Parameters in Whole Period and Half Period of Participant A. . . . .	113
6.6	IR and Estimated $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ Comparison with Different Parameters in Whole Period and Half Period of Participant A. . . . .	114
6.7	Estimated $\dot{V}_dO_2$ Fitness Comparison between Simulation and Stairs of 20 Participants in Whole Period and Ascending Period. . . . .	114
6.8	Estimated $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ Fitness Comparison between Simulation and Stairs of 20 Participants in Whole Period and Ascending Period. . . . .	115
6.9	$\dot{V}_dO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ Estimation Fitness for One Period/ Half Period by Parameter from Simulation/ from Stairs Experiment. . . . .	116

# List of tables

3.1	The Comparison of Raw Magnitude and Calibrated Magnitudes of Two Methods. . . . .	53
3.2	The Comparisons for Magnitude of Raw Data and Calibrated Data by I-Calibration with Calibrated Acceleration $A^c$ and Measured Acceleration $A^m$ . . . . .	58
3.3	The Improvement Comparisons for the Statistical Indicators. . . . .	58
4.1	Information about the subjects . . . . .	70
4.2	The statistic test outcome of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ in onset and offset . . . . .	79
4.3	The statistic test outcome of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ in the onset . . . . .	82
4.4	The statistic test outcome of $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dO_2$ in the offset . . . . .	82
5.1	Information about the Participants (n=10) . . . . .	91
5.2	Quantity of Participants with Different Number of Exercise Periods. . . . .	93
5.3	The Variance of Fitness by Different Model Method in One or Two periods. . . . .	97
5.4	Rank Sum Test of Same Participants' IR with Different Numbers of Periods. . . . .	97
6.1	Information about the 15 Participants in Stairs Experiment . . . . .	107
6.2	Information about the 20 Participants in Treadmill Experiment . . . . .	108
6.3	The Fitness of Different Parameter $\beta$ for $\dot{V}_dO_2$ and $\dot{V}_dCO_2$ about the Stairs Experiment Identification for Ten Participants. . . . .	112

6.4	The Improvement of Estimation Fitness Using Kernel Parameters from Stairs Experiment. . . . .	115
6.5	Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test of Estimation Fitness Comparison when Using $\beta$ from Simulation and Stairs Experiment. . . . .	116
A.1	List of Main Variables. . . . .	137