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Abstract

We have constructed a physiologically realistic model of a lower-limb, mammalian muscle spindle that is composed of mathematical elements closely related to the anatomical components found in the biological spindle. The spindle model incorporates three nonlinear intrafusal fiber models (\textit{bag}_1, \textit{bag}_2 and chain) that contribute variously to action potential generation of primary and secondary afferents. A single set of model parameters was optimized on a number of data sets collected from feline soleus muscle, accounting accurately for afferent activity during a variety of ramp, triangular and sinusoidal stretches. We also incorporated the different temporal properties of fusimotor activation as observed in the twitch-like chain fibers versus the tonic-like bag fibers. The model captures the spindle’s behavior both in the absence of fusimotor stimulation and during activation of static or dynamic fusimotor efferents. In the case of simultaneous static and dynamic fusimotor efferent stimulation, we demonstrated the importance of including the experimentally observed effect of partial occlusion. The model was validated against data that originated from the cat's medial gastrocnemius muscle and was different from the data used for the parameter determination purposes. The validation record included recently published experiments in which fusimotor efferent and spindle afferent activities were recorded simultaneously during decerebrate locomotion in the cat. This model will be useful in understanding the role of the muscle spindle and its fusimotor control during both natural and pathological motor behavior.
Introduction

The muscle spindle is a sense organ found in most vertebrate skeletal muscles. In a typical mammalian lower limb muscle, several tens (or even hundreds) of muscle spindles can be found lying in parallel with extrafusal fibers and experiencing length changes representative of muscle length changes (Barker 1962; Eldred et al. 1962). The spindle has been found to play a dominant role in kinesthesia as well as in reflexive adjustments to perturbations (Hulliger 1984; Matthews 1981). Its sensory transducers (primary and secondary afferents) provide the central nervous system (CNS) with information about the length and velocity of the muscle in which the spindle is embedded. The spindle provides the main source of proprioceptive feedback for spinal sensorimotor regulation and servocontrol. At the same time that the spindle supplies the CNS with afferent information, it also receives continuous control through specialized fusimotor efferents (static and dynamic fusimotor efferents) whose task is to shift the spindle’s relative sensitivities over the wide range of lengths and velocities that occur in various natural tasks (Banks 1994; Matthews 1962).

The spindle consists of three types of intrafusal muscle fibers: long nuclear bag₁ and bag₂ fibers and shorter chain fibers (Figure 1a)(Boyd et al. 1977). Typically, one bag₁, one bag₂ and about 4-11 chain fibers are found lying in parallel within a spindle (Boyd and Smith 1984). The bag₁ fiber is the only fiber that has dynamic fusimotor efferent endings located on it and is primarily responsible for the velocity sensitivity of the spindle. The bag₂ and chain fibers receive static fusimotor control and contribute mainly to length sensitivity. Located in the equatorial region of all three types of intrafusal fibers are primary afferent endings responsible for supplying the CNS with the
length and velocity information from the muscle. The more slowly conducting secondary afferent has its endings located more eccentrically, on only the bag₂ and chain fibers, and is responsible for supplying CNS with primarily length information.

Due to the difficulty of accurately recording afferent and especially fusimotor activity during motor behavior, theories of motor control usually rely on assumptions about spindle activity. Throughout the years, several attempts have been made to formalize these assumptions in mathematical models capable of accurately capturing spindle activity over the wide range of kinematic and fusimotor conditions in which spindles naturally operate. These modeling approaches involved either transfer functions (Chen and Poppele 1978; Matthews and Stein 1969), non-linear functions based on curve-fitting (Houk et al. 1981; Maltenfort and Burke 2001) or reduction to constituent anatomical components (Hasan 1983; Lin and Crago 2002; Rudjord 1970; Schaafsma et al. 1991). Due to the complex nature of spindle responses, the earliest models attempted to model primarily afferent activity in the absence of fusimotor activation, with the exception of Hasan (1983). Only recently, several more complex spindle models incorporating the fusimotor effects on afferent activity were developed (Lin and Crago 2002; Maltenfort and Burke 2001; Schaafsma et al. 1991). While each new model has enhanced our understanding of how the spindle operates, there are still certain aspects of spindle behavior that these models fail to capture (e.g. occlusion between transduction regions, temporal dynamics of changing fusimotor input, etc.; see Discussion).

We have constructed a physiologically realistic model of the spindle that is composed of mathematical elements closely related to the anatomical components found in the biological spindle and their physiological properties. Its parameters were optimized
using cat soleus muscle afferent data recorded during a variety of kinematic and fusimotor conditions. The emergent behavior of the model is shown to account well for the complete range of complex phenomena that have been described in various experiments. The model was validated against recently reported data on medial gastrocnemius afferent activity during decerebrate locomotion of the cat that include direct recordings of related fusimotor efferent activity. Preliminary reports of this study have been published elsewhere (Mileusnic et al. 2001, 2002).

**Methods**

In this section we will initially concentrate on the equations and individual terms that describe the spindle model and how they are related to the current understanding of the biological system. Afterwards, the implementation of the model will be discussed and will include the criteria for selecting the afferent records and techniques used to perform the parameter optimization.

**The spindle model**

The spindle model is composed of three intrafusal fiber models (nuclear bag₁ and bag₂ fibers and chain fiber) and two afferent firing summation models (primary and secondary afferent firing models) (see Figure 1). The same basic function was used for modeling all three intrafusal fiber types, with different coefficient values to account for their different physiology and effects. Each intrafusal fiber model responds to two inputs: fascicle length \( L \); in units of \( L_0 \), which represents the optimal muscle fascicle length) and
the relevant fusimotor drive (in case of bag₁ fiber it is dynamic fusimotor drive ($\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}$), while in case of bag₂ and chain static fusimotor drive ($\gamma_{\text{static}}$) (Figure 1b)). The spindle model generates two outputs: primary (Ia) and secondary (II) afferent activity. The primary afferent response results from the contributions of all three intrafusal fiber models on which the primary afferent receptor has transduction endings. The secondary afferent receives inputs from only the bag₂ and chain intrafusal fiber models.

In the next two major sections we will develop the spindle model in stages. First we will describe the general intrafusal fiber model. This section of model development is further sub-divided into the three components which deal with fusimotor activation, the mechanics of stretch within the intrafusal fiber and finally sensory transduction from stretch to afferent endings. Second, we describe the afferent firing model which deals with non-linear summation between the intrafusal fibers’ transduction regions.

**The intrafusal fiber model**

All the intrafusal fiber models share the same general structure, a modified version of McMahon’s spindle model (McMahon 1984), which has its origins in the earlier work by Crowe (Crowe 1968, 1970). The relative importance of model parameters differs for three intrafusal fiber models in order to account for the different properties of three fiber types (see Table 1 and Figure 2). The form of the intrafusal fiber model was
also influenced by recent improvements in the modeling of extrafusal mechanics (Brown et al. 1996b, 1999; Brown and Loeb 2000).

**Background**

The linear spindle model suggested by McMahon (1984) makes no distinction between different intrafusal fibers, but rather the fibers are lumped together into one spindle model. Similar to the structure of intrafusal fibers found in the biological spindle, McMahon’s spindle model consists of two regions, sensory and polar (a modified version is shown in Figure 2). The sensory (transduction) region contains afferent endings wrapped around it. Stretch of this region results in distortion of afferent endings, depolarization of their membranes and increase in the rate of action potential firing (Boyd and Smith 1984). McMahon modeled transduction as a spring whose stretch is proportional to afferent firing. The rest of the intrafusal fiber on either side of the sensory region is called the polar region, composing essentially a striated muscle fiber innervated by fusimotor endings; for simplicity, the two polar regions of the biological spindle are combined into one polar region for the model. McMahon used a typical Hill model for the polar region, including a passive spring in parallel with a contractile element, which further consists of an active force generator and a damping element. The contractile element was designed to represent the properties of the spindle that change in response to fusimotor activation, but these coefficients were never explicitly modeled by McMahon.
**Fusimotor activation**

A biochemical Hill-type equation was employed to convert the actual fusimotor frequency ($\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}$ or $\gamma_{\text{static}}$ in pps) to an equivalent activation level ($f_{\text{dynamic}}$ or $f_{\text{static}}$, defined within range 0 to 1). This allows each intrafusal fiber model to capture the saturation effects that take place at high fusimotor stimulation frequencies as observed in isolated, identified fibers (bag$_1$: $f_{\text{freq bag}}$ =100pps; bag$_2$: $f_{\text{freq bag}}$ =100pps; chain: $f_{\text{freq chain}}$ =150pps; Boyd 1976). In addition, the model incorporates the different temporal properties of intrafusal fiber responses that have been measured previously for individual intrafusal fibers in response to step changes in fusimotor activation (Boyd et al. 1977). These different temporal properties are thought to arise from differences in the spread of activation in twitch muscle fibers that propagate action potentials (including chain fibers) versus tonic muscle fibers where synaptic depolarization spreads electrotonically (including bag fibers; Boyd 1976), as well as being related to differences in calcium kinematics. In order to model these differences, low-pass filters between the fusimotor inputs and the equivalent activation levels were introduced for the two relatively slow bag intrafusal fibers (see Appendix I). The following equations were used to convert the actual fusimotor frequency ($\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}$ or $\gamma_{\text{static}}$) to an equivalent activation level ($f_{\text{dynamic}}$ or $f_{\text{static}}$) for three types of intrafusal fibers:
Mechanics of sensory and polar regions

With the intention of keeping our model as simple as possible, we initially assumed our intrafusal fiber model to have McMahon's intrafusal fiber model structure. By manually tuning all the parameters in the model, the model's ability to accurately account for experimentally observed spindle afferent activity during a variety of kinematic conditions and fusimotor activations was assessed and the potential need for additional terms was identified. Addition of every further term involved extensive testing of the model's performance in order to reduce the danger of overcomplicating the model with terms whose functions were unknown.

Similar to McMahon’s spindle model, our final model incorporates a sensory region of each intrafusal fiber model as a pure elastic element with a spring constant $K^{SR}$. The tension within this region is equal to:

$$T = K^{SR} \times \left[\left(L - L^{PR}\right) - L^{SR}_0\right]$$

Equation 2

where $L$ is fascicle length, $L^{PR}$ is polar region length and $L^{SR}_0$ is unloaded sensory region length, all in units of $L_0$. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{df_{\text{dynamic}}}{dt} &= \frac{\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}^p + freq_{bag_1}}{\tau} - f_{\text{dynamic}} \\
\frac{df_{\text{static}}}{dt} &= \frac{\gamma_{\text{static}}^p + freq_{bag_2}}{\tau} - f_{\text{static}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

for bag_1 fiber which saturates at approx. 100pps

for bag_2 fiber which saturates at approx. 100pps

for chain fiber which saturates at approx. 150pps
The polar region is modeled as a spring with a spring constant $K^{PR}$ and a parallel contractile element that consists of an active force generator and a damping element, both of whose properties are modulated by fusimotor input. The tension within this region is equal to:

$$T = M \dot{L}^{PR} + \beta * C * (L^{PR} - R) * \text{sign}(\dot{L}^{PR}) * \text{abs}(\dot{L}^{PR})^2 + K^{PR} * (L^{PR} - L_0) + \Gamma$$

Equation 3

where $$\beta = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * f_{\text{dynamic}} + \beta_2 * f_{\text{static}}$$

Equation 4

and $$\Gamma = \Gamma_1 * f_{\text{dynamic}} + \Gamma_2 * f_{\text{static}}$$

Equation 5.

$M$ refers to the intrafusal fiber mass which is required for computational stability in a series-elastic system with velocity-dependent contractility (Brown et al. 1996b). $L_0^{PR}$ is a polar region’s rest length. $\beta$ represents the polar region’s damping term; increases in $\beta$ result in increases in the velocity sensitivity of the primary afferent, which plays an important role in modulating the spindle’s behavior during dynamic fusimotor stimulation of bag1 fiber ($\beta_1$) (the only intrafusal fiber receiving dynamic fusimotor drive) (Crowe and Matthews 1964). By contrast, static fusimotor activation produces a small decrease in $\beta$ (note that $\beta_2$ is negative) (Crowe and Matthews 1964). $\Gamma$ is defined as the active-state force generator term; increases in $\Gamma$ result in an increase in the bias activity of the dependent afferent. Static fusimotor input causes a sustained, strong contraction within the bag2 and chain polar regions ($\Gamma_2 * f_{\text{static}}$), producing a stretch in the sensory region and a bias in the afferent activity. Dynamic fusimotor input produces a similar but much weaker effect ($\Gamma_2 * f_{\text{dynamic}}$). The model incorporates the experimentally observed nonlinear velocity dependence of the spindle’s afferent response and was modeled with
the velocity power term \( \left( L_{PR}^{\cdot} \right)^n \) (Houk et al. 1981; Prochazka and Gorassini 1998). C is a constant describing the experimentally observed asymmetric effect of velocity on force production during lengthening and shortening. While this asymmetry has been observed directly only in extrafusal striped muscle (Scott et al. 1996), we have assumed its existence also in the case of the intrafusal fiber’s contractile polar region. C was set to unity during polar region lengthening (\( C = C_L = 1 \)) and to \( C_S \) during shortening (\( C = C_S \)). Finally, the model incorporates the length-dependence of the force-velocity relationship (term \( L_{PR}^{\cdot} - R \)), where an increase in fascicle length results in increased slope of the force-velocity relationship for slow to moderate velocities. This effect, observed in extrafusal fibers, is believed to result from the influence of myofilament lattice spacing on cross-bridge kinetics (Brown et al. 1999). Under most physiological conditions the sarcomere length of the intrafusal fiber’s polar region tends to follow that of extrafusal fibers (extrafusal sarcomere: Scott et al. 1996; intrafusal sarcomere: Barker 1974; Bessou et al. 1975; Boyd 1976; Poppele and Quick 1981), so the extrafusal fiber measurements were used to estimate the length (R) of the polar region of intrafusal fibers for this effect (assuming that length changes in sensory region are minor comparing to the ones in polar region; see section Implementation of the spindle model and parameter determination).

**Intrafusal fiber contributions to afferent firing**

In our spindle model, the stretches in the sensory and polar regions are calculated for each intrafusal fiber independently in order to determine their potential contributions to afferent firing. Because tensions in Equation 2 and 3 are the same, sensory region’s
equation for tension (Equation 2) was rearranged in order to express polar region length ($L_{PR}$) in terms of tension ($T$) and fascicle length ($L$). This polar region length was then substituted into Equation 3 in order to obtain a second order differential equation of tension in terms of fascicle length:

$$T = \frac{K_{SR}^{SR}}{M} \left[ C \beta \cdot \text{sign} \left( L - \frac{T}{K_{SR}} \right) \cdot \text{abs} \left( L - \frac{T}{K_{SR}} \right)^a \left( L - L_{SR}^{SR} - \frac{T}{K_{SR}} - R \right) + \ldots \right]$$

Equation 6.

$$... + K_{PR}^{PR} \left( L - L_{SR}^{SR} - \frac{T}{K_{SR}} - L_{PR}^{SR} \right) + M \ddot{L} + \Gamma - T$$

Because the primary afferent endings are located on the sensory regions of all three intrafusal fibers, the stretch in the sensory region of each intrafusal fiber is calculated ($\frac{T}{K_{SR}}$). Once the afferent endings are stretched passed a certain sensory region length (sensory region threshold length: $L_{SR}^{SR}$) the ion channels open and depolarization/impulse generation takes place. The stretch above the threshold length is scaled by a constant $G$ (the term that relates the stretch of the intrafusal fiber’s sensory region to primary afferent firing, see Construction of the Model and Parameter Determination) in order to obtain the intrafusal fiber’s contribution to the activity of the primary afferent (prior to nonlinear intrafusal fiber firing summation between bag1 and combined bag2 and chain fiber models; for more details see next section).

$$\text{Afferent\_potential}_{primary} = G \left( \frac{T}{K_{SR}} - \left( L_{SR}^{SR} - L_{SR}^{SR} \right) \right)$$

Equation 7.

Contrary to the primary afferent endings, the secondary afferent transduction zones are located more eccentrically, straddling both sensory and polar regions of bag2.
and chain intrafusal fibers. Therefore, action potential generation reflects the stretch in both sensory and polar regions.

\[ \text{Afferent potential}_{\text{secondary}} = G \left[ X \frac{L_{\text{secondary}}}{L_{0}} \left( \frac{T}{K_{\text{SR}}} - \left( L_{N}^{\text{SR}} - L_{0}^{\text{SR}} \right) \right) + ... \right] \]

Equation 8.

\[ (1 - X) \frac{L_{\text{secondary}}}{L_{0}^{\text{PR}}} \left( L - \frac{T}{K_{\text{SR}}} - L_{0}^{\text{SR}} - L_{N}^{\text{PR}} \right) \]

\[ X \] represents the percentage of the secondary afferent that is located on the sensory region, which can vary among spindles. The stretch within the part of the secondary afferent that is located on the sensory region is obtained by multiplying \( X \) by sensory region stretch above the sensory region threshold length (\( L_{N}^{\text{SR}} \)) and normalizing it by the ratio of the secondary afferent rest length (\( L_{\text{secondary}} \)) and sensory region rest length (\( L_{0}^{\text{SR}} \)).

The stretch within the part of the secondary afferent that is located on the polar region is obtained similarly. The polar region length at and above which secondary afferent sensory endings are stretched is defined as the polar region threshold length (\( L_{N}^{\text{PR}} \)). Once the stretches of the secondary afferent portions that are located on both sensory and polar regions are obtained, they are summed together and multiplied by \( G \) in order to obtain the intrafusal fiber contribution to secondary afferent firing.

**Afferent firing model**

The output of the primary afferent is captured by nonlinear summation between the \( \text{bag}_1 \) and combined \( \text{bag}_2 \) plus chain intrafusal fiber outputs, in order to account for the effect of partial occlusion that has been observed in primary afferents during simultaneous static and dynamic fusimotor stimulation (Banks et al. 1997; Carr et al.)
Such combined fusimotor stimulation produces an afferent response that is larger than the larger of the individual responses (during either static or dynamic fusimotor stimulation) but smaller than their sum. While the mechanism responsible for the occlusion is still debated (Banks et al. 1997; Carr et al. 1998; Fallon et al. 2001; Proske and Gregory 2002), one likely explanation assumes the existence of two impulse generators in the spindle afferent. One impulse generator is believed to be located on the bag\textsubscript{1} fiber, while the second combines generator potentials from receptors on both the bag\textsubscript{2} and chain fibers (Banks et al. 1997; Carr et al. 1998; Celichowski et al. 1994; Fallon et al. 2001). The primary afferent firing results from competition between these two impulse generators in which the dominant generator wins and suppresses all activity in the weaker generator by resetting. While that would produce total occlusion, the mechanism responsible for partial occlusion is believed to involve spread of transduction current between the suppressed and dominant generator, resulting in increased impulse generation at the dominant site. Regardless of the exact mechanism, the effect has been well-described experimentally and was incorporated into the model. The driving potentials produced by bag\textsubscript{1} and combined bag\textsubscript{2} and chain intrafusal fibers are compared and the larger of the two plus a fraction (S) of the smaller are summed to obtain the primary afferent firing. The secondary afferent output (which is not influenced by bag\textsubscript{1} receptors) is obtained from the simple summation of the outputs of bag\textsubscript{2} and chain intrafusal fiber models.
Implementation of the spindle model and parameter determination

The anatomical and mathematical structure of the spindle model was embodied as a set of nested blocks in the MATLAB Simulink® modeling environment. First, a number of the model parameters were estimated and set directly from experimental measurements. The remainder of the parameters were then fit using standard least-squares fitting algorithms.

Direct parameter estimation

The values of a number of model parameters, described below, were estimated directly based on a variety of previously published data. These parameters were estimated directly rather than leaving them as free parameters because in each case there was enough experimental evidence to justify such a direct approach.

The term representing the nonlinear velocity dependence of afferent firing, ‘a’, was set to value 0.3 (Houk et al. 1981). We found velocity power term of 0.3 (Houk et al. 1981) to produce a better fit when capturing the increase in the spindle primary’s dynamic response during three velocities of ramp stretch than 0.5-0.6 as suggested by Prochazka and Gorassini (1998).

Based on Boyd's figures, we estimated ‘L_{SR}^0’, ‘L_{PR}^0’ and ‘L_{secondary}’, which represent the sensory and polar regions’ spring rest lengths and secondary afferent rest length (Boyd 1976). By dissecting the individual cat’s spindle and examining it under the microscope, Boyd found that at the spindle’s rest length, some 5% of its length belongs to
the sensory region (where primary endings are located) and 95% to the polar region. The length of the secondary afferent ending that spans both the sensory and polar regions is approximately 5% of total spindle’s rest length. In order to obtain these percentages in terms of optimal fascicle length we estimated the spindle’s rest length from soleus’ fascicle slack length (0.8L₀) (Scott et al. 1996). Therefore, ‘L₀<sup>SRᵦ</sup>’, ‘L₀<sup>PRᵦ</sup>’ and ‘L<sub>secondary</sub>’ were estimated to be 0.04L₀, 0.76L₀ and 0.04L₀, respectively.

‘R’ represents the polar region length above which the lattice spacing of the myofilaments has effects on the cross-bridge kinetics that drive the force-velocity relationship. We assumed that this basis length would be similar for intrafusal and extrafusal fibers. In the case of extrafusal fibers, the effect of myofilament lattice spacing on cross-bridge kinetics was observed for fascicle lengths between 0.8L₀ and 1.2L₀ although the data suggest that the effect exists for the shorter fascicle lengths as well (Figure 3c in Brown et al. 1999). By extracting the suggested force-fascicle length curve, we estimated that this effect exists for fascicle lengths longer than approximately 0.5L₀.

In order to determine the polar region length at 0.5L₀ fascicle length, we first needed to estimate the sensory region length. Because the evidence suggests that length changes in the sensory region are almost negligible compared to the length changes of polar region (Boyd 1976), we assumed that at 0.5L₀ fascicle length, the sensory region is approximately equal to its rest length (0.04L₀). Therefore, the polar region length at 0.5L₀ fascicle length was estimated to be 0.46L₀ (‘R’).

‘G’, the term that relates the stretch of the intrafusal fiber’s sensory endings to primary afferent firing, was estimated based on experimental data on cat tenuissimus muscle (Boyd 1976; Boyd et al. 1977) in the presence of maximal dynamic fusimotor...
stimulation; the bag₁ sensory endings stretch by some 2-8% (scaling it to units of L₀: 5% of primary sensory ending rest length = 0.05*0.04L₀ = 0.002L₀) while generating approximately 40pps of the primary afferent firing. By combining these two values together, the ‘G’ term for bag₁ fiber was estimated (G(for bag₁) = 40pps/0.002L₀ ≈ 20000pps/L₀). Similarly, we have obtained the ‘G’ value for the combined bag₂ and chain intrafusal fiber model, where maximal observed stretch during maximal static fusimotor stimulation of bag₂ and chain was 12-30% and 15-20%, respectively (average 19% of sensory region rest length = 0.19*0.04L₀ = 0.0076L₀) (Boyd 1976; Boyd et al. 1977), and primary afferent firing approximately 150pps (Boyd 1986) (G(for bag₂&chain, primary) = 150pps/0.0076L₀ ≈ 20000pps/L₀). In the case of the secondary afferent endings, the maximal observed stretch during maximal static fusimotor stimulation of bag₂ and chain fibers was comparable to the primary afferent case (Boyd 1976; Boyd et al. 1977), while the secondary firing observed at this stretch was approximately 110-115pps (Boyd 1986) (G(for bag₂&chain, secondary) = 110pps/0.0076L₀ ≈ 14500pps/L₀).

The term ‘S’ that represents the amount of partial occlusion that occurs in primary afferent firing also originated from direct experimental measurements (Fallon et al. 2001). Although there is some experimental evidence suggesting a length dependence to S, at this point, the data are very limited and noisy. As such, we have assumed that S is constant (S=0.156), with the acknowledgement that if further data supports an actual length dependence to S, then the model will need to be so modified.

The parameters that are used in mapping the fusimotor stimulation frequency to the model's fusimotor activation ('p', 'freq_bag1', 'freq_bag2' and 'freq_chain') were estimated based on Boyd's measurements of the intrafusal fiber's polar region contraction in
response to different fusimotor stimulation frequencies (Boyd 1976). Because the chain fiber's measurements were obtained at relatively high frequencies, we used these data to estimate the Hill-equation parameters for chain fiber and then modified them for other two fibers to account for their different saturation frequencies. We should mention that while limited experimental data suggests that fusimotor stimulation above the saturation frequencies (100Hz for bag1 (\(f_{\text{dynamic}} = 0.735\)) and bag2 (\(f_{\text{static}} = 0.735\)); 150Hz for chain (\(f_{\text{static}} = 0.735\))) will have little or no additional effect beyond that observed at the saturation frequency, our model actually has a slowly increasing effect because of the nature of Hill equation. While it was possible to correct this by introducing some nonlinearity in the model we chose not to do so in order to avoid complications during the model inversion (see Discussion). We believe that this does not represent a limitation of our model because fusimotor neurons usually fire at frequencies below the saturation level (see Discussion).

**Data selection for free parameter optimization**

In a series of experiments during the 1960s and 1970s, the activities of identified primary and secondary afferents were recorded from isolated or partly isolated spindles from soleus muscle of the cat. We utilized essentially the same published records that have been utilized in previous spindle modeling studies (i.e. Lin and Crago 2002; Maltenfort and Burke 2002; Schaafsma et al. 1991) in order to represent afferent activity during a broad range of experimentally controlled kinematic and fusimotor conditions. Afferent activity records during different velocities of ramp, triangular and sinusoidal stretches under various constant fusimotor drives were used to develop and tune the
model (Crowe and Matthews 1964; Hulliger et al. 1977a, b; Lennerstrand 1968; Lennerstrand and Thoden 1968a, b; Matthews 1963; Prochazka 1996). Once the selected spindle activity patterns were digitized manually from the figures in the journal articles, MATLAB’s Spline Toolbox was employed in order to facilitate parameter optimization, as described below.

The independent data set used for validation of the model originated from the medial gastrocnemius (MG) muscle of the cat rather than the soleus muscle and was similarly digitized manually (Taylor et al. 2000).

An important modification to the above-described data was made to facilitate curve-fitting. The ramp stretch records that were used in development of the model (Crowe and Matthews 1964) were modified in several ways due to their noisiness during the dynamic part of the stretch (which the authors attributed to experimental artifact). This was accomplished by using a cleaner ramp stretch record collected during a single velocity of stretch (Prochazka 1996) and scaling it to match Crowe and Matthew’s record. First we divided Prochazka’s afferent record into static and dynamic phases. We assumed that during the stretch the static component increased linearly from initial firing before the stretch to the final level 2-2.5s following the stretch. The dynamic response was obtained by subtracting this static component from the afferent firing record. While the static response of Prochazka’s data did not require scaling, the dynamic response was scaled in order to match the dynamic response of afferent activity recorded by Crowe and Matthew. The rest of the data used in tuning and validating the model did not require any such alterations or scaling.
Because the length records from the experiments used in developing the model represent whole muscle length, appropriate calculations were done using an extrafusal model of cat soleus muscle (Brown et al. 1999) to determine the relative contributions of tendon stretch and muscle fascicle (i.e. spindle) length (see Appendix section II and III).

**Free parameter optimization**

Free parameter optimization was accomplished using the Levenberg-Marquardt optimization method (Press et al. 1986). Data records of ramp, triangular and sinusoidal stretches in the absence or during constant static and/or dynamic fusimotor stimulation were used to obtain a single set of model parameters for the simulations presented throughout this report.

A single intrafusal fiber model of bag2 and chain fibers was assumed during this optimization because the bag2 and chain intrafusal fiber contributions to the activity of the primary afferent could not be quantitatively distinguished during the experiments in which constant fusimotor activity was used. Afterwards, the combined bag2 and chain model was separated based on the simplifying assumption that they share exactly the same structure and parameter values, while having different temporal properties in response to step changes in fusimotor drive (see Fusimotor Stimulation Model). This approach required two parameters relating to static fusimotor stimulation ($\beta_2$ and $\Gamma_2$) to be scaled to accommodate their different fusimotor saturation points (see Table 1).

Initial parameter optimization runs produced very similar values of $K^{SR}$ and $K^{PR}$ for both the bag1 and combined bag2 and chain fibers. We therefore made the simplifying assumption that $K^{SR}$ and $K^{PR}$ were identical for all intrafusal fiber types. Likewise, $C_S$
was found initially to be very similar for the different fiber types and so it, too, was
assumed to be a single constant. These simplifying assumptions left ten free parameters
as necessary to capture fully the primary afferent activity and two additional parameters
to capture secondary afferent activity (Table 1).

In the case of primary afferent parameter optimization, the optimization was
broken down into two stages in order to reduce the number of free parameters optimized
simultaneously. The first set of optimizations involved optimization of eight parameters
($K_{SR}$, $K_{PR}$, $\beta_0(bag_1)$, $\beta_0(bag_2&chain)$, $\beta_2(bag_2&chain)$, $\Gamma_2(bag_2&chain)$, $C_S$, $L_{SR}$) for
data recorded either in the absence of fusimotor stimulation or during constant static
fusimotor stimulation. This was done in order to introduce just enough dynamic
sensitivity into the combined model of the passive bag$_2$ and chain fibers so that it could
be reduced appropriately during the static fusimotor stimulation. Hundreds of
optimization runs starting from randomly selected initial points were performed in order
to avoid local minima. Following this initial set of optimizations, the parameter values
that generated the best fits were used in the next set of optimizations where data
involving dynamic fusimotor stimulation were employed and two more parameters were
optimized ($\beta_1(bag_1)$, $\Gamma_1(bag_1)$). In addition to using the best fit parameter values,
randomly chosen parameter values in the proximity of the best fit values were used as
well to run a number of optimizations of all ten primary afferent parameters
simultaneously (Table 1).

In the case of the secondary afferent model, two additional parameters ('$X$' and
$L_{PR}^{NL}$) had to be introduced due to the fact that part of the afferent transduction region lies
within the polar region of the intrafusal fiber. These two parameters were optimized on
the secondary afferent record during 2mm/s and 8mm/s triangular stretches in the presence of constant static fusimotor stimulation (γ_{\text{static}} = 70\text{pps}). The reason for not employing other secondary afferent records (5mm/s, 30mm/s and 50mm/s ramp stretches and 2mm/s and 8mm/s triangular stretches in the absence of fusimotor stimulation) is because of the existence of several traces of secondary afferent activity during the same kinematic and fusimotor conditions. \( L_{\text{PR}}^{N} \), the term representing the polar region length above which extension of polar region’s secondary afferent endings takes place (see Equation 8), produced the best fit at the value of 0.89L_0. Interestingly, the parameter \( L_{\text{PR}}^{N} \) when summed with sensory region rest length (\( L_{0}^{\text{SR}} \)), resembles approximately the intrafusal fiber length (0.89L_0 + 0.04L_0 = 0.93L_0) at which the passive tension develops. While this value had never been measured in the case of intrafusal fibers, the extrafusal fiber data indicated that passive tension develops at similar sarcomere lengths (Brown et al. 1996a).

Following the parameter optimization, the intrafusal fiber mass (M) was added to individual intrafusal fiber models in order to increase the model’s stability; it had no significant influence on the model’s properties.
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TABLE 1
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Results

In the following sub-sections we show the model’s prediction compared to data for each type of movement used in the parameter optimization. This is then followed by validation of the model against novel data that were not used for parameter optimization.

Ramp and hold stretches

The model’s ability to reproduce primary afferent activity during ramp and hold stretches is demonstrated and compared to the experimental data in Figure 3 (Crowe and Matthews 1964). Whole muscle stretches of 6mm length (~0.95L₀-1.08L₀ fascicle length stretches, see Appendix Section II and III) at three different velocities (5mm/s, 30mm/s and 70mm/s whole muscle or ~0.11, 0.66 and 1.55L₀/s fascicle length stretches) were used to run the spindle model simulations in which the fusimotor drive was kept either at zero (Figure 3a, b, c) or at a constant value (Figure 3d, e, f: γ_{dynamic}=70pps; Figure 3g, h, i: γ_{static}=70pps). In the absence of fusimotor stimulation, the model (solid lines) closely agreed with the experimental records of instantaneous primary afferent frequency (dots) for 5mm/s and 30mm/s while it underestimated the peak dynamic response of the 70mm/s record by some 20pps (~18%). Because the researchers reported having problems with 70mm/s records and because their published records would suggest an almost linear relationship between dynamic response and velocity that was subsequently refuted (Houk 1981), all 70mm/s records (with and without any fusimotor stimulation) were excluded from the free parameter optimization. The presence of dynamic fusimotor stimulation during three velocities of stretch increased the dynamic response of the biological spindle while the presence of constant static fusimotor drive had the opposite
effect while introducing a strong static bias (Figure 3g, h, i). The primary afferent’s
dynamic response for 5mm/s and 30mm/s during static fusimotor stimulation was
decreased, while the 70mm/s record remained unaffected. Other published records of
primary afferent activity show a consistent decrease in dynamic behavior in response to
static fusimotor drive at all velocities, providing further justification to exclude these
70mm/s records from parameter optimization. Finally, small oscillations in the behavior
of the model (e.g. at the end of stretch in Figure 3f, h) were artifacts of the abrupt
velocity changes; these can be significantly reduced or eliminated by making such
transitions smoother, as they would be in the actual spindle.
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FIGURE 3
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The predictions of the secondary afferent model during ramp and hold stretches
were compared to the secondary afferent data records of two different muscle spindles
(Matthews 1963) (Figure 3j, k, l). As seen from the figure, there exists great variability in
the original data among spindles. Instead of optimizing the X and $L_{PR}^{NL}$ for these records,
we employed the values (0.7 and 0.89$L_0$) that were optimized on the 2mm/s and 8mm/s
triangular stretches in the presence of constant static fusimotor drive where only a single
secondary afferent trace existed. In the case of three velocities tested (whole muscle
velocities: 5, 30 and 50mm/s; fascicle velocities: 0.11, 0.66 and 1.12$L_0$/s), the predictions
of the spindle model are contained within the range of the observed variability among
secondary afferent firing (see Discussion).
Triangular stretches

The model’s ability to capture primary afferent activity during 8mm whole muscle triangular stretches (fascicle length: 0.90L₀-1.08L₀) at ±8mm/s (fascicle velocity: ±0.18L₀/s) was evaluated using Lennerstrand and Thoden’s data (Lennerstrand 1968; Lennerstrand and Thoden 1968a, b). Lennerstrand and Thoden did not identify from which extensor muscle (soleus or lateral gastrocnemius) the afferent activity originated, but they suggested that the two muscles produced quantitatively similar afferent activity. Triangular stretches in the presence of either dynamic or static fusimotor drives at 35, 70 and 200pps were available (Figure 4). The primary afferent model accurately accounted for the spindle’s behavior during lengthening (similar to the ramp stretches in Figure 3), as well as during the shortening case in which the afferent firing was silenced when influenced by dynamic fusimotor stimulation or was maintained when under static fusimotor stimulation. The model performed well during the static fusimotor stimulation. In the case of dynamic fusimotor stimulation, it overestimated the initial dynamic response for the cases of 70 and 200pps stimulations, and failed to reproduce the recovery of the low-level afferent activity during the second half of shortening in the presence of 200pps dynamic fusimotor stimulation.

The model’s ability to reproduce secondary afferent firing during triangular stretches (Lennerstand and Thoden 1968a, b) is shown in Figure 5. Whole muscle triangular stretches (2mm/s and 8mm/s, corresponding to fascicle velocities 0.05L₀/s and
0.18L₀/s) were analyzed in the absence of fusimotor drive (Figure 5a, b), and in the presence of static fusimotor stimulation (Figure 5c, d). The model accurately accounted for the maintained secondary afferent firing during shortening, in contrast to silencing of the primary afferent during this phase of triangular stretch. Because X and Lₚ values were optimized on the triangular stretches in the presence of static fusimotor drive, it is not surprising that the model was very accurate in capturing those records; in the absence of fusimotor stimulation its predictions were contained within the range of the observed variability among secondary afferent firing. Finally, it should be mentioned that this particular set of secondary afferent activity most probably originated from the cat's ankle flexor muscles rather than the extensor muscles (soleus and medial gastrocnemius) that were employed in other triangular stretches involving primary afferent activity.

Sinusoidal stretches

Primary afferent activity and the model’s performance during whole muscle sinusoidal stretches (1400µm peak to peak, corresponding to fascicle length 0.995 ± 0.012 L₀) at a frequency of 1 Hz are shown in Figure 6 (Hulliger et al. 1977a, b). In the first set of experiments, such stretches were applied during constant static or dynamic fusimotor drives with stimulation frequencies of 50, 75 and 125pps (Figure 6a, b). The published database for sinusoidal stretches also includes simultaneous stimulation of dynamic and static fusimotor efferents. In one set of simulations, dynamic fusimotor
drive was held constant at 125 pps while static fusimotor drive was either 50, 75 or 125pps (Figure 6c), while in the other case static was held at 70 pps while dynamic fusimotor activity was either 50, 75 or 125pps (Figure 6d).

The records in Figure 6 are particularly important to demonstrate the effects of occlusion between primary transduction zones. A model with no occlusion (i.e. simple summation) predicts much higher activity in response to combined static and dynamic drive. For example, peak afferent activity during stretch with either pure dynamic drive (Fig. 6a) or pure static drive (Fig. 6b) was around 100pps; with combined drive at similar rates (Fig. 6c and 6d) it was only slightly higher. A model with complete occlusion (i.e. winner-take-all) would not have demonstrated the complex transition that occurs at the beginning of the stretch phase in the presence of combined static and dynamic drive (Figs. 6c and 6d). Activity during the shortening phase requires static drive because the viscosity of the bag1 fiber causes its transduction zone to be slack. When the spindle starts to lengthen in the second half of this sinusoidal motion, this same viscosity, amplified by any concurrent dynamic drive, accentuates the stretch of the bag1 transduction zone, which then modulates but does not yet dominate the activity arising from the bag2 and chain transduction zones. When stretch velocity peaks, the afferent activity tends to be dominated by the dynamic drive but residual contributions from different levels of static drive are still apparent. In Figures 6a and 6c, it is apparent that the model has over-estimated the effects of dynamic drive at the highest frequency of 125pps, perhaps because this particular bag1 fiber had a somewhat lower saturation frequency than employed in our model (100Hz). It is important to remember that all of
the experimental data from all of the experimental preparations and paradigms in the cited literature were fit with a single set of model parameters.
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FIGURE 6
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Model validation

During the early stages of this model’s development, the bag2 and chain fibers were combined into one system because of unavailability of data that would allow quantitative distinction between their properties and because of their similar responses during constant gamma static drive. The bag2 and chain fibers are distinguished by their different dynamic responses to the onset and offset of fusimotor drive (modeled as low-pass filter intrafusal fiber properties), but these effects had not been studied systematically in recordings of afferent activity during controlled fusimotor stimulation. In order to test the accuracy of the low-pass filter property of the bag2 intrafusal fiber that was included in the model, we used the secondary afferent activity recorded from MG muscle where direct recordings of two types of static fusimotor activity during decerebrate locomotion in the cat and secondary afferent activity were successfully obtained (Taylor et al. 2000). Although the existence of two types of static fusimotor drives is still not universally accepted, the direct fusimotor recordings of Taylor et al. provided convincing new evidence suggesting that type-1 static fusimotor drive
innervates chain or bag₂ and chain fibers together, while type-2 static fusimotor drive
innervates solely the bag₂ fiber.

In the experiments used for our model’s validation, Taylor et al. used a
decerebrate cat preparation where locomotor movements of three legs occurred in contact
with the treadmill. The experimental leg was denervated except for MG and tibialis
anterior (TA) muscles, kept clear of the belt by fixation at mid-femur and at the lower
end of tibia and allowed to freely rotate about ankle through the phasic contractions of
MG and TA. Single unit recordings were obtained simultaneously from type-identified
spindle afferents and fusimotor efferents. In order to reveal the effects of fusimotor drive,
Taylor et al. plotted the secondary difference signal. The secondary difference signal is
defined as the difference between the secondary afferent activity recorded during
locomotor cycling of the intact MG (where two types of static fusimotor drives were
present) and the activity recorded with the leg deefferented (no fusimotor or extrafusal
drive) while the ankle was moved through the same trajectory as recorded initially
(secondary difference in Figure 7). We used this experimentally obtained secondary
difference signal and compared it to the predicted secondary difference of our model
under the same conditions (meaning: secondary activity during same kinematics and
simultaneous stimulation of two static fusimotor drives minus the secondary activity
during same kinematics and no fusimotor drive), both with (Figure 7b) and without
(Figure 7a) the inclusion of the low-pass filter for bag₂ intrafusal fiber model (X and L^{PR}_N
were set to 0.7 and 0.89L₀). Based on the ankle angle kinematics provided during
decerebrate locomotion it was not possible to calculate the MG fascicle length, but
instead a reasonable guess about these values was made. Records suggest that during
normal walking, the MG usually operates between the lengths of 0.94-1.14L₀, which typically corresponds to some 45 degrees of ankle extension (Goslow et al. 1973). Based on the suggested limb’s position we assumed that the MG was somewhere in the vicinity of the optimal fascicle length and chose the fascicle length range for the smaller recorded movements to be between 1.05-1.085L₀ because it produced the best fit for the purpose of modeling the secondary difference signal. Furthermore, a typical spindle contains 4-10 rather than a single chain fiber (as our model does), which are driven similarly but asynchronously via separate type-1 static fusimotor neurons. Thus, our model’s secondary difference prediction had to be scaled to fit the experimental data (experimentally obtained secondary difference signal (+ +): left frequency scale; modeled secondary difference signal (without low-pass filter (---), with low-pass filter (—): right frequency scale)). The inclusion of the low-pass filter in the bag₂ fiber model improved the model’s performance (Figure 7c), although a small discrepancy remains at the onset of muscle shortening.

FIGURE 7

Discussion

Historically the muscle spindle has received much attention because of its importance in sensorimotor control. We chose to build our model of the spindle based upon the extensive information available about the internal components and their
properties as measured directly in intrafusal fibers, as inferred indirectly from spindle activity during controlled experiments, or as extrapolated from general properties of striated muscle fibers. We are pleased that a single model with one set of coefficients could account for spindle activity from many different preparations under widely varying conditions of motion and fusimotor drive.

Our analysis of the model features and results presented has focused on their ability to capture qualitative behavior rather than quantitative measurements of goodness of fit (e.g. Figures 6 and 7). Qualitative comparisons are often more instructive than overall quantitative comparisons, which tend to be dominated by portions of the records that happen to have relatively little modulation. Many estimates were required to pool data from various preparations and their disparate descriptions in the literature. Errors in these estimates or heterogeneity in the spindles themselves would be expected to produce offsets in afferent activity levels that would shed little light on the ability of the model to capture the physiological properties of muscle spindles.

An important feature of afferent activity that our model describes accurately is the partial occlusion effect that has been identified in the recent experimental literature (Banks et al. 1997; Carr et al. 1998; Fallon et al. 2001). Modeling of this effect between bag\textsubscript{1} and combined bag\textsubscript{2} and chain intrafusal fiber models reconciled the primary afferent activity during combined static and dynamic fusimotor drive. A somewhat weaker partial occlusion effect has also been reported in the biological spindle during simultaneous stimulation of multiple gamma static motoneurons (Carr et al. 1998; Fallon et al. 2001) but the interpretations of these results is less clear. One suggestion is that the bag\textsubscript{2} fiber drives one impulse generator site while all the other chain fibers (4-11 of them)
collectively drive the other, or that every single chain fiber has a separate impulse generating site as well. This seems unlikely given their proximity. The nonlinear summation observed during activation of multiple static fusimotor efferents may instead reflect nonlinear summation of the generator potentials themselves. Due to the uncertainty of interpretation of partial occlusion observations during stimulation of multiple static fusimotor efferents and because many researchers still recognize only two impulse generating sites (one on the bag₁ and other on the bag₂ and chain fibers), we excluded including other occlusion effects in our model.

Our model accounted well for the distinctive activation dynamics of bag₂ vs. chain fibers, but there are other differences in the mechanical properties of these intrafusal fibers that were omitted from modeling because of insufficient data. Evidence suggests that the bag₂ fiber is more viscous than the chain fiber (the bag₂ fiber contains slow twitch myosinATPase, while the chain fiber has the fast twitch form (Ovalle and Smith 1972)), but the afferent records demonstrating this distinction are very noisy. Therefore, instead of making arbitrary guesses regarding fibers’ viscosities, we assumed the same viscosities and structures for two intrafusal fiber models but different fusimotor saturation points and temporal properties. Note, however, that the basic structure of the model (Figure 1) assumes only a single source of static fusimotor drive controlling the bag₂ and chain fibers together, whose composite mechanical properties appear to be well-captured by our model.

Our model accounted well for the reported secondary afferent behavior. Because its parameters were optimized on the secondary afferent activity record during two ramp stretches (2mm/s and 8mm/s) in the presence of static fusimotor activity, it accurately
captured those records; in the case where more than a single afferent record was available for same kinematic and fusimotor conditions, the model predicted the values within the range of observed variability. The reason for the existence of large variability among secondary afferent records is not well understood. Initially we thought that such variability might reflect the variations in the secondary afferent location along different intrafusal fibers. If so, then it could be eliminated by adjusting the X parameter value. However, we realized that this was not sufficient and that it was also necessary to adjust the threshold length of the polar region for transmitting stretch to the secondary ending \( L_{\text{PR}} \) in order to capture the experimental variability. One anatomical feature related to the \( L_{\text{PR}} \) term could be the presence of kinks within the chain fibers, especially in the polar region areas where secondary afferent endings reside (Boyd 1976). A kinked chain fiber might need to be stretched more (i.e. larger \( L_{\text{PR}} \)) and pulled straight before its secondary endings are stretched. In order to account for variability among individual secondary afferent data, both X and \( L_{\text{PR}} \) parameters probably need to be adjusted.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the model differs from the biological spindle by omitting two effects of movement history: the response to non-cycling cross-bridges, and the effects of prior movement on the response of the receptors that are unrelated to non-cycling cross-bridges (Nichols and Cope 2004). The response to non-cycling cross-bridges is believed to give rise to the effect of “stiction” or the initial burst (Proske and Morgan 1999). This mechanism is believed to account for the experimentally observed phenomenon of very high viscosity in the quiescent bag1 fiber for a very small range of motion, purportedly as a result of the existence of a small number of residual cross-bridges between myofilaments, particularly in the absence of background fusimotor drive.
(Hill 1968). The consequences of omitting this effect are apparent during very slow and small amplitude sinusoidal stretches in the absence of fusimotor stimulation, where the model noticeably underestimated the primary afferent activity (not shown), as well as during initial moments of stretch, where an initial burst in afferent firing was not captured by the model (Figure 3b, c). We chose not to model the “stiction” because it seems unlikely to be a factor during most natural motor behavior, in which spindles usually operate over longer stretches and with continuously modulated fusimotor input, both of which eliminate stiction.

Haftel et al. (2004) described recently the phenomena of reduced dynamic response (RDR), in which immediately successive trials of triangular stretch-release produced a systematic reduction in the dynamic response in de-efferented spindles in rat triceps surae muscle. In their experiments, the RDR and initial burst properties of the rat's spindle afferents were studied and it was concluded that the initial burst and RDR exhibit very different behavior during successive trials of muscle stretch-release. For example, the initial burst is expressed over a much shorter time and smaller magnitude of muscle stretch than RDR. Additionally, the initial burst recovers more rapidly than RDR and its magnitude is variable and occasionally absent in repeated sets of stretch-release trials, whereas the greater dynamic response is always present in first trial compared with the subsequent trials. At the moment, there exist various explanations for the differences between the initial burst and RDR response properties (Haftel et al. 2004). Interestingly, using a similar triangular stretch-release paradigm in the decerebrate cat where fusimotor activity was present, Houk et al. (1992) found no evidence of change in the dynamic response. If this history-dependent effect occurs only in the absence of fusimotor tone,
then its omission should not give rise to significant errors during most conditions of normal use, which typically include substantial fusimotor modulation.

**Comparison with previous modeling attempts**

Several models of spindle afferent activity have been developed to account for the growing base of physiological data (Chen and Poppele 1978; Crowe 1968, 1970; Hasan 1983; Houk et al. 1981; Lin and Crago 2002; Maltenfort and Burke 2001; Matthews and Stein 1969; Rudjord 1970; Schaafsma et al. 1991). Prochazka and Gorassini (1998) compared the performance of some of these models to experimentally recorded primary and secondary afferent activity from cat hamstring muscles during locomotion. Because the afferent records used for this purpose incorporated intact fusimotor drive and the spindle models did not model these effects, certain assumptions regarding the fusimotor activity had to be made. We chose not to conduct a similar comparison analysis for the purpose of testing the performance of our model because accurate modeling of the fusimotor effects was our major goal. Instead, we choose to concentrate on comparisons only with those models incorporating fusimotor effects (Hasan 1983; Lin and Crago 2002; Maltenfort and Burke 2001; Schaafsma et al. 1991).

Hasan (1983) presented one of the first models consisting of mathematical elements representing the anatomical components found in the biological spindle. The model included a sensory region, which was modeled as a spring, and a polar region, which included nonlinear velocity dependence and a property akin to friction. It addressed issues such as the initial burst response (which we ignored), as well as fusimotor modulation of afferent activity. Because of the innovative nature as well as its
easy implementation, Hasan’s model attracted the attention of many researchers and its performance has been tested extensively. A major drawback of this model, however, arises from its rigid structure, which requires changing its parameters to account for each fusimotor state. Furthermore, during a series of stretches, the modeled initial burst in afferent activity persists at the start of each stretch, where as in the biological spindle it is only visible during the first stretch after a period of rest (Matthews 1972).

The next major step in spindle modeling came from Schaafsma et al. (1991), who designed a complex structural model of only the primary afferent that incorporated fusimotor effects. The model consisted of two intrafusal fiber submodels (bag₁ model, and combined bag₂ and chain model), and included thixotropic effects, although a mechanism for recovery from these effects was not provided. Subsequently the model was extended to incorporate a simulated chain fiber (Scheepstra et al. 1995). Overall, the model performed well, especially during the ramp and hold stretches for which the model parameters were optimized. Limitations in its performance were apparent for sinusoidal stretches (particularly small amplitude stretches), for which the model underestimated afferent activity. Because the model predates the elucidation of the effect of partial occlusion during simultaneous stimulation of dynamic and static fusimotor efferents (Banks et al. 1997; Carr et al. 1998; Fallon et al. 2001), the model assumes unrealistic, extreme occlusion. In other words, it assumes that the afferent activity will be controlled completely by the larger of the two fusimotor inputs. While the developers of this model do not report on its performance during conditions of simultaneous static and dynamic fusimotor activation, it is likely that the model would incorrectly predict the afferent
firing during those conditions as a consequence of its incorrect occlusion model. Finally, the model does not address the different temporal properties of the three intrafusal fibers.

During the development of the model presented here, two additional spindle models became available (Lin and Crago 2002; Maltenfort and Burke 2001). Maltenfort’s spindle model represents a black box model rather than a structural one, whose development was largely inspired by the author’s desire to study the effects of β (or also called skeleto-fusimotor) motoneurons, which innervate both intra- and extrafusal muscle fibers (Emonet-Denand and Laporte 1976). Some evidence suggests that β motoneurons receive monosynaptic group Ia excitation comparable to that in α motoneurons, which would then result in a positive feedback loop (Burke and Tsairis 1977). Maltenfort’s spindle model is a reasonably simple one and includes the effects of static and dynamic fusimotor activation, as well as the partial occlusion effect. The performance of the model, however, seems to be very limited. For example, during the sinusoidal stretches that were also employed in the development of our model (Hulliger et al. 1977a, b), the model’s prediction of peak primary afferent firing in the presence of dynamic fusimotor stimulation (either when present alone or in combination with static fusimotor stimulation, see Figure 6a, c and d) was on average 70pps larger than in the biological spindle. Maltenfort’s model also under-represents the decreased modulation of primary afferent firing during increasing static fusimotor stimulation (8-24pps in their model vs. 25-45pps in the biological spindle; our model’s performance during identical circumstances is shown in Figure 6b). Finally, their model contains no terms that would enable it to capture the response times of individual intrafusal fibers when subject to modulated fusimotor activity.
About the same time that Maltenfort’s black box model appeared in the literature, Lin and Crago (2002) presented a combined model of extrafusal muscle and spindle, in order to study how the spindle is related to the extrafusal muscle and how it operates internally. A Hill-type muscle model represented the extrafusal muscle fibers, while the spindle model was a structural one consisting of three intrafusal fiber models. Overall, 89 parameters, out of which 24 were free parameters, were employed in this model. Lin and Crago's model calculates the intrafusal muscle force by multiplication of the activation level times the output of the force-length curve times the output of the force-velocity curve, similarly to extrafusal fibers. A similar relationship is also embedded in our model where the force within the polar region results partially from the multiplicative relationship between forces due to length and velocity and activation

\[ \beta \cdot C \cdot (L_{PR}^* - R) \cdot \text{sign}(L_{PR}^*) \cdot \text{abs}(L_{PR}^*)^a. \]

Lin and Crago assumed that each intrafusal fiber acts as an independent impulse generator, despite the widely accepted notion that there are only two impulse generating sites (Banks et al. 1997; Carr et al. 1998; Celichowski et al. 1994; Fallon et al. 2001). The primary afferent was modeled as resulting from the complete, rather than the partial occlusion between the bag1 and bag2 fiber activities (rather than from the activities in all three intrafusal fibers as in the biological spindle). Similarly, the secondary afferent activity resulted from complete occlusion among the activities in bag2 and chain fibers. In the case of the primary afferent, the model performed well during ramp-and-hold and sinusoidal stretches, especially during the stimulation of individual fusimotor inputs, while demonstrating certain limitations in the absence of such inputs. In the case of the
ramp-and-hold stretch, the model underestimates the afferent decay time following the completion of the stretch, especially in the absence of any fusimotor stimulation (0.2 vs. 0.5s). Also, at the completion of the stretching phase of a ramp-and-hold stretch, the model predicts an abrupt and brief cessation of firing, which might be a troubling artifact if the model is to be incorporated into a model of segmental regulation of motor output, as intended by the authors.

Lin and Crago did not describe the performance of their model during combined fusimotor stimulation, except for a single ramp-and-hold example presented without matching experimental data. Because the model employs complete rather than partial occlusion, it seems likely that the model will underestimate afferent activity during conditions of simultaneous fusimotor stimulation. For the purposes of modeling secondary afferents, the chain fiber was modeled separately, although as the authors mention, the separation between the bag2 and chain fibers was based on qualitative rather than quantitative observations due to insufficient experimental data (fusimotor stimulation of the chain fiber increases the static sensitivity and the base-line firing while stimulation of bag2 had no or slight effect on static sensitivity; Boyd 1981). The benefit of a complete set of free parameters for each of the two fiber types (rather than modeling them as one fiber type with different dynamics) is not clear, especially if only a single source of static fusimotor drive is available. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the model assumes that the secondary afferent endings span exactly the same region on the bag2 and chain intrafusal fibers as the primary endings occupy (the sensory region), despite the fact that in the biological spindle the secondary endings are located on more juxtaequatorial regions of intrafusal fibers that exhibit some polar region properties.
While this simplification might be acceptable during muscle lengthening where the primary and secondary afferents behave similarly, it is likely to introduce errors during shortening where very different behaviors have been observed in primary and secondary afferents (especially during low or absent static fusimotor stimulation, when the primary afferent becomes silent while the secondary afferent continues to fire).

Lin and Crago's model includes individual intrafusal fiber time constants of activation dynamics (low-pass filter properties). While the chain fiber's time constant seems appropriate (0.08s), the values for bag₁ and bag₂ fibers appear to be too short (0.16s and 0.24s, respectively) in comparison to the experimental measurements (bag₁: 0.82s (Boyd 1976) and 1.24s (Boyd et al. 1977); bag₂: 0.53s (Boyd 1976) and 0.70s (Boyd et al. 1977)). It is surprising that the bag₁ was modeled as having a shorter time constant than the bag₂ fiber because the two fibers were traditionally called slow and fast nuclear bag fibers, respectively (Boyd 1976).

**The role of the spindle model in understanding the fusimotor system**

The exact pattern and purpose of fusimotor activity during natural motor behavior remain controversial. One general proposal is that the spindle is thereby programmed by the CNS so as to behave as an optimal transducer (Loeb, 1984; Loeb and Marks 1985; Scott and Loeb 1994). The information transmitting capability of a given spindle afferent is limited by the physiological range of firing rates and noisiness in the interval between successive action potentials, particularly when asynchronous signals from multiple afferents are combined (Loeb and Marks 1985). If the spindle had a fixed sensitivity to
length and velocity, it would be incapable of distinguishing fine gradations of the wide range of lengths and velocities over which muscles can operate. The CNS can improve utility of the spindle afferent signal by adjusting its sensitivity in consideration of the relatively limited range of lengths and velocities that it expects to encounter during a self-generated behavior (e.g. locomotion). In the following paragraphs we will discuss the current understanding of fusimotor control and the role it plays during natural locomotion. In doing so, we will point out some examples where our spindle model could help to resolve uncertainties regarding the nature and effects of fusimotor control.

Natural Patterns of Fusimotor Activity

Recordings of fusimotor activity during locomotor behavior are scarce due to the difficulty of the experiment. A few direct recordings have been reported from reduced preparations, but it was problematic to identify the source as being static or dynamic (Appenteng et al. 1980; Lund et al. 1979; Murphy et al. 1984). Recordings of primary afferent activity during locomotion are more common, so investigators often attempt to infer fusimotor programming by comparing the afferent firing rates to those that would have been expected in the absence of fusimotor activity.

Recently, the records of fusimotor efferent firing in medial gastrocnemius muscle (MG) during decerebrate locomotion of the cat were successfully captured, providing more direct insight into fusimotor function (Taylor et al. 2000). The dynamic fusimotor efferent increased its activity abruptly at the beginning of active shortening of MG, stayed constant during that phase and became silent at the beginning of its stretch by the antagonist dorsiflexors of the ankle. The authors hypothesized that the increased dynamic
fusimotor stimulation during the shortening phase would enhance detection and reflex effects of any unexpected lengthening that might result from obstruction of the limb’s trajectory. Furthermore, the residual dynamic fusimotor effects during the initial moments of lengthening resulted in a large burst in primary afferent firing, which was hypothesized to represent a cue signal to CNS indicating the beginning of the swing phase. When making such an interpretations, however, it should be remembered that the kinematics of the muscles in Taylor et al.’s unloaded decerebrate preparation were quite unlike those of normal locomotion; the decerebrate CNS presumably has no way of adapting fusimotor control for such altered and unexpected changes in kinematics. It should be possible to drive our model with the kinematics of normally loaded walking plus the fusimotor activity recorder from unloaded, decerebrate preparation to see if it produces spindle afferent activity patterns consistent with those recorded from intact, naturally walking animals.

In addition to capturing the dynamic fusimotor pattern during natural locomotor step, Taylor et al. recorded static fusimotor activity as well. The static fusimotor activity was found to be strongest during the periods of active shortening of MG in decerebrate locomotion. This was found to introduce a strong bias to the afferent firing, preventing it from going silent. While the existence of two types of static fusimotor drives is still not widely accepted, the direct fusimotor recordings provided convincing new evidence for this (Taylor et al. 2000). During the locomotor step the two efferent firing profiles were somewhat out of phase; type-2 drive (presumed to be innervating bag₂ fiber) lead the type-1 drive (innervating chain fibers) by approximately 0.17s. These phase differences appear to compensate for the differences in contractile dynamics of their respective
intrafusal fibers (see Appendix; Boyd 1976; Boyd et al. 1977), resulting in synchronous static fusimotor modulation of the receptors. Thus it remains unclear whether these two types of static fusimotor modulation are actually employed differentially in some behaviors.

Finally, one very useful function of our model that is currently being investigated deals with inverting the model, so that the available records of the spindle’s afferent activity and the muscle length changes during natural locomotion could be used to calculate the underlying fusimotor pattern that gave rise to the recorded afferent activity. While the inversion of the secondary afferent model was straightforward, the existence of nonlinear partial occlusion term made the inversion more complicated in the case of the primary afferent. The recently available direct recordings of fusimotor activity in the decerebrate cat (Taylor et al. 2000) allowed us to make some useful assumptions while inverting the primary afferent; the bag₂ and chain intrafusal fibers were assumed to represent a dominant pacemaker site during muscle shortening, while the bag₁ was assumed to be the dominant site during muscle lengthening. Preliminary results agreed qualitatively with Taylor's conclusions regarding fusimotor activity during decerebrate cat locomotion, but they also revealed the importance of having accurate kinematic records. For the older experimental recordings that we used (Loeb and Duysens 1979; Loeb and Hoffer 1985; Loeb et al. 1985), the muscle velocity and length records were often extrapolated from synergistic or antagonistic muscles with different musculoskeletal architecture from the source of the spindle afferent recordings. The inverted spindle model was extremely sensitive to minor misalignment between the
afferent record and muscle kinematics because it compensated for any discrepancy by using the fusimotor apparatus.

Conclusion

We are encouraged that a single set of model parameter values accurately captured the behavior of spindle afferents from different experimental preparations under widely varying kinematic and fusimotor conditions, including a complex data set not included in the optimization of any of the parameters. This provides indirect support for unifying hypotheses regarding the function of fusimotor control and the contribution of information from spindle afferents to kinesthesia and sensorimotor control in general. While the number of parameters that had to be specified is fairly large, the anatomically based design of the model facilitated a bootstrapping approach in which some individual parameters could be set directly from literature values or from specific experiments designed to reveal a particular property of a given spindle structure. The correspondence between model terms and anatomical components facilitates the formulation and experimental testing of specific hypotheses about transduction in spindles such as those related to occlusion and phasing.

The model itself will be useful in several ways. Most directly, it can be used to demonstrate the effects of particular patterns of fusimotor activity on the sensitivity of spindle afferents to a given set of kinematic inputs. Conversely, it can be inverted to infer fusimotor activity from patterns of activity in spindle afferents, which are relatively easy to record in both reduced and naturally behaving preparations. More generally, realistic representations of spindle afferent activity in larger models of neural control systems will
provide better understanding of the actual control problems that must be solved by those systems. Currently, the model has been successfully incorporated into a relatively complex model of the human arm with 15 muscles (Lan et al. 2005). One key feature of the model is that it can be implemented in a Simulink block defined by a Matlab S-function, and seamlessly incorporated into the Virtual Muscle model (Cheng 2000), or any other muscle model defined with a Simulink block.
Appendix

I. Designing the low-pass filters

a. Determining the contractile dynamics of individual intrafusal fiber types in the presence of modulated fusimotor activation

The primary data for the time constants of individual intrafusal fiber contractions during fusimotor stimulation are from Boyd (Boyd 1976; Boyd et al. 1977). In the first set of such experiments (Boyd 1976) the spindles from tenuissimus muscle of the cat were successfully isolated with most or all of their innervation intact. Their intrafusal fiber contraction and relaxation properties were observed and recorded on still or moving film. The individual fusimotor axons to the spindle were not isolated, but instead the stimulus to the nerve was gradually increased, activating multiple fusimotor efferents and resulting in the multiple intrafusal fiber contractions. Therefore, the individual intrafusal fiber measurements were performed at the same time when most other intrafusal fibers were contracting in the spindle, which probably reflects normal fusimotor patterns of activity. The mean times of the complete contraction for individual bag\(_1\) and bag\(_2\) fibers and the chain bundle (rather than a single chain fiber) were 0.82, 0.53 and 0.48s, respectively. In the second set of experiments (Boyd et al. 1977) the individual fusimotor efferents to the spindles were isolated and their connections to particular intrafusal fibers identified. Dynamic fusimotor efferents were related to bag\(_1\) intrafusal fibers, while static fusimotor efferents were identified as being selective and innervating either bag\(_2\) or chain fibers, or as being non-selective and innervating both fibers. By appropriately stimulating individual intrafusal fibers, the mean times of the complete contraction for individual...
bag\textsubscript{1} and bag\textsubscript{2} fibers and bundle of chain fibers were measured to be 1.24, 0.70 and 0.35s, respectively. The two experiments (Boyd 1976; Boyd et al. 1977) agree that the bag\textsubscript{1} fiber has the longest contraction time among the intrafusal fibers. In the case of bag\textsubscript{2} and chain fibers, the first experiment suggests that their time constants are similar while the second one describes a significantly slower nature of bag\textsubscript{2} fiber in comparison to the chain fiber.

Inspired by the recent primary afferent recordings during sinusoidally modulated fusimotor efferent stimulation (1Hz, 50+30pps) of individual intrafusal fibers, we took a closer look at their implications regarding individual fiber contraction times (Durbaba et al. 2001). The recorded data suggest that chain fibers respond to static fusimotor stimulation with little or no delay (Durbaba et al. 2001: primary gain 0.25, primary phase lag 3 degrees), which seems surprisingly low compared to Boyd's complete contraction times of 0.48 (Boyd 1976) and 0.35s (Boyd et al. 1977) in response to sustained static fusimotor stimulation. In the light of these new observations, we returned to Boyd's experiments to search for experimental conditions that might have resulted in longer chain contraction times. We found that in the most of the spindles, Boyd identified and stimulated only a single static fusimotor efferent innervating the chain fibers and assumed that it was innervating the entire chain bundle. The experimental evidence, however, suggests that a single static fusimotor efferent innervates either one or two chain fibers, and only rarely three fibers, while a single spindle on average has between four and eleven chain fibers (Boyd and Ward 1975). During stimulation of a single static fusimotor efferent, the bundle of chain fibers in the spindle tends to respond as a single unit, possibly because passive chain fibers are bound to active ones by connective tissue
(Boyd and Ward 1975). In light of Boyd's comment on the difficulty of clearly observing the chain contraction pattern due to the fibers' small diameters and close packing, we argue that the Boyd's unexpectedly long contraction time might be the result of incomplete fusimotor stimulation of the chain bundle. Activation of only a few of the chain fibers could have significantly slowed the overall contraction of the bundle. Therefore, we decided to employ the recently obtained observations that suggest almost zero contraction time for chain fibers (Durbaba et al. 2001). These are consistent with the well-known ability of static fusimotor efferents to entrain spindle afferent activity at rates of 50-100pps when stimulated individually (Boyd 1986).

Bag1 and bag2 fibers have simpler fusimotor innervation than the set of chain fibers, so Boyd's measured complete contraction time constants are more likely to be accurate (bag1: 1.24s; bag2: 0.70s; Boyd 1977). Nevertheless, we again looked at the recently obtained records of the primary afferent firing when individual intrafusal fibers were sinusoidally stimulated ($\gamma_{\text{static}}$: 1Hz, 50÷30pps) as described earlier (Durbaba et al. 2001). The primary afferent data suggests that the bag2 fiber cannot significantly modulate afferent activity at even this low modulation frequency (primary gain: 0.1, Durbaba et al. 2001). Nevertheless, the researchers decided to fit the afferent activity with a sinusoidal curve in order to calculate its phase lag in comparison to the sinusoidal static fusimotor stimulation (primary phase lag: 53 degrees or 0.15s). The problem is compounded by the fact that much of the high range of the frequency modulation occurred at stimulation frequencies for which bag2 activation saturates (60-75pps). Instead, we decided to look at the lower half of the sinusoidal curve (i.e. where static fusimotor frequencies were between 20 and 50pps) in order to examine the modulation
gain and phase lag values for the bag2 fiber. Even there, we found very little afferent modulation. In Boyd’s earlier work, a ramp increase in static fusimotor stimulation to the bag2 significantly altered the afferent firing (i.e. the increase in the static fusimotor activation of the bag2 fiber from 30 to 60pps resulted in approximately 30pps increase in the primary afferent firing; Boyd 1986). All of these data are consistent with the contraction time of 0.70s measured by Boyd et al. (1977) and used in designing of our low-pass filter for type-2 static innervation of the bag2 fiber. Very similar observations were also obtained for the bag1 fiber, which was found to be incapable of modulating the primary afferent activity during sinusoidal dynamic fusimotor stimulation at 1Hz (Durbaba et al. 2001). Therefore, the Boyd's measured complete contraction time constant was employed in developing the bag1 low-pass filter (1.24 sec, Boyd et al. 1977). In designing the bag1 and bag2 fiber low-pass filters we chose contraction time measurements from individual intrafusal fibers (Boyd et al. 1977) rather than during simultaneously contraction of multiple intrafusal fibers (Boyd 1976) because the onset of fusimotor activation of each intrafusal fiber in the later experiments was not known, so time constants had to be estimated subjectively.

b. Determining time constants for low-pass filters

Initially, very high fusimotor frequencies (bag1 and bag2: 100Hz; chain: 150Hz) were applied to each intrafusal fiber model in order to measure the time it takes each intrafusal fiber model to contract to approximately 90% of the maximum (bag1: 0.5s; bag2: 0.005s; chain: 0.005s). For bag1 and bag2 intrafusal fiber models, these 90% contraction times were shorter than the 90% contraction values that we estimated from
biological intrafusal fibers (bag$_1$: 0.843s; bag$_2$: 0.476s; Boyd et al. 1977) based on similar estimates in earlier Boyd’s work (1976). In order to reconcile these differences, we assumed a low-pass filter behavior for bag$_1$ and bag$_2$ fibers and designed appropriate filters for the two fibers.

$$f_{\text{dynamic}}(t) = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}\right) \cdot \frac{\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}^p}{\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}^p + \text{freq}_{\text{bag1}}^p} \quad \text{bag}_1$$

$$f_{\text{static}}(t) = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}\right) \cdot \frac{\gamma_{\text{static}}^p}{\gamma_{\text{static}}^p + \text{freq}_{\text{bag2}}^p} \quad \text{bag}_2$$

For each intrafusal fiber, the constant ($\tau$) was calculated by setting:

- $f_{\text{dynamic}}=0.9*0.735$ (for bag$_1$ case) or $f_{\text{static}}=0.9*0.735$ (for bag$_2$ case), because the rise-times to approximately 90% of the intrafusal fiber contraction during 100Hz frequency were measured (note that $f_{\text{dynamic}}=0.735$ for bag$_1$ fiber at 100Hz and $f_{\text{static}}=0.735$ for bag$_2$ fiber at 100Hz), and

$$- \frac{\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}^p}{\gamma_{\text{dynamic}}^p + \text{freq}_{\text{bag1}}^p} = 0.735 \quad \text{(for bag}_1\text{ case), or} \quad \frac{\gamma_{\text{static}}^p}{\gamma_{\text{static}}^p + \text{freq}_{\text{bag2}}^p} = 0.735 \quad \text{(for bag}_2\text{ case), because 100Hz fusimotor stimulations were employed;}$$

- time $t$ was equal to the difference in 90% contraction rise-times between biological intrafusal fiber and intrafusal fiber model (bag$_1$: 0.843s-0.500s=0.343s; bag$_2$: 0.476s-0.005s=0.471s).

The calculated values of constant $\tau$ were found to be 0.149 and 0.205 for bag$_1$ and bag$_2$, respectively.
II. Calculating the maximal fascicle length from the whole muscle length during passive stretch

In order to calculate the maximal muscle fascicle length during passive stretch ($L_f^{\text{max}}$), maximal whole muscle length ($L_{\text{max}}^{\text{MT}}$) and tendon and aponeurosis length during maximal passive stretch ($L_{\text{max}}^{\text{passive}}^{T}$) need to be determined.

1. Calculation of the maximal whole muscle length ($L_{\text{max}}^{\text{MT}}$):

The values used in these calculations were based on the measurements of soleus muscle made by Scott et al. (Scott et al. 1996):

- Optimal muscle fiber fascicle length ($L_f^{0}$) = 3.8cm
- Length of whole-muscle at $L_0$ ($L_{0}^{\text{MT}}$) = 10.9cm
- Range of Motion (ROM) = 2.5cm
- $L_0$ relative to range of motion (ROM) (% from shortest length) = 85%

$L_{\text{max}}^{\text{MT}}$ is then calculated:

$$L_{\text{max}}^{\text{MT}} = L_{0}^{\text{MT}} + (1 - 0.85)*\text{ROM} = 11.275\text{cm}$$

2. Calculation of tendon and aponeurosis length during maximal passive stretch ($L_{\text{max}}^{\text{passive}}^{T}$):

In determining this value we used soleus data where the measurements of force produced by the muscle (in units of $F_0$, where $F_0$ represents muscle force at optimal fascicle length...
$L_0$) were compared to the measured length of the tendon and aponeurosis (in units of $L_0^T$, where $L_0^T$ represents optimal tendon and aponeurosis length at $F_0$) (Brown et al. 1996b). We first determined the passive stress produced by the muscle when stretched to the maximal physiological length to be 4N/cm$^2$ (Brown et al. 1996a), which was then normalized by $F_0$/PCSA (32 N/cm$^2$, Scott et al 1996) in order to get this value in units of $F_0$ ((4N/cm$^2$)/(32N/cm$^2$)=0.125$F_0$). The length of tendon and aponeurosis at force 0.125$F_0$ was approximated to the value 0.96$L_0^T$ (Brown et al. 1996b). In order to obtain this value in terms of centimeters, $L_0^T$ was estimated based on tendon slack length ($L_{slack}^T=7.1$cm, Scott et al. 1996; $L_{slack}^T=0.94*L_0^T$; $L_0^T=1/0.94*L_{slack}^T=7.553$cm) and the tendon and aponeurosis length during maximal passive stretch was: $L_{max\,\text{passive}}^T=0.96*7.553cm=7.251$cm.

3. Calculation of the maximal muscle fascicle length ($L_{max}^f$) during passive stretch:

The maximal fascicle length was determined by subtracting $L_{max\,\text{passive}}^T$ from $L_{max\,\text{MT}}^T$:

$$L_{max}^f = L_{max\,\text{MT}}^T - L_{max\,\text{passive}}^T = 11.275 - 7.251 = 4.024$cm.$$

III. Calculation of the amount of muscle fascicle stretch from the whole muscle stretch

In the following calculations the equations of the model describing properties of the mammalian skeletal muscle (soleus) were used (Brown et al. 1999) to determine muscle fascicle stretch. Under passive conditions, the whole muscle model consists of two non-
linear springs in series: the parallel elastic element (PE) (which lies in parallel with the contractile element) and the series elastic element (SE) representing the tendon and aponeurosis. During the passive stretch, the force produced in the active contractile element is zero, and the force in the non-linear spring is:

\[ F_{PE} = c_1 \times k_1 \times \ln \left( \exp \left( \frac{L_f - L_{r1}}{k_1} \right) + 1 \right) \]

where \( c_1, k_1 \) and \( L_{r1} \) are measured constants for soleus muscle (\( c_1 = 76.4, k_1 = 0.053, L_{r1} = 1.4 \)) and \( L_f \) is the fascicle length in units of \( L_0 \). By inverting this equation, an equation for fascicle length can be obtained:

\[ L_f = k_1 \times \ln \left( \exp \left( \frac{F_{PE}}{c_1 \times k_1} \right) - 1 \right) + L_{r1} \]

The force in the tendon and aponeurosis is equal to:

\[ F_{SE} = c^T \times k^T \times \ln \left( \exp \left( \frac{L^T - L^T_{r}}{k^T} \right) + 1 \right) \]

where \( c^T, k^T \) and \( L^T_{r} \) are measured constants for soleus muscle (\( c^T = 27.8, k^T = 0.0047, L^T_{r} = 0.964 \)) and \( L^T \) is tendon length in units of \( L_0^T \).

Because the force in the fascicle area is equal to the force in the tendon and aponeurosis area (\( F_{PE}=F_{SE} \)), the equation for \( F_{SE} \) can be used and substituted in the previous equation for \( L_f \).

\[ L_f = k_1 \times \ln \left( \exp \left( \frac{c^T \times k^T \times \ln \left( \exp \left( \frac{L^T - L^T_{r}}{k^T} \right) + 1 \right)}{c_1 \times k_1} \right) - 1 \right) + L_{r1} \]
Because the experimental literature dealing with spindle activity provides the whole muscle length, the tendon length in the previous equation can be expressed in terms of fascicle length and whole muscle length: \[ L_T = \frac{L_{WM} - L^f_0 * L^f}{L^T_0} \]

Therefore, we are left with the following equation which needs to be solved for \( L_f \)

\[
L^f = k_1 \ln \left( \frac{c^T * k^T * \ln \left( \exp \left( \frac{L_{WM} - L^f_0 * L^f}{L^T_0} - L^T_r \right) + 1 \right) - 1}{c_1 * k_1} + L_{r1} \right)
\]

An analytical solution of this equation in terms of constants does not exist. Instead, values of constants and whole muscle length as described above were provided to MATLAB in order to calculate the fascicle length \( L_f \).
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**Figures**

**Figure 1. A biological muscle spindle and the structure of the spindle model.**

a: A biological muscle spindle consists of three types of intrafusal fibers which receive several fusimotor inputs (gamma static and dynamic) while giving rise to primary (Ia) and secondary (II) afferent; modified from Bakker (1980). b: The spindle model consists of three intrafusal fiber models. It receives three inputs (fascicle length, in terms of optimal length $L_0$, and static and dynamic fusimotor drives) in order to produce primary and secondary afferent firing.

**Figure 2. The intrafusal fiber model.**

All intrafusal fibers consist of polar and sensory zones with qualitatively identical mechanical components. For each fiber model the stretch in the sensory and polar regions are calculated in order to determine its contribution to the firing of each afferent. The model parameters for each intrafusal fiber type are provided in Table 1.

**Figure 3. Spindle model performance during 6 mm whole muscle ramp stretches.**

The primary afferent response at three different velocities (whole muscle stretches at 5, 30 and 70mm/s; fascicle stretches at 0.11, 0.66 and 1.55$L_0$/s; fascicle length changes 0.95-1.08$L_0$) were performed in the absence of fusimotor stimulation (a, b, c), during
constant dynamic fusimotor stimulation at 70 pps (d, e, f) and during constant static fusimotor stimulation at 70 pps (g, h, i). The solid thin lines represent model output, while the experimental data are shown as dots (·). The secondary afferent responses at three different velocities (whole muscle stretches at 5, 30 and 50 mm/s; fascicle stretches at 0.11, 0.66 and 1.12L₀/s) are compared to the secondary afferent activity from of two different muscle spindles (shown as +, ·) originating from the same experimental preparation (j, k, l).

**Figure 4. Model’s ability to capture primary afferent activity during triangular stretches.**

The 8 mm whole muscle stretches (fascicle length changes 0.90-1.08L₀) at 8 mm/s (fascicle stretches at 0.18L₀/s) were performed during constant dynamic (a, b, c) or static (d, e, f) fusimotor stimulations at three different frequencies (35, 70 and 200 pps). The solid thin lines represent model output, while the experimental data are shown as dots.

**Figure 5. Model’s ability to capture secondary afferent activity during triangular stretches.**

The 8 mm whole muscle stretches (fascicle length changes 0.90-1.08 L₀) at 2 and 8 mm/s (fascicle stretches at 0.05 and 0.18L₀/s) were performed in the absence of fusimotor stimulation (a, b) and during static fusimotor stimulation at 70 pps (c, d). The solid thin lines represent model output, while the experimental data are shown as dots.
Figure 6. Model’s ability to capture primary afferent activity during sinusoidal stretches and constant fusimotor stimulation.

Whole muscle stretches of 1.4mmpeak-to-peak (fascicle length changes $0.995\pm0.012L_0$) at 1Hz. a: Dynamic fusimotor stimulation at 50, 75 or 125pps; b: Static fusimotor stimulation at 50, 75 or 125pps; c: Dynamic fusimotor stimulation at 125pps plus static fusimotor stimulation at 50, 75 or 125pps; d: Static fusimotor stimulation at 70pps, plus dynamic fusimotor stimulation at 50, 75 or 125pps. The solid thin lines represent model output, while the experimental data are shown as +, · and *.

Figure 7. Model’s prediction of the secondary difference signal of secondary afferent during the cat’s locomotor step.

The secondary difference signal is the difference between the secondary afferent activity recorded during locomotor cycling of the intact MG and the activity recorded with the leg deeffferented (no fusimotor or extrafusal drive) while the ankle was moved through the same trajectory as recorded (thin solid lines). In this figure the model’s prediction of secondary difference signal during simultaneous stimulation of 2 types of static fusimotor drives (type-1 ($\Delta$) and type-2 ($\square$), left frequency scale) is compared to experimental data (Taylor et al. 2000) (+, left frequency scale). While the amplitude stretch ($\alpha$) was approximately 7 degrees of ankle rotation, the mean cycle period lasted for about 0.83s. The performance of the model lacking low-pass filter property of bag_2 fiber is shown in (a) (thick interrupted line, right frequency scale), compared to the performance of the model when low-pass filter was introduced in bag_2 intrafusal fiber model (b) (thick solid line, right frequency scale). Figure (c) represents magnified portion of the cycle (enclosed
areas in figures (a) and (b)) where the greatest difference in the performance of the model without and with low-pass filters occurred.

Tables

Table 1. The spindle model parameters.

*FU is the force unit. Values in FUs are arbitrary because they can be scaled by a constant without a change in the model behavior. ** Chain fiber values that needed to be scaled from bag₂ values due to different fusimotor saturation frequencies for two fibers (bag₂ values x 1.5). Values in the parenthesis are values used for modeling the secondary afferent. *** Parameters that need to be adjusted in order to capture the variability in secondary afferent response across different spindles. Note that the parameter values below the interrupted line (···) were extracted directly from the experimental literature (see text).
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- **Primary afferent firing**
  - no $\gamma$
  - $\gamma_{\text{dyn}}$ on
  - $\gamma_{\text{stat}}$ on

- **Fascicle length**
  - 5 mm/s
  - 30 mm/s
  - 70 mm/s

- **Secondary afferent firing**
  - 450 pps
  - 150 pps

- **Time**
  - 0 3.3 sec
  - 5 mm/s 30 mm/s 70 mm/s

- **Fascicle length**
  - 5 mm/s 30 mm/s 50 mm/s
Figure 4

- **$\gamma_{\text{dyn}}$ on**: Primary afferent firing with different rates (35 pps, 70 pps, 200 pps).
- **$\gamma_{\text{stat}}$ on**: Primary afferent firing with different rates (35 pps, 70 pps, 200 pps).
- **Fascicle length**: 0.90$L_o$ to 1.08$L_o$ over 2 sec.

(a) 35 pps  (b) 70 pps  (c) 200 pps

(d) 35 pps  (e) 70 pps  (f) 200 pps
Figure 5

Secondary afferent firing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicle length</th>
<th>2 mm/s</th>
<th>8 mm/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no $\gamma$</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{stat}$ on</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicle length</th>
<th>1.08 $L_0$</th>
<th>0.90 $L_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 sec</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fascicle length

Secondary afferent firing

2 mm/s

8 mm/s

no $\gamma$

$\gamma_{stat}$ on
Figure 6

(a) Primary afferent firing

(b) Fascicle length

(c) Time

(d) H_stat: 125 pps

(e) H_dyn: 70 pps
Figure 7

+ Experimentally obtained secondary difference

--- Modeled secondary difference signal when low pass filter was not included for bag₂ fiber

— Modeled secondary difference signal when low pass filter was included for bag₂ fiber

Δ Type-1 static fusimotor activity (innervating chain fiber)

□ Type-2 static fusimotor activity (innervating bag₂ fiber)
## Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Parameter definition</th>
<th>Bag₁</th>
<th>Bag₂</th>
<th>Chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K&lt;sub&gt;SR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>sensory region spring constant [FU*/L₀]</td>
<td>10.4649</td>
<td>10.4649</td>
<td>10.4649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&lt;sub&gt;PR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>polar region spring constant [FU/L₀]</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>intrafusal fiber mass [FU/(L₀/sec²)]</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₀</td>
<td>passive damping coefficient [FU/(L₀/sec)]</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>0.0822</td>
<td>0.0822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β₁</td>
<td>coef. of damping due to dyn. fusimotor input [FU/(L₀/sec)]</td>
<td>0.2592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β₂</td>
<td>coef. of damping due to stat. fusimotor input [FU/(L₀/sec)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0460</td>
<td>-0.0690**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ₁</td>
<td>coef. of force generation due to dyn. fusimotor input [FU]</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ₂</td>
<td>coef. of force generation due to stat. fusimotor input [FU]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0636</td>
<td>0.0954**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;L&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>coef. of asymmetry in F-V curve during lengthening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;S&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>coef. of asymmetry in F-V curve during shortening</td>
<td>0.4200</td>
<td>0.4200</td>
<td>0.4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>percentage of the secondary afferent on sensory region</td>
<td>0.7***</td>
<td>0.7***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;SR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>sensory region threshold length (L₀)</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;PR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>polar region threshold length (L₀)</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>term relating the sensory region’s stretch to afferent firing</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>10000 (7250)</td>
<td>10000 (7250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>nonlinear velocity dependence power constant</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>fascicle length below which force production is zero (L₀)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;SR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>sensory region rest length (L₀)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;PR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>polar region rest length (L₀)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;secondary&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>secondary afferent rest length (L₀)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>Low-pass filter time constant (see Appendix) (sec)</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>constant relating the fusimotor frequency to activation</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>power constant relating the fusimotor frequency to activation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>