

Modified Bicycle Motion

Final Proposal

Team 19:

Fahad Alajmi

Matthew Palmer

K. Zoe Lucke

Alex Lawson

Basem Alghamdi

November 2016

ME 476C – Section 1

Project Sponsor: Dr. Raab

Faculty Advisors: Dr. Trevas and Dr. Oman

Instructor: Dr. Trevas

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1 | BACKGROUND | 4 |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 4 |
| 1.2 | Project Description | 4 |
| 1.3 | Original System | 4 |
| 1.3.1 | Original System Structure | 5 |
| 1.3.2 | Original System Operation | 5 |
| 1.3.3 | Original System Performance | 5 |
| 1.3.4 | Original System Deficiencies | 5 |
| 2 | REQUIREMENTS | 6 |
| 2.1 | Customer Requirements (CRs) | 6 |
| 2.2 | Engineering Requirements | 6 |
| 2.3 | Testing Procedures (TPs) | 6 |
| 2.4 | Design Links (DLs) | 7 |
| 2.5 | House of Quality (HoQ) | 7 |
| 3 | EXISTING DESIGNS | 8 |
| 3.1 | Design Research | 8 |
| 3.2 | System Level | 8 |
| 3.2.1 | Existing Design #1: Shortened Crank Arm (Orthopedal) | 8 |
| 3.2.2 | Existing Design #2: Retractable/Extendable Crank Arm Patent | 8 |
| 3.2.3 | Existing Design #3: CrankTip Pedal | 9 |
| 3.2.4 | Existing Design #4: Kneesavers | 9 |
| 3.2.5 | Existing Design #5: Pivoting Crank Arm (Duke University) | 10 |
| 3.2.6 | Existing Design #6: Rotor Q-Rings | 10 |
| 3.3 | Functional Decomposition | 11 |
| 3.4 | Subsystem Level | 11 |
| 3.4.1 | Subsystem #1: Crankset | 11 |
| 3.4.2 | Subsystem #2: Chains | 13 |
| 3.4.3 | Subsystem #3: Cassettes | 14 |
| 4 | DESIGNS CONSIDERED | 15 |
| 4.1 | Crankset Slider | 15 |
| 4.2 | Pedal Slider | 16 |
| 4.3 | Translating Cranks | 16 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.4 | Four Chainrings | 17 |
| 4.5 | Q-Rings / Elliptical Chainrings | 17 |
| 4.6 | Gear Ratios..... | 18 |
| 4.7 | Manually Adjustable Pedals..... | 18 |
| 4.8 | CVT (Continuously Variable Transmission) | 18 |
| 4.9 | Translating Seat..... | 19 |
| 4.10 | Modified Pedal Shape | 19 |
| 5 | DESIGN SELECTED | 20 |
| 5.1 | Rationale for Design Selected | 20 |
| 5.2 | Design Description | 21 |
| 5.2.1 | Modeled Drawing | 21 |
| 6 | Proposed Design | 22 |
| 6.1 | Intended Design Construction | 22 |
| 6.2 | Materials | 22 |
| 6.2.1 | Crankset – Carbon Fiber..... | 22 |
| 6.2.2 | Chain – Stainless Steel | 23 |
| 6.2.3 | Cassette – Nickel Stainless Steel Alloy | 23 |
| 6.2.4 | Bill of Materials | 23 |
| 6.3 | Cost and Budget..... | 23 |
| 6.4 | Schedule..... | 24 |
| | REFERENCES | 25 |
| | Appendices..... | 26 |
| | Appendix A: House of Quality..... | 26 |
| | Appendix B: Bill of Materials..... | 27 |
| | Appendix C: Gantt Chart | 28 |

List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| FIGURE 1: BICYCLE DIAGRAM | 5 |
| FIGURE 2: ORTHOPEDAL CRANK ARM | 8 |
| FIGURE 3: EXTENDABLE/RETRACTABLE CRANK ARM | 9 |
| FIGURE 4: PEDAL PATH FOR EXTENTABLE/RETRACTABLE CRANK ARM | 9 |
| FIGURE 5: CRANKTIP PEDAL PATH VS. STANDARD PEDAL PATH | 9 |
| FIGURE 6: PEDAL WITHOUT KNEESAVERS VS. PEDAL WITH KNEESAVERS | 10 |
| FIGURE 7: PIVOTING CRANK ARM | 10 |
| FIGURE 8: ELLIPTICAL ROTOR Q-RING CHAIN RING | 11 |
| FIGURE 9: FUNCTIONAL DECOMPOSITION | 11 |
| FIGURE 10: SHIMANO ULTEGRA CRANKSET | 12 |
| FIGURE 11: SHIMANO XTR TRAIL CRANKSET (2X)..... | 12 |
| FIGURE 12: CAMPAGNOLO SUPER RECORD CRANKSET | 13 |
| FIGURE 13: SRAM XX1 EAGLE CHAIN | 13 |
| FIGURE 14: SHIMANO DURA-ACE CHAIN | 13 |
| FIGURE 15: MUC-OFF NANO CHAIN | 14 |
| FIGURE 16: SRAM XX1 EAGLE CASSETTE | 14 |
| FIGURE 17: CAMPAGNOLO SUPER RECORD CASSETTE..... | 15 |
| FIGURE 18: SHIMANO ULTEGRA CASSETTE | 15 |
| FIGURE 19: CRANKSET SLIDER CONCEPT | 16 |
| FIGURE 20: PEDAL SLIDER CONCEPT..... | 16 |
| FIGURE 21: TRANSLATING CRANKSET CONCEPT | 17 |
| FIGURE 22: FOUR CHAINRINGS CONCEPT | 17 |
| FIGURE 23: MANUALLY ADJUSTABLE PEDALS | 18 |
| FIGURE 24: CVT CONCEPT..... | 19 |
| FIGURE 25: TRANSLATING SEAT CONCEPT | 19 |
| FIGURE 26: MODIFIED PEDAL SHAPE CONCEPT | 20 |
| FIGURE 27: CRANKSET SLIDER WITHOUT SPRING AND PEDAL HOLDER..... | 21 |
| FIGURE 28: CRANKSET SLIDER WITH SPRING AND PEDAL HOLDER..... | 21 |
| FIGURE 29: CRANKSET SLIDER ATTACHED TO BICYCLE..... | 22 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE 1: COMMONLY MANUFACTURED LENGTHS OF CRANK ARMS | 5 |
| TABLE 2: ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS | 6 |
| TABLE 3: DECISION MATRIX..... | 20 |
| TABLE 4: COSTING ANALYSIS FOR PROTOTYPE..... | 24 |

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

This project is about modifying a bicycle to limit range of motion in the knee joint. The project was presented by our client Dr. Scot Raab, an assistant professor of Athletic Training at Northern Arizona University. Dr. Raab has suffered a knee injury that resulted in his meniscus being removed. This severely limits his range of motion in his knee making it difficult to ride a bicycle. Although there are products that accomplish this, they tend to limit torque output, making it difficult for the rider to go uphill and attain high speeds. The objective of this project is to design a device for a standard bicycle that will limit range of motion in the knee with minimal torque loss.

1.2 Project Description

Following is the original project description provided by the sponsor:

“Modified Bicycle Motion”

Problem: Cyclist (recreational or competitive) that suffer knee injuries limiting ROM (Range of Motion) must give up cycling because the top of the pedal stroke causes extreme flexion of the knee. This results in abnormal forces across the knee joint and the patellar femoral articulation causing discomfort.

Current attempted solutions:

1. Raise seat height but to go to high prevents appropriate alignment at the bottom of the pedal stroke and may result in rocking left and right on the saddle resulting in low back issues or soft tissue damage to the Perineum (area of soft tissue between what cyclist refer to as the sit bones or the ischium's)
2. Shorten the crank arm of the pedal but this decreases torque and speed available to the cyclist or ability to climb inclines.

Objective: Protect ROM (limit it) and allow cyclist to produce maximal torque using current gears available to cyclist via front or rear chain rings

That last part almost allows the team to invent a new set of gears but that requires thinner, thicker, longer, or shorter chains, etc. As you add rings to the gears your chain must be thinner to fit between the gears or the hub needs to get wider and that create s wider bike, etc. The objective of this project is to limit the amount of drastic modifications to existing bikes, but provide a smaller ROM for the rider.

Create a modification that can be applied to (one size, multiple sizes?) standard bikes to modify the motion of the cyclist so their knees do not bend beyond 90 degrees.”

1.3 Original System

This project involves the modified design of a standard two-wheel bicycle design. A standard bicycle is composed of a frame, fork, wheels, drivetrain, handlebars, brakes, and a saddle.

1.3.1 Original System Structure

A standard bicycle frame design consists of a double diamond design and features a fork that is placed in the head tube of the frame. Bicycles can be made from steel, aluminum, titanium, or carbon fiber. Most bicycle components are made of either aluminum or carbon fiber depending on the price level of the build. The figure below is of a standard road bike and has all of the components labeled.



Figure 1: Bicycle Diagram

1.3.2 Original System Operation

A standard bicycle converts mechanical energy from the user into translational motion. This is performed via the drivetrain system containing a set of chain-driven gears. This set of gears is put in motion by the user through the pedals. The bicycle's drivetrain contains a set of adjustable gears, allowing the user to shift to a different gear ratio depending on terrain. This system is cable-operated, and adjusted manually by the user via a switch on the handlebars. This same handlebar system contains the controls for the cable-operated brakes and steering functionality [1].

1.3.3 Original System Performance

The weight of our client's road bicycle is 19 lb. and the general modern mid-range road bike weighs around 17-18 lbs. Our client generally averages about 15-16 mph on his bike rides, but can fluctuate due to head or tail winds and the amount of climbing or descent included in the ride.

1.3.4 Original System Deficiencies

The current system forces the user to bend their knee at an angle less than 90 degrees at the top of the pedal stroke, causing pain for a rider with flexural knee issues. It is currently believed that a combination of the pedal crank arm length and seat height are the primary cause of this issue. Table 1 tabulates a list of commonly manufactured crank arm lengths.

Table 1: Commonly Manufactured Lengths of Crank Arms

| Crank Arm Length (mm) |
|-----------------------|
| 165 |
| 170 |
| 172.5 |
| 175 |

2 REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Customer Requirements (CRs)

Our customer requirements are rated on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the least important. Our customer requirements are durability (4), retrofittability (5), low weight (3), maximum torque (5), low cost (3), safety (5), and aesthetics (2).

We rated retrofittability as a 5 because our client wants a device that he can attach to his own bicycle instead of having to replace his entire bicycle. We rated maximum torque as a 5 because this is one of our main objectives and what will distinguish our design from existing designs. We rated safety as a 5 due to our engineering code ethics. We rated durability as a 4 because we desire for our design to not break in a crash and for it to withstand uneven terrain. We rated low weight as a 3 because low weight is desirable and convenient, but not necessary. We rated low cost as a 3 because we would like our product to be accessible to more cyclists. Finally, we rated aesthetics as a 2 because we value function over form.

2.2 Engineering Requirements

Engineering Requirements were created from our customer requirements and are listed in Table 2. The first requirement for the modified design is added weight. Since our design to have the ability to be retrofitted onto different bicycles, the added weight should not exceed 300 grams. The second requirement for the modified design is the effect of cost. The cost should be less than \$250 per design. All the design requirement should be met within this cost. The third engineering requirement for the design is falling weight. The design should be able to sustain a falling weight of more than 50 lbs. at a height of 0.6 ft. which is the criteria bicycles are typically designed and tested for. The fourth aspect considered is the effect of modified design on power generation. The design requires that the maximum difference in power generation of modified design with reference to the standard crank should be less than 5%. The fifth requirement for the design is its effect on the knee. The knee angle should always be greater than 90°.

Table 2: Engineering Requirements

| Sr. no | Requirement | Condition |
|--------|---|--------------------------|
| 1 | Added Weight | < 300g |
| 2 | Cost | < \$250 |
| 3 | Sustain Falling weight | 50 lb at height of 0.6ft |
| 4 | Power generation as compared to standard cranks | Difference < 5% |
| 5 | Knee Angle | > 90° |

2.3 Testing Procedures (TPs)

The following list outlines the testing procedures to be performed. Most are derived from the engineering requirements.

- 1) Knee angle testing – take pictures of knee angle at key locations during a pedal stroke
- 2) Torque test – 3D print test platform, use belts to test the torque
- 3) Falling weight test – outlined in the engineering requirements
- 4) Seat height test – to see how much higher the seat must be in order for the knee angle to be less than 90 degrees throughout pedal stroke
- 5) Gear test – test the force/time it takes for a foot to reach the bottom of the pedal stroke after applying pressure

- 6) Weight test – weigh the design using a tabletop scale

2.4 Design Links (DLs)

Our selected designs meet the engineering requirements previously stated. Each design link correlates by number to the engineering requirements.

- 1) Added weight will be less than 300g since the only weight being added is a spring added to the crank arm.
- 2) The crank arm and the spring will cost less than \$250 meeting our cost requirement (The slot and assembly will be machined on campus). According to Section 6.3 the estimated cost will be \$230 which meets the requirement.
- 3) After machining the part, it will be tested (number 3 of testing procedures) to ensure that it meets the requirements.
- 4) According to calculations a shortened crank arm has a 10% difference in torque generation. Our design will lessen that difference, making it a less than 5% difference.
- 5) The knee angle will remain less than 90 degrees with our design because the design involves the crank arm shortening to ensure a larger knee angle.

2.5 House of Quality (HoQ)

A House of Quality is used to determine our most important engineering requirements for this project. In the table, the customer requirements are listed on the left and weighted in terms of importance on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important. The customer requirements are rated 0, 1, 3, or 9 depending upon their correlation with the engineering requirements. A 0 is no correlation, 1 is weak correlation, 3 is medium correlation, and 9 is strong correlation to the engineering requirements. The weight factor is multiplied by the correlation value and summed up at the bottom to find the absolute technical importance (ATI). The engineering requirement largest ATI number will be first in Relative Technical Importance (RTI) and RTI will continue down until the lowest ATI and that will be the last in RTI.

[See Appendix A for House of Quality]

Our teams most import engineering requirement is the sustained falling weight. This engineering requirement won because if our design can sustain a falling weight of 50 lbs. it will be safe and durable by being able to sustain damage from a crash. Power generation and knee angle are also important engineering requirements to consider when designing our product.

3 EXISTING DESIGNS

3.1 Design Research

We researched many different existing designs that claim to help reduce forces on the knee joint and/or reduce the knee's range of motion, or the knee angle. We conducted web searches and wrote literature reviews on the existing designs we found, whether in the form of an article, a patent, or a product's website. The existing designs found are outlined and compared to customer requirements in Section 3.2.

3.2 System Level

The following section describes existing designs found and compares it to customer requirements and to the other existing designs.

3.2.1 Existing Design #1: Shortened Crank Arm (Orthopedal)

This design is a product currently on the market, called the Orthopedal. The Orthopedal is a small metal device that is attached onto a bicycle crank arm illustrated in Figure 2. It has four different slots along the crank arm to insert the pedal, thus adjusting the crank arm length. The shortened crank arm length results in a limited range of motion, causing reduced forces on the knee joint. However, it reduces torque capacity causing increased difficulty in biking uphill and reduced maximum speed. [2]



Figure 2: Orthopedal Crank Arm

3.2.2 Existing Design #2: Retractable/Extendable Crank Arm Patent

This design is a for a US patented retractable crank set for a bicycle. This crank set, illustrated in Figure 3, has a crank arm that extends and retracts depending on position. The crank shaft will be in the retracted phase at the top of the pedal stroke which will reduce the effects of patellar femoral articulation. Then the crank shaft will extend along the front side of the stroke which results in more produced torque. The crank path is illustrated in Figure 4 in orbital L. This design is similar, but is more desirable in terms of torque than the Orthopedal design described in 3.2.1. However, this design cannot be easily retrofitted onto different bicycles, like the Orthopedal. [3]




Figure 3: Extendable/Retractable Crank Arm




Figure 4: Pedal Path for Extendable/Retractable Crank Arm

3.2.3 Existing Design #3: CrankTip Pedal

This design is a device that is currently available on the market and is attached onto the pedal of a standard bicycle. The device has a dual swing-arm mechanism that moves the pedal in front of the end of the crank arm along the front of the pedal stroke causing increased torque. The crank arm shortens along the back of the stroke to reduce range of motion experienced by the knee at the top of the stroke. The path of the pedal for a CrankTip Pedal is compared to the pedal path of a standard pedal in Figure 5. This design can be easily retrofitted onto any bicycle and has a more desirable torque than the plain shortened crank arm design. However, it's high in cost. [4]




Figure 5: CrankTip Pedal Path vs. Standard Pedal Path

3.2.4 Existing Design #4: Kneesavers

This design is a small device that is currently on the market, called Kneesavers. It extends the pedals outward from the bicycle, as seen in Figure 6, reducing forces on the knee joint. This design changes the forces acting on the knee, however it does not affect the knee angle throughout the pedal stroke. [5]



Figure 6: Pedal without Kneesavers vs. Pedal with Kneesavers

3.2.5 Existing Design #5: Pivoting Crank Arm (Duke University)

This design was created by a group of students at Duke University. They were tasked with modifying a bicycle so that their client, who has limited range of motion in her left knee, can continue to bike as a hobby. Their design consists of a pivoting crank arm that pivots to shorten the crank arm, reducing the range of motion in the knee and making it more comfortable for the injured rider. This design is pictured in Figure 7 below. This design is limited due to its poor torque output which produces the same problem as the Orthopedal and the shortened crank arm. It reduces the maximum speed attainable and the ability to go uphill comfortably. [6]



Figure 7: Pivoting Crank Arm

3.2.6 Existing Design #6: Rotor Q-Rings

This design is of chain rings that are applied to standard cranks. The chain rings are elliptical in shape, shown in Figure 8, and reduce the patellar force on the knee at the top of the pedal stroke by making the chain ring size smaller. The chain ring becomes bigger along the front of the pedal stroke where the most power is produced, thus creating more torque. Although this does not directly affect the range of motion

in the knee, it can be combined with a shortened crank arm to limit range of motion and increase torque output. [7]



Figure 8: Elliptical Rotor Q-Ring Chain Ring

3.3 Functional Decomposition

The final product works by using the user’s legs to compress and relax a spring to generate translational motion. This is accomplished by pedaling the crank arm apparatus to generate motion. The springs allow the user to bend the knees as little as possible during the power stroke of the pedal stroke. Removing the user’s legs from the system exits the continuous loop of spring compression and relaxation. The functional decomposition is illustrated in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Functional Decomposition

3.4 Subsystem Level

The main function of this project is to propel the rider of the bicycle forward through the drivetrain of the bicycle. Firstly, the user applies force through the legs on to the pedals, which are attached to the end of crankset. The force from the crankset is applied to chain rings that causes them to rotate in a clockwise motion, the teeth on the chain ring pull the chain in the same direction. The chain will pull rotate the cassette (gear set located at the back of the bicycle) and the rear wheel in the clockwise direction. The content of the section below will be discussing the existing designs for (1) cranksets, (2) chains, and (3) cassettes.

3.4.1 Subsystem #1: Crankset

Force is applied through the pedals on the crank arms make them act as a lever. The chain rings are fixed to the crankset and rotate with the cranks in a clockwise motion.

3.4.1.1 Existing Design #1: Shimano Ultegra Crankset

The Shimano Ultegra road bicycle crankset features a four arm spider design for mounting two chain rings, capable of handling a variety of different chain ring sets, chain guide on chain rings to reduce chain dropping, made of aluminum, and works for 11 speed group sets. This product relates to our customer requirements by having optimal stiffness for power/torque transfer, durable, aesthetics, low weight (765g), and reasonably priced. [8]



Figure 10: Shimano Ultegra Crankset

3.4.1.2 Existing Design #2: Shimano XTR Trail Crankset

The Shimano XTR mountain bicycle crankset features three different four arm spider designs for mounting 1-3 chain rings (1X, 2X, or 3X), made for 11 speed group sets, and made of aluminum. This product relates to our customer requirements by providing optimal power transfer through the cranks, low weight (1X – 583g, 2X – 630g, and 3X – 656g), durable, aesthetics, and safe. [9]



Figure 11: Shimano XTR Trail Crankset (2X)

3.4.1.3 Existing Design #3: Campagnolo Super Record Crankset

The Campagnolo Super Record road bicycle crankset features a four arm spider design for mounting the two chain rings, step-up system on chain rings to enhance shifting performance, carbon construction, compatible with 11 speed group sets, and a simple assembly for ease of maintenance. This crankset relates the following customer requirements durable, aesthetics, no torque/power loss, and low weight (603g). [10]



Figure 12: Campagnolo Super Record Crankset

3.4.2 Subsystem #2: Chains

The chains are held in place by the toothed gears that are the chain rings and cassettes. The chain will carry the clockwise rotation of the crankset which will move the cassette and rear wheel.

3.4.2.1 Existing Design #1: Sram XX1 Eagle Chain

This Sram XX1 mountain bicycle chain features quiet operation, no interior square edges, increased wear resistance over previous iterations, hollow pins, and compatible with 12 speed group sets. This chain relates to the following customer requirements of being durable, low weight from the hollow pins, and aesthetics (gold colored). [11]



Figure 13: Sram XX1 Eagle Chain

3.4.2.2 Existing Design #2: Shimano Dura-Ace Chain

The Shimano Dura-Ace chain features hollow pins, a PTFE coating to help increase the wear resistance of the chain, and is compatible with 11 speed group sets. This product relates to our customer requirements by being low weight (243g) and having increased durability. [12]



Figure 14: Shimano Dura-Ace Chain

3.4.2.3 Existing Design #3: Muc-Off Nano Chain

The Nano Chain is a chain is not made by a bicycle component company, however it is made by company that makes chain lubricants. A chain can be chosen for the drivetrain of the purchaser's choice. The chain is hand treated and has a special lubricant applied to it to reduce drivetrain resistance and improve the chain's weatherproof capabilities. This chain meets the customer requirements of durability and improves the torque output efficiency of the drivetrain. [13]



Figure 15: Muc-Off Nano Chain

3.4.3 Subsystem #3: Cassettes

The cassette is the group of gears located at the rear of a bicycle and is attached to the rear wheel. The motion transferred from the chain causes the cassette to rotate clockwise and rotate the rear wheel.

3.4.3.1 Existing Design #1: Sram XX1 Eagle Cassette

Sram's XX1 Eagle Cassette is one of the only commercially available cassettes that has 12 cogs or gears on it, has a wide range of gears that are optimal for mountain biking (10-50 teeth), one of the strongest cassettes available, and has the smallest tooth available which has 10 teeth in it. This product meets the customer requirements of durability, maximum torque output from the 10 tooth cog, and aesthetics (gold colored). [14]



Figure 16: Sram XX1 Eagle Cassette

3.4.3.2 Existing Design #2: Campagnolo Super Record Cassette

The Campagnolo Super Record cassette features six titanium sprockets, has a nickel-chrome surface treatment to increase the life of the cassette, and the teeth are designed to provide maximum power transmission to the rear wheel. This design meets the customer requirements of maximum torque, durability, and lightweight (177g). [15]



Figure 17: Campagnolo Super Record Cassette

3.4.3.3 Existing Design #3: Shimano Ultegra Cassette

The Shimano Ultegra cassette features the availability to have a wide range of gears available for road cycling ranging from 11 to 32 teeth, which is better for climbing. This cassette aligns with the torque because an 11 is the general industry standard for the smallest number of cassette teeth and this design is reasonably priced. [16]



Figure 18: Shimano Ultegra Cassette

4 DESIGNS CONSIDERED

4.1 Crankset Slider

The crankset slider is a crank based concept that consists of a crank with a channel machined out of it. A tension spring is attached at the top of the channel and to the pedal holder, which is the drawing on the right side of figure 19 below. In the 3 to 6 o'clock position of the pedal stroke the spring elongates, thus increasing the length of the crank. The crank length will be shortened at the top of the pedal stroke, which will allow the knee angle to open up and ease the pain in the knee. Advantages of this design is that it maximizes torque in the pedal stroke, low weight, keeps the knee at an angle greater than 90°, and is

retrofitable. Disadvantages of this design is that this design may be difficult to manufacture, due to the possibility of welding aluminum.




Figure 19: Crankset Slider Concept

4.2 Pedal Slider

The pedal slider design is similar to crankset slider except that it is mounted to a standard set of cranks. The design is a hollow rectangular box with an open side. A tension spring is attached to the top of the inside of the box and to the top of the pedal holder. This design screws into normally where the pedal would go and the straps on the top of it will wrap around the cranks to hold the pedal slider in place. Same as the crankset slider, the pedal slider's spring in the 3 to 6 o'clock position of the pedal stroke elongates and in the 12 o'clock position the spring will be retracted thus making the crank arm feel shorter and increasing the knee angle. Advantages of this design is that it is low weight, can be placed on any crankset with the same threading, and keeps the knee angle greater than 90°. Disadvantages of this design is there is a safety and durability issue with the spring and widens the rider's stance on the bicycle.




Figure 20: Pedal Slider Concept

4.3 Translating Cranks

The translating cranks is a crank based design. The design uses two vertical parallel bars that attach to the crank arms and to the pedal bar which is seen above the crank arm in Figure 21 below. The two bars are allowed to move freely in either the left or right direction. In the lower half or 3 to 9 o'clock position of the pedal stroke the cranks will be in the extended position, illustrated by the drawing on top in the figure. This position will extend the crank length through part of the downward stroke, increasing the torque output. In the upper half of the pedal stroke or 9 to 3 o'clock position of the cranks, the cranks will be in the lower position shown in the figure. This will shorten the crank length at the top of the pedal stroke allowing for a greater knee angle. Advantages of this design is that it is retrofitable, able to maximize torque output in the pedal stroke, and keep the knee angle greater than 90°. The disadvantages of this

design is that the pedal bar moving freely may be difficult to adjust to and the vertical bars may break from impact forces of a crash.




Figure 21: Translating Crankset Concept

4.4 Four Chainrings

The four chainrings design is the concept of creating a greater range of gears available to the rider. The gears would range from an extremely tall gear (55T or 54T) that can be used for fast descents or sprint finishes in a race to a small gear (30T or 32T) for steep or long climbs. The team recommends that this design is paired with short crank arms in order to keep the knee angle greater than 90° . The advantages of this design is that the largest chainring would maximize torque output, increase the range of gears usable by the rider, and the design is durable. The disadvantages of the four chainrings is that there are currently no commercially available cranksets, shifters, or front derailleurs that are designed to accommodate four chainrings on a bicycle.




Figure 22: Four Chainrings Concept

4.5 Q-Rings / Elliptical Chainrings

Q-rings are commercially available elliptical chainrings, they are mentioned previously in section 3.2.6 of this report. The team recommends that this design is paired with short crank arms in order to keep the knee angle greater than 90° . These chainrings allow the user to produce more torque through the power phase of the pedal stroke and Q-rings reduce the force on the knee in the dead spots of the pedal, which is located at the top and bottom of the pedal stroke. The advantages of this design is that it is lightweight, durable, safe, retrofittable, and helps to produce maximal torque. The disadvantages of this design is that Q-rings drop chains more frequently than standard round chainrings, crank arm length is nonadjustable, and elliptical chainrings may take time to get accustomed to.

4.6 Gear Ratios

Adjusting the gear ratios on the client's bicycle is the simplest solution. This design involves making the chainrings larger and/or making the cassette teeth smaller in order to produce more torque through the drivetrain of the bicycle. The advantages of this design is that it is safe, durable, retrofittable, low weight, inexpensive, and simple. The disadvantages of this design is that the knee angle may be less than 90° and the torque increase in the system may be marginal.

4.7 Manually Adjustable Pedals

An issue with the current design of a shorter crank arm length is that it limits torque. This limited torque creates a designed disadvantage when in competitive applications. As a modification of this design, the user can adjust the crank arm length on an as-needed basis. By releasing a locking mechanism connecting the pedal to the crank arm, the user can move the pedal to several positions along the crank arm while riding. This results in a shorter effective crank arm length. In application, the rider can shorten the effective crank arm length while at cruising speeds, and lengthen it when extra torque is needed for added acceleration.




Figure 23: Manually Adjustable Pedals

4.8 CVT (Continuously Variable Transmission)

As currently designed, a CVT transmission maximizes the torque transferred from an engine to the wheels. This is done by having a large number of gear sets that seamlessly change gearing based on the input torque and rpm. These transmissions are frequently used in small (under 50cc) scooter applications. To explore the maximization of the available torque a user can utilize, the implementation of a CVT transmission may be advantageous. In application the user would not need to shift the bicycle, the gearing ratio delivering maximum torque would already be selected. This coupled with a shorter crank arm would provide the user with the maximum torque with minimal bending of the knee.



Figure 24: CVT Concept

4.9 Translating Seat

While current designs raise the seat to minimize knee bending, this causes discomfort and possible injury for the user. A different approach would be to translate the seat horizontally. This would change the angle the knees would bend without adding the unwanted discomfort. This design would be achieved by adding a horizontal post onto the base of the seat. A metal pin would be inserted to lock the seat into the horizontal post.




Figure 25: Translating Seat Concept

4.10 Modified Pedal Shape

In an attempt to create an adjustable crank arm length, a modification of the pedal can be utilized. In this design, the pedal would be modified to have multiple “steps” of height along its width. While this would significantly increase the width of the pedal, this would achieve an inexpensive and effective way to adjust the angle of the users’ knees.




Figure 26: Modified Pedal Shape Concept

5 DESIGN SELECTED

5.1 Rationale for Design Selected

A decision matrix was used in order to decide which designs to pursue and is shown in Table 3. In the table, the customer requirements are listed on the left and weighted in terms of importance on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the most important. Each design is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the design completely fulfills the customer requirement and 1 being the design doesn't satisfy the customer requirement. Each rating is multiplied by the customer requirement weighting and added together to create the total score.

Table 3: Decision Matrix

| Customer Requirements: | Weightings: | Designs: | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Crankset Slider | Translating Cranks | Pedal Slider | 4 Chain Rings | Q-Rings | Adjustable Pedals | Translating Seat | CVT | Pedal Shape | Gear Ratios |
| Durable | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Retrofittable | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Low weight | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Max torque | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Low cost | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Safe | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 |
| Aesthetics | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Knee angle | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Total Score: | | 122 | 107 | 108 | 105 | 119 | 111 | 93 | 100 | 114.5 | 116 |

As illustrated in Table 3, the crankset slider design, Q-rings, and improved gear ratios are the three designs that receive the highest score. Due to the patented design of the Q-rings, we decided not to pursue that, but potentially add it to another design. So, the pursued designs will be the crankset slider and the gear ratios.

The crankset slider can easily be retrofitted to any bicycle, it would greatly improve torque as opposed to a standard shortened crank arm, would help the knee angle, and is safe for the rider. These benefits caused this design's high score and our selection of this design to pursue.

The improvement of gear ratios is very durable, has increased torque capacity, and can easily be retrofitted. These benefits caused its high score and our selection of this design to pursue. The design did receive a 1 in terms of knee angle, because the knee angle is unaffected. However, when paired with a shortened crank arm, it meets this requirement and increases its score.

5.2 Design Description

The crankset slider is a crank based concept that consists of a crank with a channel machined out of it. A tension spring is attached at the top of the channel and to the pedal holder. In the 3 to 6 o'clock position of the pedal stroke the spring elongates, thus increasing the length of the crank. The crank length will be shortened at the top of the pedal stroke, which will allow the knee angle to open up and ease the pain in the knee.

5.2.1 Modeled Drawing

In this section the initial 3-D design of our crankset slider design is included in figures 27 and 28. Figure 27 shows our design without the tension spring and pedal holder in it and in figure 28 shows the crankset slider with the pedal holder attached to spring. The channel extends for most of the crankset, which will make the extension in the power stroke equivalent to a standard sized crank length and at the top of the stroke the crankarms will be shorter to allow for a greater knee angle.




Figure 27: Crankset Slider without Spring and Pedal Holder




Figure 28: Crankset Slider with Spring and Pedal Holder

Figure 29 illustrates how the crankset slider design appears when attached to a bicycle. The crankset is shown at the bottom of the pedal stroke to display how the crankset behaves at that part of the stroke.




Figure 29: Crankset Slider attached to bicycle

6 Proposed Design

6.1 Intended Design Construction

Our slider crankset design will be a modified commercially available crankset. The crankset will be a Bontrager Select Triple crankset to keep the same crankset that our client has on our bike. From the center of where the threading is on the crankset a 40 mm vertical slot towards the top of the crank arms will be drilled out at the NAU Machine Shop.

The pedal holder will be a small square piece made of steel or aluminum with a rounded top and bottom, in the center of the pedal holder a 9/16 inch x 20 tpi threading will be tapped for the pedals. On the right side pedal holder the threading will be standard threading direction and the left side pedal holder will be reverse threaded because all left side bicycle crank arms have reverse threading. The tension spring will be attached to the top of the channel in the crankset and the pedal holder by fasteners or by welding.

After the pedal holder is placed inside the channel of the cranks a washer or small piece of sheet metal with a hole in in the center will be welded or pressed on the pedal holder to prevent lateral movement of the pedal slider.

6.2 Materials

For our project it is necessary to choose the right material for the crankset, chain, and the cassette. For bicycle components it is important that the chosen material is strong, light, and durable. The chosen material needs to be strong in order to be capable of handling the force a rider outputs. Lightweight is an important factor in bikes because the lighter the bike is, the less effort it takes to ride the bike. Durable is important because it will need to be capable of handling thousands of cycles and possibly impact damage from a crash.

6.2.1 Crankset – Carbon Fiber

Carbon fiber is common place material used in most modern bicycle frames because of its exceptional strength to weight ratio. The crankset is under constant force when in use and is an ideal material to use because of its strength. Below are some of the properties of carbon fiber.

Properties of Carbon Fiber:

- i. Low Density – approximately 83 lb/ft³ (Clearwater composites)
- ii. High Strength – approximately 300 ksi (Clearwater composites)
- iii. Cost - \$12.00/lb.

The best material for this case would be carbon fiber, however it costs significantly more than aluminum. The benefits of aluminum over carbon fiber are that it can be machined in many different types of ways and that it will be much easier and cheaper to manufacture a part of aluminum. The strength and durability of the crankset are important factors to consider while making the bicycle component. Aluminum is optimal material to build our design out of because of its machinability and has a strength to weight ratio that is better than most metals.

6.2.2 Chain – Stainless Steel

The chain will be made of stainless steel, this a common material used in bicycle chains. Stainless steel has excellent wear capability, high strength, and after a wet ride the chain will not rust.

Properties of stainless steel:

- i. High density –Stainless Steel has density of 500 lb/ft³
- ii. High strength – about 325 ksi.
- iii. Cost – \$1.06/lb

6.2.3 Cassette – Nickel Stainless Steel Alloy

Nickel and stainless steel are strong metals, when the two metals combine because it increases the strength and wear capabilities of either of the metals. A nickel and steel alloy is an ideal combination for a cassette. Below are the properties of the alloy.

Properties of Nickel-Stainless steel

- i. Density – about 546 lb/ft³
- ii. High strength – approximately 630 ksi.
- iii. Cost– \$17.20/lb

The cassette transfers the torque from the crankset to the rear wheel. The cassette has to deal with is the constant changing of the gears, which leads to a lot of scraping and grating on the teeth. The teeth of the cassette therefore need to be strong to withstand the effects that are produced through the crankset. The best choice for a cassette is a Nickel-Stainless Steel alloy.

6.2.4 Bill of Materials

The bill of materials in Appendix B was made based on the materials that were chosen. We will purchase the components and machine it from there. The prices that have been quoted in this report are the relative prices that are currently in the market.

6.3 Cost and Budget

The client budget allotted for this project of \$1500. This amount is set to cover the expenses for analysis, prototyping, and the final product. Currently, none of this money has been spent, leaving the full balance remaining to apply to the project. However, plans for prototyping are currently in progress, expecting a finished prototype available to display at the project presentation. This prototype will illustrate a proof of

concept for the final design. It is estimated that the cost of this prototype will be less than one dollar. A cost breakdown of the initial prototype is included in Table 4.

Table 4: Costing Analysis for Prototype

| Material (Quantity) | Cost (\$ USD) |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Staples (2) | 0.05 |
| Rubber Bands (1) | 0.02 |
| Cardboard | 0.00 |
| Look Pedals | 0.00 |

Although assembly and manufacturing are not scheduled yet, a budget of estimated manufacturing and material costs are seen in Appendix B. From this analysis, we are currently estimating that the cost will be \$230 meaning we will be under our budget by \$1270. Based on this information, it would be beneficial to allocate some of these additional resources into research, development, and manufacturing of the highest quality product. We will discuss this financial plan in our next team and staff meeting.

6.4 Schedule

To ensure our team would meet our project deadlines, our team set up a Gantt chart. This helps to organize the team on important milestones and deadlines. All the tasks are completed up to November 23, 2016 including this report. See Appendix C for Gantt Chart.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bicycle science - how bikes work and the physics behind them. (2016). *Explain that Stuff*. [Online]. Available: <http://www.explainthatstuff.com/bicycles.html> (URL).
- [2] Orthopedal – Knee Rehabilitation. (N.D.). Orthopedal. [Online]. Available: <http://www.orthopedal.com> (URL).
- [3] K. H. Lee, “Retractable/extendable crank using a cylindrical cam, an end cam, or a swash plate cam, and bicycle using the same,” U.S. Patent 20110121536 A1. May 26, 2011.
- [4] Cranktip: How It Works. (N. D.). Cranktip [Online]. Available: <http://www.cranktip.com/how-it-works/> (URL).
- [5] Welcome to Kneesavers. (N.D.). Kneesavers [Online]. Available: <http://www.kneesaver.net> (URL).
- [6] S. Tupi, W. Lynk, M. Toney, “A Pivoting Crank Arm for Riders with Limited Left Knee Flexion,” in *Resna Annual Conference*, Durham, NC, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://www.resna.org/sites/default/files/legacy/conference/proceedings/2009/SDC2009/Tupi.html> (URL).
- [7] Q-Rings. (N.D.). Rotor Bike Components. [Online]. Available: http://www.rotorbikeusa.com/products/qrings_standard.html (URL).
- [8] Shimano. (N.D.) "FC-6800", *Bike.shimano.com*. [Online]. Available: <http://bike.shimano.com/content/sac-bike/en/home/components11/road/ultegra1/fc-6800.html> (URL).
- [9] FC-M9020-2. (N.D.). *Bike.shimano.com*. [Online]. Available: <http://bike.shimano.com/content/sac-bike/en/home/components11/mountain/xtr-m9000/fc-m9020-2.html> (URL).
- [10] Super Record Crankset. (N.D.). *Campagnolo.com*. [Online]. Available: http://www.campagnolo.com/UK/en/Components/super_record_crankset (URL).
- [11] XX1 Eagle Chain. (N.D.). *Sram.com*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sram.com/sram/mountain/products/xx1-eagle-chain> (URL).
- [12] CN-9000. (N.D.). *Bike.shimano.com*. [Online]. Available: <http://bike.shimano.com/content/sac-bike/en/home/components11/road/dura-ace-di21/cn-9000.html> (URL).
- [13] Muc-Off Nano Chain. (N.D.). *Muc-Off UK*. [Online]. Available: <https://muc-off.com/products/nano-chain> (URL).
- [14] XG-1299 Eagle Cassette. (N.D.). *Sram.com*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sram.com/sram/mountain/products/xg-1299-eagle-cassette> (URL).
- [15] Super Record Sprocket. (N.D.). *Campagnolo.com*. [Online]. Available: http://www.campagnolo.com/US/en/Components/super_record_sprockets (URL).
- [16] CS-6800. (N.D.). *Bike.shimano.com*. [Online]. Available: <http://bike.shimano.com/content/sac-bike/en/home/road/drivetrain/cassettes0/cs-6800.html> (URL).

Appendices



























Appendix A: House of Quality

| | | Engineering Requirements | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------|
| Customer Req. | Weight Factor | Added Weight <300 g | Design Cost <\$250 | Sustain Falling Weight ≥50 lbs At .6 ft | Power Generation <5% Difference Vs. Std. Cranks | Knee Angle > 90° |
| Durable | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Retrofittable | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low weight | 3 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Max Torque | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 |
| Low cost | 3 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Safe | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Aesthetics | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Knee Angle | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| Target (w/ tol.) | | 200 (<300) g | \$160 (<\$250) | 55 (>50) lb at .6 ft | 3 (<5) % | 93°-141° (>90) |
| ATI | | 35 | 36 | 51 | 49 | 41 |
| RTI | | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TP# | | 6 | N/A | 3 | 2,5 | 1,4 |
| DL# | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Appendix B: Bill of Materials

| Part # | Part Name | # | Description | Functions | Material | Manufacturing Process | Dimensions | Cost |
|--------|------------------|---|---|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|
| 1.1 | Crankset | 2 | Had a small rod shape and have a threaded hole on both sides | The crank set connects the pedals of the bike to the chaining | Carbon fiber | Casting of molten carbon | 0.75 feet | \$140 |
| 1.2 | Chain | 1 | Series of metallic interconnected rollers. | The chain transfers power from the pedals to the drive-wheel of a bike to the cassettes | Stainless steel | Molding and joinery | 1.5 meter long | \$90 |
| 1.3 | Cassettes | 1 | It is cluster of sprockets that are found on the rear of the bike hub | Transfers power fro, the chain to the rear wheel thus causing the motion of the bike | Nickel-stainless | Molding through the use of simulator | Speed 9 7 to 11 | \$60 |

Appendix C: Gantt Chart

| |  | Name | Duration | Start | Finish | Predecessors | Resources |
|----|---|----------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|--------------|------------------|
| 1 |  | Modified Bicycle Motion Capstone | 174d | 09/06/2016 | 05/05/2017 | | |
| 2 |  | Client Meeting 1 | 1d | 09/13/2016 | 09/13/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 3 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 09/14/2016 | 09/14/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 4 |  | Perform Background Research | 6d | 09/14/2016 | 09/21/2016 | 2 | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 5 |  | Staff Meeting 1 | 1d | 09/20/2016 | 09/20/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 6 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 09/21/2016 | 09/21/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 7 |  | Presentation 1 | 1d | 09/27/2016 | 09/27/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 8 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 09/28/2016 | 09/28/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 9 |  | Background Report | 7d | 09/22/2016 | 09/30/2016 | 4 | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 10 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 10/05/2016 | 10/05/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 11 |  | Concept Generation | 10d | 10/05/2016 | 10/18/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 12 |  | Client Meeting 2 | 1d | 10/13/2016 | 10/13/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 13 |  | Staff Meeting 2 | 1d | 10/18/2016 | 10/18/2016 | 11 | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 14 |  | Presentation 2 | 1d | 10/25/2016 | 10/25/2016 | 11 | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 15 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 10/26/2016 | 10/26/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 16 |  | Preliminary Report | 1d | 10/28/2016 | 10/28/2016 | 11 | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 17 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 10/19/2016 | 10/19/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 18 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 11/02/2016 | 11/02/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 19 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 11/09/2016 | 11/09/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 20 |  | Staff Meeting 3 | 1d | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 21 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 11/16/2016 | 11/16/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 22 |  | Individual Analytical Report | 1d | 11/18/2016 | 11/18/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 23 |  | Final Proposal Report | 1d | 11/23/2016 | 11/23/2016 | 22 | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 24 |  | Presentation 3 | 1d | 11/22/2016 | 11/22/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |
| 25 |  | Team Meeting | 1d | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | | Fahad Alajmi[50% |