Bioinspiration from fish for smart material design and function
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Abstract
Fish are a potentially rich source of inspiration for the design of smart materials. Fish exemplify the use of flexible materials to generate forces during locomotion, and a hallmark of fish functional design is the use of body and fin deformation to power propulsion and maneuvering. As a result of nearly 500 million years of evolutionary experimentation, fish design has a number of interesting features of note to materials engineers. In this paper we first provide a brief general overview of some key features of the mechanical design of fish, and then focus on two key properties of fish: the bilaminar mechanical design of bony fish fin rays that allows active muscular control of curvature, and the role of body flexibility in propulsion. After describing the anatomy of bony fish fin rays, we provide new data on their mechanical properties. Three-point bending tests and measurement of force inputs to and outputs from the fin rays show that these fin rays are effective displacement transducers. Fin rays in different regions of the fin differ considerably in their material properties, and in the curvature produced by displacement of one of the two fin ray halves. The mean modulus for the proximal (basal) region of the fin rays was 1.34 GPa, but this varied from 0.24 to 3.7 GPa for different fin rays. The distal fin region was less stiff, and moduli for the different fin rays measured varied from 0.11 to 0.67 GPa. These data are similar to those for human tendons (modulus around 0.5 GPa). Analysis of propulsion using flexible foils controlled using a robotic flapping device allows investigation of the effect of altering flexural stiffness on swimming speed. Flexible foils with the leading edge moved in a heave show a distinct peak in propulsive performance, while the addition of pitch input produces a broad plateau where the swimming speed is relatively unaffected by the flexural stiffness. Our understanding of the material design of fish and the control of tissue stiffness is still in its infancy, and the development of smart materials to assist in investigating the active control of stiffness and in the construction of robotic fish-like devices is a key challenge for the near future.

1. Introduction

Fish, as a result of their 500 million year evolutionary history, have evolved a remarkable variety of materials and configurations of these materials that allow them to swim, feed, reproduce, and locomote in the aquatic realm. Fish represent an elegant solution to the problem of moving through water at larger length scales. And although other types of evolutionary design solutions to this problem have occurred during the history of life, fishes are well known for the diversity of their locomotor abilities, with some species able to achieve high-speed locomotion and migrate many thousands of miles, while other species excel at low-speed maneuverability. Fishes are also striking for the diversity of body shapes and fin positions and sizes (Helfman et al 1997, Lauder 2006, Marshall 1971), with noteworthy examples including the variety of tail shapes...
which range from the asymmetrical shape of the shark tail to wing-like tuna tails, and the highly flexible elongate tails of many smaller maneuvering species. A similar diversity exists in the placement of fins around the body axis and in the size and shape of these fins (Young 1981, Webb 1975).

Another key characteristic of fish propulsion systems is the use of flexible materials or combinations of materials. Most man-made systems designed for aquatic propulsion are composed of rigid materials, while fish execute their locomotor behaviors by activating flexible bodies and fins. However, despite some recent significant advances in understanding the material composition and function of fish (reviewed in Summers and Long 2006); also see the overview of fish biomechanics in Shadwick and Lauder (2006), there is still only the most general understanding of the materials that make up a fish body and fins and how these materials function during natural behaviors such as swimming. For example, the mechanical design of fin rays that support the fins of fishes are very poorly understood, and yet these elements are critical to understanding how fish swim because they determine fin conformation and allow muscular activation of fin motion (Lauder and Madden 2007, Lauder et al 2007).

One of the current impediments to building our knowledge about fish material design is that we lack good model systems for laboratory investigation of individual mechanical properties of fish structures. As a result, even basic biomechanical issues such as how body stiffness affects locomotor performance and swimming speed are not well understood. If we are to take inspiration from fish and use fish as a platform for constructing flexible materials that can be used in robotic devices or for new types of mechanical designs, then we need to have a better understanding of how fish are constructed, of the material properties of the components, and to develop test platforms that allow us to answer basic biomechanical questions about how fish function in the aquatic environment.

In this paper, we first provide a brief overview of some key aspects of fish mechanical design, and then focus on two areas that are key to making progress in understanding fish biomechanics, with specific implications for fish-inspired smart material construction: the mechanics of fish fin rays, and the function of simple undulatory fish swimming models varying in flexural stiffness. The underlying theme of the paper is that a great deal more information is needed about the design and function of flexible materials that make up the fins and body of fishes.

2. Brief overview of fish functional design

Fish vary greatly in basic design, but almost all species of the loosely defined group termed ‘fishes’ (primarily sharks and relatives, and bony or ray-finned fishes) possess a central backbone that is stiff relative to the surrounding soft tissues (figures 1(A) and (B)). Attached in various ways to this backbone are the fins, and the presence of multiple propulsive fins that are used to produce fluid forces is a hallmark of fish functional design. In most fish, the body is surrounded by fins, and the caudal (tail fin), anal and dorsal fins, and pectoral and pelvic fins (all under active muscular control) allow fish to position their body accurately in the three-dimensional fluid environment, and to generate and control fluid forces.

The fins of bony fishes consist of a fan-like membrane supported by fin rays (figures 1(C)–(E)). Fin rays may develop into solid spines (figure 1(C)) or remain separate throughout most of their length, and the fin rays of most fishes are segmented (figures 1(E) and 2). The fin rays of bony fishes have a remarkable bilaminar structure that has been described generally in several recent analyses (Alben et al 2007, Lauder 2006, Lauder et al 2006), but much remains to be learned about the mechanical properties of fin rays in bony fishes (figure 2). Briefly, fin rays are composed of two halves (termed hemitrichs, figure 2(A)) that can slide past each other, allowing the fin ray to curve along its length as a result of differential muscle activation at the base (Alben et al 2007, Lauder 2006). The ability to actively curve the propulsive surface of fins is a hallmark of bony fishes, and distinguishes the propulsive mechanics of these appendages from similar propulsors such as bird feathers and insect wings. Sharks and rays have fins with fin rays, but these rays are solid and do not have the two hemitrich structure that allows active control of curvature. Each of these two halves is composed of small bony segments that are attached to each other (figures 1(E) and 2(B)). Fin rays can branch toward the distal end (away from the base) and in this case each of the hemitrich branches to maintain the bilaminar structure from base to the tip. The region of the fin ray near the base is often unsegmented. Each of the two hemitrichs often has a concave structure with small blood vessels and nerves that run out along the length of the ray (figure 2(B)). Fin ray structure is also discussed in Goodrich (1904), Geraudie and Meunier (1982), Geraudie (1988), Haas (1962), Lanzing (1976), and papers by Geerlink and Videler (1987), Geerlink (1989).

Fin rays attach to the body (figure 3) via a series of small bony elements (radials) that allow the fin rays to rotate around their base as a result of the activation of fin muscles. Each hemitrich also has a complex expanded head at the base that serves as the site of attachment of up to four separate muscles that permit active control over fin motion, and allow the fin to expand and contract like a fan thus changing surface area, and to produce limited rotation and twisting (figure 3). Fin muscles provide the differential force at the base of the two hemitrichs that cause the whole fin ray to curve as shown in figure 2(C) (Lauder 2006, Lauder and Madden 2006).

The body of fishes consists of a flexible backbone surrounded by segmented muscular tissue with a complex topology, the functional significance of which is not yet fully understood (Brainard and Azizi 2005, Jayne and Lauder 1994, 1995a, Alexander 1969) (figure 1(A)). The body muscles of bony fishes are patterned into a series of W-shaped segments termed myomeres which are activated sequentially by the nervous system to produce an undulatory wave of bending that passes down the body, and this wave of muscular activity causes the segmented backbone to bend in a wave-like pattern (Lauder and Tytell 2006, Jayne and Lauder 2007).
A considerable number of studies have been conducted on fish muscular properties, and work-loop analyses have demonstrated how these properties change along the body and how power is generated by longitudinal fish musculature (Syme 2006, Johnston and Salamonski 1984, Johnston 1981, Rome et al 1992). Wave-like deformations of the fish body with increasing amplitude from head to tail result in the production of thrust which is manifested in the water as a series of vortices shed into the wake by the bending body (Webb 1975, Lauder and Tytell 2006).

Although some important studies have provided data on the mechanics of fish backbones (Long 1992, Long et al 1996, Long and Nipper 1996, Hebrank 1982, Porter et al 2006), the role of body musculature in modulating stiffness during swimming and the mechanisms by which fish can alter flexural stiffness are as yet poorly understood. Even basic features of undulatory locomotion such as the extent to which changing flexural stiffness of the body can affect propulsion are not well characterized (McHenry et al 1995), and we have only a general idea of how or if fish tissue stiffness is actively controlled to modulate locomotor performance.

3. Mechanics of fish fin rays

In order to investigate the mechanical properties of bony fish fin rays, we performed experiments on fresh rays from bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus) under a variety of conditions (figure 4). Individual fin rays were removed from fins and each hemitrich clamped separately in small clips attached to micrometer actuators allowing independent displacement of each hemitrich as well as measurement of the force exerted to displace one hemitrich relative to the other (figure 4(A)). This arrangement also allowed us to quantify fin ray curvature relative to hemitrich displacement (figure 4(B)). Cantilever measurements of the force output at varying sites along the fin ray relative to force and displacement inputs at the hemitrichs (figure 4(C)), and three-point bending tests (figure 4(D)) to calculate the fin ray Young’s modulus were also performed. Micro-CT scans of fin rays allowed calculation of the second moment of area along each fin ray. All results reported here are for bluegill sunfish pectoral fin rays.

Displacing one hemitrich relative to the other generates curvature along the length of the fin rays, and the shape
Figure 2. Schematic diagrams of ray anatomy in ray-finned fishes. (A) Lateral and dorsal views of a whole pectoral fin and two fin rays, respectively. The two hemitruchs that make up each fin ray can be seen in the dorsal view of individual fin rays. (B) Schematic diagram of the structure of an individual fin ray. Each ray has two halves called hemitruchs that are semilunate (shown in the ray cross-section). Each hemitruch is composed of multiple bony hemisegments. Each ray can branch one or more times along its length. The tips of the hemitruchs are joined by fibrous actinotrichia. (C) Simplified fin ray bending mechanism. Forces are applied to hemitruchs via muscles attaching through tendons near the hemitruch base. When the applied forces move one hemitruch relative to the other (large red arrow) to create an offset (labeled in figure) the fin ray bends. A ligament (green) that joins the bases of the hemitruchs slides over a supporting cartilage pad. Portions of this figure modified from Alben et al (2007).

of the ray varies depending on its location within the fin (figure 5). In general, the distal and basal thirds of fin rays show relatively little curvature, while the greatest curvature occurs in the middle region of the fin (figure 5). The maximum curvatures of each fin ray produced by hemitruch displacement are approximately linear functions of the offset of the bases (figures 6(A) and (B)). Fin rays differ considerably in the extent of curvature for a given hemitruch base offset. Rays in the middle of the fin give curvature values of around 0.3 mm\(^{-1}\) for a 0.2 mm displacement, and the tips of the fin rays displace 5–10 mm from the centerline for an 0.2 mm offset. These curvature values are similar to those observed in kinematic studies of the fins of swimming fishes (Standen and Lauder 2005, 2007, Taft et al 2008), and indicate that these in vitro manipulations of fin rays produce natural deformations. Measurement of the force required to displace hemitruchs relative to each other show that fin rays at different locations within the fin differ considerably from each other in the extent of force needed to produce a given curvature or tip displacement (figures 6(C) and (D)): a force of 30 mN applied to one hemitruch of the pair can generate between 0.1 mm\(^{-1}\) and 0.4 mm\(^{-1}\) curvature and 3.5 mm and 8.5 mm tip displacement respectively depending on the fin ray.

Cantilever force measurements to quantify the relationship between hemitruch offsets and force inputs at the hemitruch bases and output at the fin ray (method shown in figure 4(C)) show that the first two fin rays (joined together tightly and thus treated as a unit) produce much more force out for a given offset input than the other fin rays (figure 7). A 0.15 mm offset generates almost 20 mN force near the end of the fin ray for ray 1 + 2, but only 1–4 mN force for other fin rays (figure 7(A)). Simultaneous measurements of force input and output show that the fin ray design is not particularly effective at transmitting force, as a 50 mN force input only produces 1.5 mN of force near the tip of the ray (figure 7(B)).

Three-point bending tests on bluegill sunfish fin rays show that there is considerable variation between locations along the fin rays (figure 8) and that the basal region of each ray is much stiffer than the distal (outer) region (figure 8(A)). Fin rays within the fin differ considerably in their force–displacement curve with smaller rays on the ventral margin of the fin (rays 11 and 12) being much less stiff than other rays in the fin. Because fin rays are reported to possess a series of connections along the lengths of the two hemitruchs, and mathematical models of fin ray function indicate the importance of these connections compared to the attachment at the tips (Alben et al 2007) we made a series of measurements of tip displacement versus force input for fin rays in which we sequentially cut the ray shorter from the tip toward the base (figure 9). In figure 9(B), each curve ii, iii, and iv compares intact fin ray displacements at the point of the same-colored dot in figure 9(A) (online figure version is in color), with displacements after cutting the fin ray. These data show that cutting the fin ray to remove any tip connections and to progressively make the ray shorter does not alter the displacement–force plot slope as compared to an intact fin ray: both the dashed lines and solid lines in figure 9(B) are very similar for each fin ray length compared to the same position in the intact ray. Shorter sections of fin rays thus show the same response to a given force input as the intact ray, indicating clearly that the two hemitruchs possess a
Figure 3. Three-dimensional reconstructions from micro-CT scans of fin rays and the supporting skeleton in a bluegill sunfish, with the major elements segmented and indicated in different colors. (A) The pectoral girdle with the scapula, coracoid, and radials support the pectoral fin rays. Medial hemitrichs are shown in red and lateral hemitrichs are shown in blue. (B) Most hemitrichs have two tendon attachment points. The adductor superficialis and adductor profundus pectoral fin muscles attach to the medial hemitrichs (yellow arrows). The abductor profundus and abductor superficialis attach to the lateral hemitrichs (not shown). (C) The medial hemitrich of the first ray has a large base structure that articulates with the coracoid. The lateral hemitrich base is much smaller. Unlike other rays, the hemitrichs of ray 1 are fused over much of their lengths, and the bases of the two hemitrichs are asymmetrical in structure. The base of the ray 2 medial hemitrich is shown for comparison. (D) Protrusions at the base of the hemitrichs are attachment points for muscle tendons. The ventralmost nine fin rays are each shown in a different color, and in an oblique view down the fin from proximal to distal.

series of interconnections along their length that dominate the mechanical behavior of the system. It is currently unclear just what the nature of the connection between the two hemitrichs of fish fin rays is, and what the material located inside the two semilunar hemitrichs consists of. Certainly small blood vessels, lymphatics, and nerves may be present, but these structures will not bridge the two hemitrichs. There has been some suggestion of elastic fibers connecting the two hemitrichs of a fin ray (Videler 1993, Geerlink and Videler 1987), but considerable future work will be needed to convincingly identify the specific components that are responsible for the behavior of the bilaminar fin ray design.

Data from the three-point bending tests along with micro-CT scans of bluegill sunfish fin rays were used to estimate the second moment of area of individual fin rays and also the modulus of elasticity (Young’s modulus). Table 1 shows a summary of these data and calculated values of the modulus of elasticity of different fin rays. The mean modulus for the proximal (basal) region of the fin rays was 1.34 GPa, but this varied from 0.24 to 3.7 for different fin rays. The distal fin region was less stiff, and moduli for the different fin rays measured varied from 0.11 to 0.67 GPa. These data are similar to that of human tendon (modulus around 0.5 GPa), which is not too surprising given that adjacent fin ray segments are connected by collagenous fibers, and that bending of fin rays would stretch these fibers. Hence, fin ray stiffness may be dominated by the same collagenous proteins found in tendons.

4. Flexible foils as models of fish propulsion

Understanding fin ray mechanics is a critical part of learning about the material design of fishes, but a second key feature of fish design is the flexible body that is used in a wave-like undulatory fashion to power propulsion in fishes. Body deformations have frequently been quantified to calculate wave velocities, the amplitude of side-to-side excursions down the body, and locomotor efficiency (e.g. Webb 1975, 1978, Webb and Keyes 1982, Lauder and Tytell 2006). Measurements of body wave characteristics have given rise to the common terminology used to characterize different modes of undulatory locomotion in fishes, such as the anguilliform (or eel-like) pattern of body waves compared to a trout-like
(carangiform mode) or tuna-like swimming (thunniform wave characteristics). Much of this terminology has been developed from inaccurate measurements of fish midline deformation (Lauder 2006), but it persists in the literature as a shorthand way of describing the pattern of body deformation used during swimming by fishes of differing body shape.

To date the vast majority of such studies of fish swimming have been necessarily descriptive because of our inability to manipulate a freely swimming fish and alter specific features of the body that might influence swimming performance. For example, ideally we would like to be able to change the length of a fish, its aspect ratio, and body flexural stiffness to determine how each of these factors in isolation influences swimming speed and waveform along the body.

In order to better control the myriad variables that could possibly affect the generation of undulatory waves along the body of swimming fishes, we have developed a computer-controlled robotic flapping foil device that allows us to measure the effect of different flexible foil motion programs and materials on swimming speed. This device and details of self-propelled swimming speed measurement are described in Lauder et al (2007). Foils of different flexible materials are

---

**Table 1.** Area moments, flexural stiffness and Young’s modulus of bluegill sunfish fin rays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ray</th>
<th>Proximal three-point stiffness a (mN mm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Distal three-point stiffness a (mN mm⁻¹)</th>
<th>Proximal summed moments b (×10⁻⁵ mm⁴)</th>
<th>Distal summed moments b (×10⁻³ mm⁴)</th>
<th>Proximal modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Distal modulus (GPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73 ± 5.5</td>
<td>34 ± 20</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.07</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>270 ± 40</td>
<td>36 ± 20</td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.22</td>
<td>0.43 ± 0.29</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>330 ± 240</td>
<td>26 ± 9.5</td>
<td>4.02 ± 1.04</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>140 ± 15</td>
<td>23 ± 20</td>
<td>1.29 ± 0.70</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>12 ± 5.6</td>
<td>12 ± 5.6</td>
<td>0.26 ± 0.19</td>
<td>0.26 ± 0.19</td>
<td>1.34 (0.24–3.72)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.11–0.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Three-point bending stiffness: values are mean ±2 standard errors.

b Proximal summed moments: only one moment (and hence modulus) could be measured on rays 1, 11, and 12 due to their short lengths.

---

**Figure 4.** Experimental methods. (A) Oblique view of hemitrich clips holding a fin ray. The fin ray (a) is submerged in water and two clips (b) hold the two hemitrich bases. To bend the rays, the upper clip is shifted parallel to the ray direction (blue arrow). Inset: view from the base end of the fin ray. Each hemitrich base is held by a single clip. (B) Curvature measurements. The fin ray (a) is held horizontally as the hemitrich offset and force are changed at the base (b). Curvature and vertical tip displacement are measured from digital photographs. (C) Cantilever force measurements. The vertical force at the distal end of the ray is measured with a probe (a) as the hemitrich offset and force are changed. (D) Three-point bending measurements. A ray (a) is deflected by a probe (b) which is lowered between two supporting points (c). Stiffness of the ray is measured by holding one or both hemitricts fixed and measuring force as the probe is moved vertically. Scales shown are marked at 1 mm intervals. Portions of this figure modified from Alben et al (2007).
set in motion and the flow speed in the recirculating flow tank is tuned (using a LabView program) to match foil swimming speed. This Labview program that takes input from linear encoders on the flapping foil robotic apparatus to tune the flow tank speed so that the mean position is constant over a flapping cycle. Our force measurements from an ATI six-axis force/torque sensor on the foil shaft confirm that when the foil is self-propelling, the thrust force oscillations integrated over a flapping cycle equal zero. This proves that we have accurately tuned the flow speed to a mean exact self-propelled speed. In this way, foils swim at their natural speed, the point at which thrust and drag forces balance each other when averaged over each flapping cycle, and measuring this speed provides an indication of propulsive effectiveness. In this paper we present data on the effect of altering flexural stiffness on swimming performance, measured as self-propelled swimming speed. Figure 10 shows the flapping foil apparatus and panels A and B show how foils are attached to a rigid stainless steel sting (holding rod) that can be programmed to move in both heave (side-to-side) and pitch (rotating around the long axis). Foil propulsion occurs as the result of the interaction between the stiffness of the foil material itself, and the fluid forces on the foil. This structure–fluid interaction is critical to propulsion and determines the characteristics of the propulsive waveform.

Testing foil propulsion in still water provides an entirely misleading picture of swimming performance as can be seen in figure 10 panels (C) and (D) where the waveform produced by a flexible foil (flexural stiffness of this foil $= 3 \times 10^{-6}$ N m$^2$) is compared for motion in still water and when swimming at the self-propelled speed. In still water, the foil produces a complex and chaotic waveform when heave motion is imparted to the leading edge, and there is no regularity to the waves that move down the length of the foil (figure 10(C)). When the foil is allowed to self-propel at its natural swimming speed (figure 10(D)), it assumes a distinct sinusoidal shape that results from the fluid–structure interaction. Thus, quantifying the effect of flexibility on propulsion requires self-propelled conditions, and the lower the flexural stiffness, the greater the effect that the fluid motion has on swimming shape.

Figure 11 shows the results of experiments in which the propulsion of foils of different flexural stiffness was measured under conditions of heave actuation only, and then with pitch motion added to the heave. When flexible foils are moved in
Figure 6. Curvature and vertical tip displacement of the fin ray versus hemitrich offset and hemitrich force. One hemitrich is held fixed while a force is applied to move the second hemitrich. (A) Average ray curvature versus hemitrich offset. (B) Vertical tip displacement versus hemitrich offset. (C) Average curvature versus hemitrich force. (D) Vertical tip displacement versus hemitrich force. Ray numbers associated with each curve are marked on the plot (1 + 2: rays 1 and 2 measured together). Red: dorsal rays. Green: middle rays. Blue: ventral rays. Plots are shown for nine rays from three different fish. There are between 9 and 16 measured points per curve. For clarity, markers for individual measurements are not shown.

Figure 7. Cantilever force measurements. In panels (A) and (B), one hemitrich is held fixed while force is applied to move the second hemitrich. A probe near the distal end of the ray measures the force required to prevent the ray from curving upwards. (A) Cantilever force versus hemitrich offset for different fin rays. (B) Cantilever force versus hemitrich force. In panels (A) and (B), ray numbers for each curve are marked on the plot (1 + 2: rays 1 and 2 measured together). Red: dorsal rays. Green: middle rays. Blue: ventral rays. Panel (A) shows plots for four rays from a single fish. Panel (B) shows plots for 10 rays from three individuals. Plotted measurement curves have between 10 and 15 points.
heave only, there is a clear peak at which swimming speed is maximized. Foils that are either more or less flexible show reduced swimming performance. In contrast, adding a 20° pitch actuation to the leading edge of the foil in addition to the heave motion produces a broad plateau along which swimming performance does not change. Interestingly, maximum swimming speed is very similar for the two foil actuation modes, but there is no decline in performance as stiffness increases. These data show that swimming speed of flexible bodies in the water depends on the type and pattern of actuation, and on the value chosen for flexural stiffness.

There are certainly additional parameters that could influence self-propelled speed such as the phase relationship between heave and pitch, and changes in frequency and
amplitude of the imposed leading edge motion. We have not presented results varying these parameters here, but such studies are needed in the future to understand more completely the range of behaviors exhibited by swimming flexible foils.

The range of values represented in these experiments (figure 11) matches well with data on fish body flexural stiffness and these flexible foil experiments thus represent a reasonable model system for the study of fish propulsion using flexible surfaces. McHenry et al (1995) report values for flexural stiffness along the body of pumpkinseed sunfish Lepomis gibbosus that range from approximately $1 \times 10^{-3}$ N m$^2$ near the head to $1 \times 10^{-6}$ N m$^2$ near the tail. These values fall within the range of foil flexural stiffnesses plotted in figure 11, supporting the use of these flexible foils as models of fish locomotion. Long et al (2002) report flexural stiffness values of hagfish bodies in the range of $3 \times 10^{-4}$ N m$^2$.

This represents a point on the rising portion of the curves in figure 11 where the flexible foils self-propel at approximately 40–45 cm s$^{-1}$. A species of fish with a much greater flexural stiffness is the gar (genus Lepisosteus), which is in many ways a ‘living fossil’ covered with rows of large interlocking bony scales reminiscent of early ray-finned fishes of 300 million years ago (Lauder and Liem 1983). The scales contribute to a stiffer body with a flexural stiffness of about 0.06 N m$^2$ (Long et al 1996), about four to six orders of magnitude greater than the bodies of other fishes measured.

Changing the aspect ratio of self-propelling foils also has significant effects on locomotor performance. The diversity of fishes includes species with a wide range of caudal fin aspect...
ratios, but it is not possible to isolate this trait independently of other differences among species in studies of live fishes to determine the effect of changes in aspect ratio alone on propulsion performance. Our experiments on flexible foil propulsion included studies of the effect of aspect ratio on swimming speed for materials with a given flexural stiffness, and we found that simply changing the orientation of a given rectangular foil shape from the long axis oriented horizontally (as in figure 10(A)) to a vertical orientation (while keeping all else constant, with actuation of ±1.5 cm heave, no pitch, at 1 Hz) more than doubled the self-propelled speed from 21.2 cm s⁻¹ (±0.85 s.e.) to 46.0 cm s⁻¹ (±0.24 s.e.) for material with a flexural stiffness of 0.3 × 10⁻⁴ N m². Moving propulsive mass closer to the axis of actuation thus greatly increases swimming speed, and allows flexible materials to impart more of the imposed actuation movement into the water as thrust. A more flexible material with a higher aspect ratio can swim with the same speed as a stiffer material formed into a lower aspect ratio foil.

5. Learning from fish: needs and prospects for smart materials

Fish provide a multitude of potential models for smart material design, including fin rays, fin webbing, a flexible body, jointed backbone, and segmental musculature. The development of smart materials that represent one or more aspects of these features would be of tremendous use. Researchers interested in testing hypotheses of the function of fish anatomical features could use smart materials to develop models for undulatory propulsion. More specifically, the simple flexible foil robotic models discussed above are passive representations of fish swimming. Traveling waves of a generally similar character to those produced by fish are generated by actuation at the leading edge of the foil, but swimming fishes have segmental muscles down the body that provide power input along the length of the fish. The development of controllable active materials that could be incorporated into the design of fish models would be a significant advance and allow biomechanists to test models of fish propulsion in ways not currently possible. For example, the successful incorporation of contractile polymers or IPMCs (ionic polymer metal composites) into a flexible foil would allow active elements to contribute to generating undulatory patterns along the body, and some designs using this approach have been suggested in the literature (Kim and Tadokoro 2007). In addition, contractile polymers, FMCs (flexible matrix composites) and IPMCs have begun to appear in early designs of fins and propulsive surfaces (Tangorra et al 2007a, Chen et al 2010, Yim et al 2007, Zhang et al 2010, Shan et al 2006, Yeom and Oh 2009, Chen and Tan 2010), as well as in actuated control flaps (Madden et al 2004a, 2004b) on airfoil-like designs. And, actuators made from piezoelectric composites (Wiguna et al 2009), shape memory alloys (Shinjo and Swain 2004, Wang et al 2008), muscle-tissue materials (Feinberg et al 2007), and electromechanical systems (Curet et al 2011a, 2011b), could all be brought to bear on the problem of designing fish-like actuators and devices. Being able to adjust the stiffness of design components would allow the effect of dynamic changes in stiffness on locomotor performance to be assessed (Mutlu and Alici 2010). The promise of this new smart material technology is great, as it would introduce an active contractile element into studies that have until now emphasized the passive properties of flexible foil propulsion. And the availability of such controllable elements would allow a wide range of experimental tests of propulsion such as altering the phasing of activation of contractile elements along the flexible surface, a topic of considerable interest to researchers in fish locomotion (Shadwick et al 1999, Donley and Shadwick 2003, Rome et al 1984, Jayne and Lauder 1995b), but a topic on which experimental study has not yet been possible due to the constraints of working on live fish.

Not only can the development of new controllable smart materials allow biologists and biomechanists to test hypotheses about aquatic propulsive systems in ways not previously possible, but smart material design and fish biology can also achieve a profitable interaction in the development of new types of robotic models for aquatic propulsion with controllable and deformable surfaces (Tangorra et al 2007a). At present, most robotic fish models of whole fish or fish fins use a single rigid or uniformly flexible membrane to transmit force to the water (Kato 1999, 2000), and even in the more complex robotic fish models with jointed and individually actuated fin rays (Tangorra et al 2010, 2007b) the surface conformation of the propulsor cannot be easily altered. The advent of smart materials that allow surface conformational changes in a controlled way will greatly enhance our ability to design robotic fish-like devices with performance that is closer to real animals.

Two overarching themes that emerge from biomechanical studies of fish propulsion are (1) that locomotion involves the use of flexible materials, and (2) that fish have the ability to actively control the stiffness of their flexible propulsive surfaces during swimming and appear to use this ability to tune locomotor dynamics (Flammang 2010, Tangorra et al 2010, Long et al 2006, 2002, Lauder and Madden 2007, Alben et al 2007). And the extent to which body and fin stiffness changes moment-to-moment during locomotion in a time-dependent fashion has not yet been addressed. Many questions remain about how stiffness tuning, if present, is achieved, and to what extent fish can modulate stiffness of the body and fins to optimize propulsive performance. The advent of smart materials that can be used to assist in answering these questions would be a great benefit for biologists, roboticists, and materials engineers interested in understanding the mechanical basis for the diversity of fish locomotor patterns seen in nature.
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