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ABSTRACT

Based on constrain and move concept, a new algorithm CCM (complex Constrain and Move) is proposed to reorient objects with a distributed object handling mobile robots. In traditional constrain and move strategy, a group of robots constrain the object in undesirable directions and another group push the object to move it in desired path. In proposed CCM method, each robot does both constrain task and move task and the algorithm of robots are the same. A series of dynamic computer simulations are conducted to measure the efficiency of the new proposed algorithm for different experiments. The results of the simulations indicate that the system is stable in all experiments and it is more faults tolerant. Simulations also revealed that the minimum necessary numbers of robots in this method to handle the object is less than traditional constrain and move strategy.

INTRODUCTION

A strong, complicated and expensive robot is needed to manipulate a heavy, big object. Such a robot usually depends on the shape of the object. The cooperation of some simple and cheap robots is a suitable way to manipulate objects with various shapes. Different controlling methods exist in this area of researches, Such as: a) Leader-follower [1] b) Centralized [2] c) Distributed [3], which are the three main controlling methods for cooperative object manipulating systems. Deep dependence of robot teams to leader (Leader-follower) or central unit (Centralized systems) causes to decrease fault tolerance. Although performance in distributed systems is not dependent to one special robot, making coordination in such systems has its own complications.

Constrain and Move strategy becomes mooted to rotate an object around a desired point by a distributed robot teams in [2]. In this method, a group of robots constrain object in undesirable directions and another group push the object. The result of this cooperation is the rotation around the desired point. The divisions of robots into two separated teams, which are, constrain and move is the weakness of implementation of this method. Also the existence of some errors in position of robots causes the object to be locked.
Detection and solving the faults in [4] for position errors of the robots have been considered. In this paper, a distributed method is proposed for rotating an object with a team of cooperative object handling mobile robots. In the algorithm each robot does both constrain and move tasks and the algorithm of robots are the same. In the next section the definition of problem and assumptions are introduced, then Constrain and Move strategy for rotating an object is explained. The Complex Constrain and Move (CCM) algorithm is proposed in fourth section. Simulation results are defined in section 5. Final remark is explained in the last section.

PROBLEM DEFINITION

In this paper we consider rotation as a part of transferring object. Assume we wish to turn a two dimensional object (figure 1) around point DCR. Some robots that know the desired center of rotation (DCR) constrain the object’s rotation center while the other robots rotate it. Each robot will run the same rotation algorithm. If the minimum necessary numbers of robots are available (3 robots) and the angle between each neighboring pairs of robot arms is less than 180 degrees then the cooperation of distributed object handling mobile robots will be caused to rotate the object around DCR point with consideration of some ignorable errors.

ASSUMPTIONS

Each object handling robot has an arm with one degree of free. The robot arms are modeled with springs and dampers (figure 2).

The force applied by each robot is the sum of the force applied by spring \( F_{spring} \) and damper \( F_{damper} \).

\[
\vec{F}_i = \vec{F}_{spring} + \vec{F}_{damper}
\]

\[
\vec{F}_{spring} = K \times \Delta l, \quad \vec{F}_{damper} = B \times \Delta \dot{V}, \quad \Delta V = \frac{\Delta l}{\Delta t} \quad (1)
\]
Where $K$ is the spring stiffness and $\Delta l$ is spring deflection. $B$ is the damping factor and $\Delta V$ is the difference of the velocities of the head and the end of the spring.

Each robot controls the compression of its arm spring and the arm-object angle with its sensors.

See figure 3, the parameters are defined as below:
1- DCR : Desired Center of Rotation point
2- $L_{0i}$ : Free length of the spring of robot $i$'s arm
3- $L_i$ : Length of the spring of robot $i$'s arm
4- $\alpha_{oi}$ : Arm-object angle of robot $i$ when robot arm direction passes through DCR
5- $\alpha_i$ : Arm-object angle of robot $i$
6- $H_i$ : Head of the robot $i$
7- $d_{0i}$ : Distance between DCR and $H_i$ when $L_i = L_{0i}$
8- $d_i$ : Distance between DCR and $H_i$
9- $C_i$ : Arc of the robot $i$ when DCR is the center and $d_{0i}$ is the radius
10- $\gamma$ : Rotate direction, -1 is clock wise direction and +1 is its opposite
11- $\theta_{0obj}$ : Initial object angle
12- $\theta_{obj}$ : Object angle
13- $\theta_{des}$ : Desired object angle

THE CONSTRAIN-MOVE STRATEGY FOR REORIENTATION OF AN OBJECT IN PLACE

When a train moves on rails, the rails interaction forces constrain the train so that it can only move along them. When a crank turns, the reactive wrenches of the ground cancel out all of the external forces about the crank-ground joint.

In these examples, the robot or the operator is not concerned about constraining the object. Therefore, the main job is to control the object along its desired path in such a way that the interaction forces do not exceed their limits or a jamming does not occur. This idea is used to develop the Constrain-Move strategy [11]. In this strategy a group of the robots constrain undesirable movements of the object and another team of the robots pushes the load on desirable path.

Figure 4 shows object rotation around point O [10]. Three robots (white ones) constrain the object's rotation center. The desired rotation center (O) does not move and the object is free to rotate. The black robot pushes the object with force $F$ and $F_y$ creates a torque around point O and the object rotates.
This strategy is done for moving the object on a straight line [3] and moving on desired path [5]. If there are some errors in constraining robot arms directions, the lock problem will be occurred [10,11]. Compliance of the robot arms is needed for partially solving lock problem. Weakness of compliance leads to propose methods for detection and solve lock problem. We have two separated teams in all proposed methods; Constrain team and Move team. On the other hand, we need at least 4 robots for rotation. Also tasks of the agents are not the same. This new method is considered for removing mentioned problems.

![Figure 4: Turning an object with a team of robots (C&M algorithm)](image)

**CCM (COMPLEX CONSTRAIN-MOVE) METHOD**

This method is based on Arm Rotation Method [10]. Each agent of the team does both constrain and move tasks; therefore all robots have the same task. It supports system to increase fault tolerance by using redundant robots. Rotation of an object can be done with the minimum number of robots (3 Robots).

Let's consider one of the robots, see figure 5. Since $d_i \leq d_{0i}$, the locus of possible rotation center of the object is in the left half-plane of each robot arm, when the object is rotated in $\gamma$ direction. Therefore, the object instantaneous center of rotation (ICR) must be inside the area where the entire one-robot-object rotation center locus overlaps. We call this area “the Possible Rotation Center Area (PRCA)”.

![Figure 5: PRCA for each robot](image)

Due to the $\gamma$ direction in figure 6, when robot 1 is in state 2, PRCAs of the robots overlap at $M_1M_2M_3$ (common triangle). ICR will be in this triangle. In state 1 there
isn’t any common triangle, so the object can’t turn in $\gamma$ direction and the lock problem occurs.

Figure 6: Common triangle $M_1M_2M_3$ will create when robot1 is in state2

This problem is discussed in [10]. New algorithm is proposed according to common triangle idea.

Figure 7: Team of the robots do the constrain task

Figure 7 shows object constraining task. Robots move in a way that in all situations $d_1 \leq d_0$, so the algorithm does the constrain task. Figure 8 shows the object Move task. Each robot pushed a controlled force to object. $F_\gamma$ creates a torque around point ICR and the object rotates. Figure 9 shows the combination of these two tasks. Each robot controls its arm-object angle and amount of the force that pushes the object. Due to DCR position and $\gamma$ direction, each robot controls its arm angle to create common triangle $M_1M_2M_3$ with overlapping PRCAs. DCR point is in this triangle. With $F_1, F_2$ and $F_3$ forces, ICR point will always be in $M_1M_2M_3$ triangle. Sum of the robot forces for each ICR point among mentioned triangle makes necessary torque. On the other hand, the common triangle is small, so ICR point is close enough to DCR point and the error can be ignored (This error is mentioned in simulation result). Based on the algorithm, each robot ($\text{robot}_i$) controls its arm-object angle ($\alpha_i$) and arm spring length ($L_i$) as below:
\[ L_i = L_{0i} - C_1 |\theta_{\text{dif}}| \]
\[ \alpha_i = \alpha_{0i} - C_2 \theta_{\text{dif}} \quad (2) \]
where, \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are constant, \( \theta_{\text{dif}} = \theta_{\text{des}} - \theta_{\text{obj}} \).

The brake system is simulated with changes in the amount of \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \). Some errors in arm angle of the robot (\( \alpha_0 \)) can be handled automatically. Simulation results show that the algorithm is efficient.

TWO MEASURES

Two parameters are considered to check the efficiency of the algorithm. The first one is displacement of the desired rotation center in the world coordinate system and is defined as:
\[ e_r = \sqrt{\Delta x_{d.c.r.}^2 + \Delta y_{d.c.r.}^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where \( \Delta x_{d.c.r.} \) and \( \Delta y_{d.c.r.} \) are displacements of the desired center of rotation (DCR) in X and Y directions of the world coordinate system.

The second parameter is the interaction forces between robots and object. These forces are a function of the arm stiffness.

We define \( F_r \) as average of the interaction forces:

\[ F_r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i \Delta x_i}{n} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where \( K_i \) is the stiffness coefficient of the \( i \)th robot arm, \( \Delta x_i \) is its deflection and \( n \) is the number of robots.

SIMULATION RESULT

A series of dynamic computer simulations is conducted to study effects of the CCM algorithm.

Figure 10 shows the model used in the simulations. In this model, the object is a (0.6,0.4) square of unit mass and moment of inertia. The mass center is placed at the geometrical center of the object. The desired center of rotation is at (0.1, 0.1) of the mass center of the object. The robots (robots 1, 2, and 3) are located at (-0.3, 0.3), (0.2,0.0), and (0.0, -0.1) of the desired center of rotation respectively. The stiffness and damping factors are set to 2000 N/m and 200 Ns/m. The maximum force applied by the robots is set to 40N. The initial orientation of the object is set to 0 degrees and...
the goal is set to 30 degrees. Figure 11 shows the model with ten robots. The object movement for a sample test shows in figure 12.

![Figure 12: Object movement in turning](image)

We describe two simulations in figure 13, figure 14. In sim.1 there aren’t any errors in robot arm angles ($\alpha_0$), but in sim.2 there is 6 degrees error in robot3 arm angle. In each simulation we have done two experiments, one of them is done by 3 robots and the other one is done by 10 robots. It can be observed that the object has been rotated to the desired angle (30 degrees) and the system is stable in all experiments. We see that the maximum $e_r$ is ignorable in comparison with object size. Maximum value of $F_r$ is arisen because of the braking system.

Comparing two simulations, we can see that in sim.2 the average value of $e_r$ and $F_r$ for 3 robots experiments is greater than those in sim.1 but for 10 robots experiments those values are nearly the same. That means increasing the number of robots can cover the error of a robot arm angle.

With comparing experiments of 3 robots and 10 robots, we have greater values for $e_r$ and $F_r$ in 3 robots.

In sim.1 the maximum value of $e_r$ for 3 robots reaches to 0.003M. In both experiments the final value of $e_r$ reaches to zero. The maximum value of $F_r$ is 40N.
In sim.2 the maximum value of \( e_t \) is 0.005M and the final value doesn’t reach to zero in simulation steps for 3 robots.

FINAL REMARKS

In this paper Complex Constrain and Move (CCM) method is introduced to rotate an object with a team of distributed object handling mobile robots. This method is based on the Constrain and Move strategy. In this method all of the robots have the same algorithm. Each robot controls its force to the object and its arm-object angle to do the algorithm. To constrain an object, we need at least 3 robots and these number of robots are sufficient to move the robot too. This algorithm handles some errors in the position of robots automatically.

The simulation results show that increasing of some robots in system give better result and increase the fault tolerance. Transferring an object in a straight line or arbitrary path with this algorithm must be studied.
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