

We are IntechOpen, the world's leading publisher of Open Access books Built by scientists, for scientists

4,800

Open access books available

122,000

International authors and editors

135M

Downloads

Our authors are among the

154

Countries delivered to

TOP 1%

most cited scientists

12.2%

Contributors from top 500 universities



WEB OF SCIENCE™

Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us?
Contact book.department@intechopen.com

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.

For more information visit www.intechopen.com



Dynamic Model, Control and Simulation of Cooperative Robots: A Case Study

Jorge Gudiño-Lau* & Marco A. Arteaga**

* *Facultad de Ingeniería Electromecánica
Universidad de Colima
México*

** *Departamento de Control y Robótica
División de Ingeniería Eléctrica, de la Facultad de Ingeniería
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
México*

1. Introduction

The modelling and control of multiple robotic manipulators handling a constrained object requires more sophisticated techniques compared with a single robot working alone. Since the theory employed for cooperative robots is independent of their size, one can think of them as mechanical hands. The study of mechanical hands is important not only because these can be used as prosthetic devices for humans, but also because they increase considerably the manipulation capacity of a robot when substituting the usual gripper. Thus, robot hands (as well as cooperative robots), may find many areas of application nowadays. Many benefits can be obtained by using them in industrial manufacturing. A typical example is in a flexible assembly, where the robots join two parts into a product. Cooperative manipulators can also be used in material handling, *e.g.*, transporting objects beyond the load carrying capacity of a single robot. Furthermore, their employment allows to improve the quality of tasks in the manufacturer industry that require of great precision. On the other hand, cooperative robots are indispensable for skillful grasping and dexterous manipulation of objects. However, the literature about experimental results on the modeling, simulation and control of systems of multiple manipulators holding a common object is rather sparse.

A dynamic analysis for a system of multiple manipulators is presented in Orin and Oh (Orin & Oh 1981), where the formalism of Newton-Euler for open chain mechanisms is extended for closed chain systems. Another approach widely used is the Euler-Lagrange method (Naniwa *et al.* 1997). The equations of motion for each manipulator arm are developed in the Cartesian space and the impact of the closed chain is investigated when the held object is in contact with a rigid environment, for example the ground. Another general approach to obtain the dynamic model of a system of multiple robots is based on the estimation of the grasping matrix (Cole *et al.* 1992, Kuc *et al.* 1994, Liu *et al.* 2002, Murray *et al.* 1994, Yoshikawa & Zheng 1991). Here, the grasping matrix is used to couple the manipulators dynamics with that of the object, while this is

modeled by the Newton-Euler formulation. The dynamic analysis for cooperative robots with flexible joints holding a rigid object is presented in Jankowski *et al.* (Jankowski *et al.* 1993).

This work presents the study of the dynamic equations of a cooperative robot system holding a rigid object without friction. The test bed is made up of two industrial robots and it is at the Laboratory for Robotics of the National University of Mexico. The dynamic model for the manipulators is obtained independently from each other with the Lagrangian approach. Once the robots are holding the object, their joint variables are kinematically and dynamically coupled. Assuming that the coupling of the system is described by holonomic constraints, the manipulators and object equations of motion are combined to obtain the dynamic model of the whole system, which can be used for simulation purposes. It is important to stress that a robot manipulator in free motion does not have geometric constraints; therefore, the dynamic model is described by Ordinary Differential Equations (ODE). When working with constrained motion, the dynamic model is described by Differential Algebraic Equations (DAE). It is shown how the simulation of this kind of systems can be carried out, including a general approach to simulate contact forces by solving DAE's.

Early attempts to establish a relationship between the automatic control of robots carrying out a shared task are referred to Khatib's operational space formulation (Khatib 1987). During the 1980's, the most important research results considered the contact evolution during manipulation (Montana 1988). Such a contact evolution requires a perfect combination of position and force control. Some of the first approaches following this objective are presented in Ly and Sastry (Li & Sastry 1989) and Cole (Cole 1990). In those works, the dynamics of the object is considered explicitly. In Parra-Vega and Arimoto (Parra-Vega & Arimoto 1996), Liu *et al.* (Liu *et al.* 1997) and Parra-Vega *et al.* (Parra-Vega *et al.* 2001), control schemes which do not take into account the dynamics of the object but rather the motion constraints are designed. These control approaches have the advantage that they do not require an exact knowledge of the system model parameters, since an adaptive approach is introduced. More recently, Schlegl *et al.* (Schlegl *et al.* 2001) show some advances on hybrid (in terms of a combination of continuous and discrete systems) control approaches.

Despite the fact that Mason and Salisbury (Mason & Salisbury 1985) proposed the base of sensor-less manipulation in the 1980's, there are few control algorithms for cooperative robot systems which take into account the possible lack of velocity measurements. Perhaps because, since a digital computer is usually employed to implement a control law, a good approximation of the velocity vector can be obtained by means of numerical differentiation. However, recent experimental results have shown that a (digitalized) observer in a control law performs better (Arteaga & Kelly 2004). Thus, in Gudiño-Lau *et al.* (Gudiño-Lau *et al.* 2004) a decentralized control algorithm for cooperative manipulators (or robot hands) which achieves asymptotic stability of tracking of desired positions and forces by using an observer is given. In this work, a new control law based on a force filter is presented. This is a general control law, so that it can be applied to a system with more than two manipulators involved as well. The control scheme is of a decentralized architecture, so that the input torque for each robot is calculated in its own joint space and takes into account motion constraints rather than the held object dynamics. Also, an observer is employed to avoid velocity measurements and experimental results are presented to validate the theoretical results.

2. Experimental System

The system under study is made up of two industrial robots and it is at the Laboratory for Robotics of the National University of Mexico (Figure 1). They are the A465 and A255 of *CRS Robotics*. Even though the first one has six degrees of freedom and the second one five, only the first three joints of each manipulator are used in this case, while the rest of them are mechanically braked. Each joint is actuated by a direct current motor with optical encoders. Both manipulators have a crash protection device in the end effector and a force sensor installed on it; an aluminum finger is mounted on the sensor. The object is constituted by a melamine plastic box with dimensions $0.15\text{m} \times 0.15\text{m} \times 0.311\text{m}$ and weight 0.400kg . The experiments are performed in a Pentium IV to 1.4 GHz personal computer with two PCI-FlexMotion-6C boards of *National Instruments*. The sampling time is of 9ms. Controllers are programmed in the *LabWindows/CVI* software of *National Instruments*.

A schematic diagram of the robots holding an object is depicted in Figure 2. The system variables are the generalized coordinates, velocities, and accelerations, as well as the contact forces exerted by the end effector on the common rigid object, and the generalized input forces (*i.e.*, torques) acting on the joints.



Fig. 1. Robots A465 and A255 of CRS Robotics.

To describe the kinematic relationships between the robots and the object, a stationary coordinate frame C_0 attached to the ground serves as reference frame, as shown in Figure 2. An object coordinate frame C_2 is attached at the center of mass of the rigid object. The origin of the coordinate frame C_1 is located at the center of the end effector of robot A465. In the same way, the origin of the coordinate frame C_3 is located at the

center of the end effector of robot A255. The coordinate frame C_0 has been considered to be the inertial frame of the whole system. 0p_2 is the position vector of the object center of mass expressed in the coordinate system C_0 . 0p_1 and 0p_3 are vectors that describe the position of the contact points between the end effectors of robots A465, A255 and the object, respectively, expressed in the coordinate system C_0 (Gudiño-Lau & Arteaga 2005).




Fig. 2. Schematic diagram of robots holding an object.

3. The Cooperative Robots Dynamic Model

Consider the cooperative system with two robot arms shown in Figure 1, each of them with $n_i = 3$ degrees of freedom and $m_i = 1$ constraints arising from the contact with the held object. Then, the total number of degrees of freedom is given by $n = \sum_{i=1}^2 n_i$ with a total number of $m = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i$ constraints.

3.1 Dynamic model with constraint motion and properties

The dynamic model for each individual manipulator, $i=1,2$, is obtained by the Lagrange's formulation as (Parra-Vega *et al.* 2001)

$$H_i(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i + D_i\dot{q}_i + g_i(q_i) = \tau_i + J_{\varphi_i}^T(q_i)\lambda_i \quad (1)$$

where $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the vector of generalized joint coordinates, $H_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ is the symmetric positive definite inertia matrix, $C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the vector of Coriolis and centrifugal torques, $g_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the vector of gravitational torques, $D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ is the positive semidefinite diagonal matrix accounting for joint viscous friction coefficients, $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the vector of generalized torques acting at the joints, and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the vector of Lagrange multipliers (physically represents the force applied at the contact point). $J_{\varphi_i}^T(q_i)\lambda_i$ represents the interaction of the rigid object with the two manipulators. $J_{\varphi_i}(q_i) = \nabla \varphi_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$ is assumed to be full rank in this paper. $\nabla \varphi_i(q_i)$ denotes the gradient of the object surface vector $\varphi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$, which maps a vector onto the normal plane at the tangent plane that arises at the contact point described by

$$\varphi_i(q_i) = 0. \tag{2}$$

Equation (2) is a geometrical constraint expressed in an analytical equation in which only position is involved and that does not depend explicitly of time t . Constraints of this forms are known as *holonomic constraints* (they are also classified as *sclero-holonomic*).

Note that equation (2) means that homogeneous constraints are being considered (Parra-Vega *et al.* 2001). The complete system is subjected to 2 holonomic constraints given by

$$\varphi(q) = 0, \tag{3}$$

where $\varphi(q) = \varphi(q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$. This means that the object being manipulated and the environment are modeled by the constraint (3). If the holonomic constraints are correctly calculated, then the object will remain hold.

Let us denote the largest (smallest) eigenvalue of a matrix by $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ ($\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$). The norm of an $n \times 1$ vector x is defined by $\|x\| \triangleq \sqrt{x^T x}$ while the norm of an $m \times n$ matrix A is the corresponding induced norm $\|A\| \triangleq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^T A)}$. By recalling that revolute joints are considered, the following properties can be established (Liu *et al.* 1997, Arteaga Pérez 1998, Parra-Vega *et al.* 2001):

Property 3.1. Each $H_i(q_i)$ satisfies $\lambda_{H_i} \|x\|^2 \leq x^T H_i(q_i) x \leq \lambda_{H_i} \|x\|^2 \quad \forall q_i, x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, where $\lambda_{H_i} \triangleq \min_{x \neq 0} \lambda_{\min}(H_i)$, $\lambda_{H_i} \triangleq \max_{x \neq 0} \lambda_{\max}(H_i)$ and $0 < \lambda_{H_i} \leq \lambda_{H_i} < \infty$. Δ

Property 3.2. With a proper definition of $C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)$, $\dot{H}_i(q_i) - 2C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)$ is skew-symmetric. Δ

Property 3.3. The vector $C_i(q_i, x)y$ satisfies $C_i(q_i, x)y = C_i(q_i, y)x \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$. Δ

Property 3.4. It is satisfied $\|C_i(q_i, x)\| \leq k_{ci} \|x\|$ with $0 < k_{ci} < \infty, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$. Δ

Property 3.5. The vector \dot{q}_i can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}_i &= \dot{q}_i + (J_{\phi}^+ J_{\phi} \dot{q}_i - J_{\phi}^+ J_{\phi} \dot{q}_i) \\ &= (I_{n_i \times n_i} - J_{\phi}^+ J_{\phi}) \dot{q}_i + J_{\phi}^+ J_{\phi} \dot{q}_i \\ &\triangleq Q_i(q_i) \dot{q}_i + J_{\phi}^+(q_i) \dot{p}_i, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $J_{\phi}^+ = J_{\phi}^T (J_{\phi} J_{\phi}^T)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$ stands for the Penrose's pseudoinverse and $Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ satisfies $\text{rank}(Q_i) = n_i - m_i$. These two matrices are orthogonal, i.e. $Q_i J_{\phi}^+ = 0$ (and $Q_i J_{\phi}^T = 0$). $\dot{p}_i \triangleq J_{\phi} \dot{q}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the so called constrained velocity. Furthermore, in view of constraint (3), it holds

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \dot{p}_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^l p_i = \sum_{i=1}^l \int_0^t J_{\phi} \dot{q}_i d\theta = 0. \tag{5}$$

Since homogeneous constraints are being considered, it also holds in view of (2) that

$$\dot{p}_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p_i = 0. \tag{6}$$

for $i=1, \dots, l$. p_i is called the constrained position. Δ

As shown in Liu *et al.* (Liu *et al.* 1997), if we consider homogeneous holonomic constraints we can write the constrained position, constrained velocity and constrained acceleration as

$$\varphi_i(q_i) = 0 \tag{7}$$

$$\dot{\varphi}_i(q_i) = J_{\varphi_i}(q_i) \dot{q}_i = 0 \tag{8}$$

$$\ddot{\varphi}_i(q_i) = J_{\varphi_i}(q_i) \ddot{q}_i + \dot{J}_{\varphi_i}(q_i) \dot{q}_i = 0, \tag{9}$$

respectively. Recall that in our case $n_i = 3, n = 6, m_i = 1$, and $m = 2, i=1,2$.

3.2 Dynamic model of the rigid object

The motion of the two robot arms is dynamically coupled by the generalized contact forces interacting through the common rigid object. To describe this interaction, it is necessary to know the object dynamics. According to the free body diagram of Figure 3, Newton's equation of motion are

$$m_o \ddot{x}_o - m_o g_o = f_1 - f_2, \quad (10)$$

where $m_o \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is the diagonal mass matrix of the object, $\ddot{x}_o \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the vector describing the translational acceleration of the center of mass of the rigid object, $f_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $f_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are forces exerted by the robots, and $g_o \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is a gravity vector. All vectors are expressed with reference to the inertial coordinate frame C_0 . The contact forces vector are given by

$$f_i = n_i \lambda_i, \quad (11)$$

where $n_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ represents the direction of the force (normal to the constraint) and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ given in (1).




Fig. 3. Force free body diagram.

The following assumptions are made to obtain the dynamic model for the cooperative system and to design the control-observer scheme:

Assumption 3.1 The end effectors (fingers) of the two robot arms are rigid. Δ

Assumption 3.2 The object is undeformable, and its absolute and relative position are known. Δ

Assumption 3.3 The kinematics of each robot is known Δ

Assumption 3.4 The l robots of which the system is made up satisfy constraints (2) and (6) for all time. Furthermore, none of the robots is redundant and they do not reach any singularity. Δ

Assumption 3.5 The matrix J_{ϕ_i} is Lipschitz continuous, i. e.

$$\|J_{\phi_i}(q_i) - J_{\phi_i}(q_{di})\| \leq L_i \|q_i - q_{di}\|, \quad (12)$$

for a positive constant L_i and for all $q_i, q_{di} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Besides, there exist positive finite constants c_{0i} and c_{1i} which satisfies

$$c_{0i} \triangleq \max_{\forall q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \|J_{oi}^+(q_i)\| \quad (13)$$

$$c_{1i} \triangleq \max_{\forall q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}} \|J_{oi}(q_i)\|' \quad (14)$$

△

Note that Assumption 3.4 is a common one in the field of cooperative robots. None of the robots can be redundant that (2) is satisfied only by a bounded vector q_i . On the other hand, the closed kinematic loop that arises when the manipulators are holding an object is redundant. Assumption 3.5 is quite reasonable for revolute robots, since the elements of q_i appear as argument of sines and cosines functions. This is why (13)-(14) is valid.

3.3 Dynamic coupling

The position, velocity and acceleration of the object center of mass with reference to the inertial coordinated frame are given in Cartesian coordinates by:

$$x_o = h_i(q_i) \quad (15)$$

$$\dot{x}_o = J_{oi}(q_i)\dot{q}_i \quad (16)$$

$$\ddot{x}_o = J_{oi}(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + \dot{J}_{oi}(q_i)\dot{q}_i, \quad (17)$$

respectively, with $i = 1, 2$. $h_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the forward kinematics of the center of mass of the object expressed in the coordinate system C_0 , and $J_{oi}(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n_i}$ is the corresponding Jacobian matrix of $h_i(q_i)$. Substituting (17) into (10) yields

$$m_o J_{oi}(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + m_o \dot{J}_{oi}(q_i)\dot{q}_i - m_o g_o = f_1 - f_2. \quad (18)$$

Now, consider writing (1) as (Murray *et. al* 1994)

$$H_i(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i + D_i\dot{q}_i + g_i(q_i) = \tau_i + J_{ai}^T(q_i)f_i. \quad (19)$$

Note that

$$J_{oi}^T(q_i) = J_{ai}^T(q_i)n_i, \quad (20)$$

in view of (11). $J_{ai}(q_i)$ is the manipulator analytical Jacobian. On the other hand, from (18) one gets

$$f_1 = m_o J_{oi}(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + m_o \dot{J}_{oi}(q_i)\dot{q}_i - m_o g_o + f_2. \quad (21)$$

Then, for $i=1$ in (19) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(q_1)\ddot{q}_1 + C_1(q_1, \dot{q}_1)\dot{q}_1 + D_1\dot{q}_1 + g_1(q_1) = \\ \tau_1 + J_{a1}^T(q_1)(m_o J_{o1}(q_1)\ddot{q}_1 + m_o \dot{J}_{o1}(q_1)\dot{q}_1 - m_o g_o + f_2) = \\ \tau_1 + J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o J_{o1}(q_1)\ddot{q}_1 + J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o \dot{J}_{o1}(q_1)\dot{q}_1 - J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o g_o + J_{a1}^T(q_1)f_2, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1 + J_{a1}^T(q_1)f_2 = & (H_1(q_1) - J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o J_{o1}(q_1))\ddot{q}_1 \\ & + (C_1(q_1, \dot{q}_1) + D_1 - J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o \dot{J}_{o1}(q_1))\dot{q}_1 + g_1(q_1) + J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o g_o. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By defining

$$H_{T1}(q_1) \triangleq H_1(q_1) - J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o J_{o1}(q_1) \quad (24)$$

$$C_{T1}(q_1, \dot{q}_1) \triangleq C_1(q_1, \dot{q}_1) + D_1 - J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o \dot{J}_{o1}(q_1) \quad (25)$$

$$g_{T1}(q_1) \triangleq g_1(q_1) + J_{a1}^T(q_1)m_o g_o, \quad (26)$$

one finally gets

$$H_{T1}(q_1)\ddot{q}_1 + C_{T1}(q_1, \dot{q}_1)\dot{q}_1 + g_{T1}(q_1) = \tau_1 + J_{a1}^T(q_1)f_2. \quad (27)$$

In the same fashion, we make the analysis for the robot A255, to get

$$H_{T2}(q_2)\ddot{q}_2 + C_{T2}(q_2, \dot{q}_2)\dot{q}_2 + g_{T2}(q_2) = \tau_2 + J_{a2}^T(q_2)f_1, \quad (28)$$

with

$$H_{T2}(q_2) \triangleq H_2(q_2) + J_{a2}^T(q_2)m_o J_{o2}(q_2) \quad (29)$$

$$C_{T2}(q_2, \dot{q}_2) \triangleq C_2(q_2, \dot{q}_2) + D_2 + J_{a2}^T(q_2)m_o \dot{J}_{o2}(q_2) \quad (30)$$

$$g_{T2}(q_2) \triangleq g_2(q_2) - J_{a2}^T(q_2)m_o g_o. \quad (31)$$

The dynamic models in (27)-(28) describe the motion of the entire closed chain, where each individual manipulator represents a subsystem coupled to the other one through kinematic and dynamic constraints.

3.4 Force modeling for cooperative robots

A robot manipulator in free motion does not have geometric constraints; therefore, the dynamic model is described by Ordinary Differential Equations (ODE). When working with constrained motion, there appear holonomic constraints; for this reason, the dynamic model is described by Differential Algebraic Equations (DAE). To simulate contact forces, DAE's must be solved. First of all, from the dynamic model for cooperative robots (1), we obtain

$$\ddot{q}_i = H_i^{-1}(q_i)(\tau_i + J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)\lambda_i - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i - D_i\dot{q}_i - g_i(q_i)) \quad (32)$$

However, (7)-(9) must hold as well. Substituting the right hand side of (32) into (9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\phi}_i(q_i) &= J_{\phi_i}(q_i)[H_i^{-1}(q_i)(\tau_i + J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)\lambda_i - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i - D_i\dot{q}_i - g_i(q_i))] \\ &\quad + \dot{J}_{\phi_i}(q_i)\dot{q}_i \\ &= J_{\phi_i}(q_i)H_i^{-1}(q_i)J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)\lambda_i + \dot{J}_{\phi_i}(q_i)\dot{q}_i \\ &\quad + J_{\phi_i}(q_i)H_i^{-1}(q_i)(\tau_i - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i - D_i\dot{q}_i - g_i(q_i)) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

From the previous equation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &= (J_{\phi_i}(q_i)H_i^{-1}(q_i)J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i))^{-1}[\ddot{\phi}_i(q_i) - \dot{J}_{\phi_i}(q_i)\dot{q}_i \\ &\quad - J_{\phi_i}(q_i)H_i^{-1}(q_i)(\tau_i - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i - D_i\dot{q}_i - g_i(q_i))] \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The system described by (11), (27)-(28) and (34) could now be simulated as second order differential equations. However, the inclusion of the constraints in the form (34) does not guarantee the convergence of the contact velocity and position constraints to zero. This is because $\ddot{\phi}_i(q_i)=0$ represents a double integrator. Thus, any small

difference of $\varphi_i(q_i)$ or $\dot{\varphi}_i(q_i)$ from zero in (7)-(9) will diverge. This problem has been successfully addressed by the constraint stabilization method in the solution of DAE's (Baumgarte 1972).

According to this approach, the constraints are asymptotically stabilized by using

$$\ddot{\varphi}_i(q_i) + 2\alpha_i\dot{\varphi}_i(q_i) + \beta_i\varphi_i(q_i) = 0, \quad (35)$$

instead of $\ddot{\varphi}_i(q_i) = 0$. α_i and β_i are chosen appropriately to ensure the fast convergence of both the constraint position $\varphi_i(q_i)$ and velocity constraint $\dot{\varphi}_i(q_i)$ to zero (in case of offset).

Equations (11), (27)-(28) and (34)-(35) fully describe the motion of the system to be simulated (Gudiño-Lau & Arteaga 2005).

4. Control with velocity estimation

4.1 Control Law

In this section, a linear filter for the force error and the tracking control problem of a cooperative system of rigid robots are studied. Consider model (1) and define the tracking and observation errors as

$$\tilde{q}_i \triangleq q_i - q_{di} \quad (36)$$

$$z_i \triangleq q_i - \hat{q}_i, \quad (37)$$

where q_{di} is a desired smooth bounded trajectory satisfying constraint (2), and $(\hat{\bullet})$ represents the estimated value of (\bullet) . Other error definitions are

$$\Delta p_i \triangleq p_i - p_{di} \quad (38)$$

$$\Delta \lambda_i \triangleq \lambda_i - \lambda_{di} \quad (39)$$

where p_{di} is the desired constrained position which satisfies (6). λ_{di} is the desired force to be applied by each finger on the constrained surface. Other useful definitions are

$$\dot{q}_{ri} \triangleq Q_i(q_i)(\dot{q}_{di} - \Lambda_i(\hat{q}_i - q_{di})) + J_{\varphi_i}^+(q_i)(\dot{p}_{di} - \beta_i\Delta p_i + \bar{\xi}_i\phi_i + \xi_i\Delta F_i) \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &\triangleq \dot{q}_i - \dot{q}_{ri} \\ &= Q_i(q_i)(\dot{\hat{q}}_i + \Lambda_i\tilde{q}_i - \Lambda_i z_i) + J_{\varphi_i}^+(q_i)(\Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i\Delta p_i - \bar{\xi}_i\phi_i - \xi_i\Delta F_i). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\triangleq s_{pi} + s_{fi} \\ \Delta F_i &\triangleq \int_0^t \Delta \lambda_i(\vartheta) d\vartheta, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where $\Lambda_i = k_i I \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ with $k_i > 0$, and $\bar{\xi}_i, \xi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$ are diagonal positive definite matrices, and β_i is a positive constant. To get (41) the equality $\hat{q}_i - q_{di} = \tilde{q}_i - z_i$ has been used. Note also that s_{pi} and s_{fi} are orthogonal vectors. $\phi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the output of the linear filter given by

$$\dot{w}_i = -A_i w_i + \Delta \lambda_i \quad w_i(0) = 0 \quad (43)$$

$$\phi_i = B_i w_i. \quad (44)$$

$A_i, B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$ are diagonal positive definite matrices and $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the state for the filter. Also, we define

$$\zeta_i \triangleq \dot{\phi}_i = -B_i A_i w_i + B_i \Delta \lambda_i = -A_i \phi_i + B_i \Delta \lambda_i. \quad (45)$$

Now, let us analyze \ddot{q}_{ri} . This quantity is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{q}_{ri} \triangleq & Q_i(q_i)(\ddot{q}_{di} - \Lambda_i(\dot{q}_i - \dot{q}_{di})) + J_{\phi_i}^+(q_i)(\ddot{p}_{di} - \beta_i(\dot{p}_i - \dot{p}_{di}) + \bar{\xi}_i\zeta_i + \xi_i\Delta\lambda_i) \\ & + \dot{Q}_i(q_i)(\dot{q}_{di} - \Lambda_i(\hat{q}_i - q_{di})) + \dot{J}_{\phi_i}^+(q_i)(\dot{p}_{di} - \beta_i\Delta p_i + \bar{\xi}_i\phi_i + \xi_i\Delta F_i). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

As it will be shown later, \ddot{q}_{ri} is necessary to implement the controller and the observer. However, this quantity is not available since \dot{q}_i is not measurable. In order to overcome this drawback, let us consider $Q_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$. Then you have

$$\dot{Q}_i(q_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial a_{11}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i & \dots & \frac{\partial a_{1n_i}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial a_{n_i1}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i & \dots & \frac{\partial a_{n_in_i}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

where $a_{\alpha\beta}$ is the $\alpha\beta$ element of $Q_i(q_i)$. Based on (47), consider the following definition

$$\dot{\hat{Q}}_i(q_i) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial a_{11}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_{oi} & \dots & \frac{\partial a_{1n_i}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_{oi} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial a_{n_i1}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_{oi} & \dots & \frac{\partial a_{n_in_i}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_{oi} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

with

$$\dot{q}_{oi} \triangleq \dot{\hat{q}}_i - \Lambda_i z_i. \quad (49)$$

Then, one can compute

$$\ddot{Q}_i(r_i) \triangleq \dot{Q}_i(q_i) - \dot{\hat{Q}}_i(\dot{q}_{oi}) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial a_{11}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} r_i & \dots & \frac{\partial a_{1n_i}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} r_i \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial a_{n_i1}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} r_i & \dots & \frac{\partial a_{n_in_i}(q_i)}{\partial q_i} r_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$r_i \triangleq \dot{q}_i - \dot{q}_{oi} = \dot{z}_i + \Lambda_i z_i. \quad (51)$$

In view of (48), we propose the following substitution for \ddot{q}_{ri}

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{q}_{ri} \triangleq & Q_i(q_i)(\ddot{q}_{di} - \Lambda_i(\dot{q}_i - \dot{q}_{di})) + J_{\phi_i}^+(q_i)(\ddot{p}_{di} - \beta_i(\dot{p}_i - \dot{p}_{di}) + \bar{\xi}_i\zeta_i + \xi_i\Delta\lambda_i) \\ & + \dot{\hat{Q}}_i(q_i)(\dot{q}_{di} - \Lambda_i(\hat{q}_i - q_{di})) + \dot{J}_{\phi_i}^+(q_i)(\dot{p}_{di} - \beta_i\Delta p_i + \bar{\xi}_i\phi_i + \xi_i\Delta F_i), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where $\dot{J}_{\phi_i}^+(q_i)$ is defined in the very same fashion as $\dot{Q}_i(q_i)$ in (48). Note that \dot{p}_i is still used since this value is known from (6). After some manipulation, it is possible to get

$$\ddot{q}_{ri} = \ddot{q}_{ri} + e_i(r_i), \quad (53)$$

where

$$e_i(r_i) \triangleq -\tilde{Q}_i(q_i)(\dot{q}_{di} - \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i + \Lambda_i z_i) - \tilde{J}_{\phi_i}^+(q_i)(\dot{p}_{di} - \beta_i \Delta p_i + \bar{\xi}_i \phi_i + \xi_i \Delta F_i) \quad (54)$$

The proposed controller is then given for each single input by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &\triangleq H_i(q_i) \ddot{q}_{ri} + C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_{ri}) \dot{q}_{ri} + D_i \dot{q}_{ri} + g_i(q_i) \\ &\quad - K_{Ri}(\dot{q}_{oi} - \dot{q}_{ri}) - J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)(\lambda_{di} + B_i^{-1} \zeta_i - K_{Fi} \Delta F_i), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $K_{Ri} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$, $K_{Fi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_i}$ are diagonal positive definite matrices. Note that from (41) and (51) it is $\dot{q}_{oi} - \dot{q}_{ri} = s_i - r_i$. Thus, from (53) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i &= H_i(q_i)(\ddot{q}_{ri} + e_i(r_i)) + C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_{ri}) \dot{q}_{ri} + D_i \dot{q}_{ri} + g_i(q_i) \\ &\quad - K_{Ri}(s_i - r_i) - J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)(\lambda_{di} + B_i^{-1} \zeta_i - K_{Fi} \Delta F_i). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

By substituting (56) into (1), the closed loop dynamics becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(q_i) \dot{s}_i &= -C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) s_i - K_{DRi} s_i + K_{Ri} r_i \\ &\quad + J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)(B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + K_{Fi} \Delta F_i) - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_{ri}) s_i + H_i(q_i) e_i(r_i) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

after some manipulation, where $K_{DRi} \triangleq K_{Ri} + D_i$. In order to get (57), Property 3.3 has been used.

4.2 Observer definition

The proposed dynamics of the observer is given by

$$\dot{\hat{q}}_i = \dot{\hat{q}}_{oi} + \Lambda_i z_i + k_{di} z_i \quad (58)$$

$$\ddot{\hat{q}}_{oi} = \ddot{\hat{q}}_{ri} + k_{di} \Lambda_i z_i, \quad (59)$$

where k_{di} is a positive constant. This observer is simpler than the one given in (Gudiño-Lau *et al.* 2004), where the inverse of the inertia matrix and force measurements are required. Since from (58) you have $\ddot{\hat{q}}_{oi} = \ddot{\hat{q}}_i - \Lambda_i \dot{z}_i - k_{di} \dot{z}_i$, (59) becomes

$$\dot{s}_i = \dot{r}_i + k_{di} r_i + e_i(r_i), \quad (60)$$

in view of (53). By multiplying both sides of (60) by $H_i(q_i)$, and by taking into account (57), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(q_i) \dot{r}_i &= -H_{rdi} r_i - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) s_i - C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_{ri}) s_i - K_{DRi} s_i \\ &\quad + J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)(B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + K_{Fi} \Delta F_i), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where $H_{rdi} \triangleq k_{di} H_i(q_i) - K_{Ri}$. Finally, by using Property 3.3 again and some manipulation, it is

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(q_i) \dot{r}_i &= -C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) r_i - H_{rdi} r_i + C_i(q_i, s_i + \dot{q}_{ri}) r_i - K_{DRi} s_i \\ &\quad - C_i(q_i, s_i + 2\dot{q}_{ri}) s_i + J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i)(B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + K_{Fi} \Delta F_i). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Now, let us define

$$x_i \triangleq [s_i^T \quad r_i^T \quad \Delta F_i^T \quad \phi_i^T]^T, \quad (63)$$

as state for (42), (45), (57) and (62). The main idea of the control-observer design is to show that whenever $\|x_i\|$ tends to zero, the tracking errors \tilde{q}_i , $\dot{\tilde{q}}_i$, Δp_i , $\Delta \dot{p}_i$ and $\Delta \lambda_i$ and the

observation errors \mathbf{z}_i and $\dot{\mathbf{z}}_i$ will do it as well. From (51), this is rather obvious for \mathbf{z}_i and $\dot{\mathbf{z}}_i$. However, it is not clear for the other variables. The following lemma shows that this is indeed the case under some conditions.

Lemma 4.1 If \mathbf{x}_i is bounded by $\mathbf{x}_{\max i}$ and tends to zero, then the following facts hold:

- $\Delta \mathbf{p}_i$ and $\Delta \dot{\mathbf{p}}_i$ remain bounded and tend to zero
- $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i$ and $\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}_i$ remain bounded. Furthermore, if the bound $\mathbf{x}_{\max i}$ for $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|$ is chosen small enough so as to guarantee that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\| \leq \eta_i$ for all t , with η_i a positive and small enough constant, then both $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i$ and $\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}_i$ will tend to zero as well.
- If, in addition, the velocity vector $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i$ is bounded, then $\Delta \lambda_i$ will remain bounded and tend to zero. Δ

The proof of Lemma 4.1 can be found in Appendix B. It is interesting to note that, if $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|$ is bounded by $\mathbf{x}_{\max i}$, then it is always possible to find a bound for $\mathbf{e}_i(\mathbf{r}_i)$ in (54) which satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{e}_i(\mathbf{r}_i)\| \leq M_{ei}(\mathbf{x}_{\max i}) \|\mathbf{r}_i\| < \infty. \quad (64)$$

Consider now the following function

$$V_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{M}_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (65)$$

where $\mathbf{M}_i \triangleq \text{block diag}\{H_i(\mathbf{q}_i), H_i(\mathbf{q}_i), R_i\}$, and

$$R_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} N_i B_i^{-1} & -N_i \\ -N_i & N_i B_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (66)$$

with $N_i \triangleq (\xi_i B_i^{-1} A_i + \bar{\xi}_i K_{Fi}) A_i^{-1}$. In Appendix C it is shown that $V_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is a positive definite function. Suppose that one may find a region

$$\mathbb{D}_i = \{\mathbf{x}_i : \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq \mathbf{x}_{\max i}\}, \quad (67)$$

so that for all time $\dot{V}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \leq 0$ with $\dot{V}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$. If $\mathbf{x}_{\max i}$ is small enough in the sense of Lemma 4.1, then from the former discussion one can conclude the convergence to zero of all error signals. The following theorem establishes the conditions for the controller-observer parameters to guarantee this.

Teorema 4.1 Consider the cooperative system dynamics given by (1), (2) and (6), in closed loop with the filter (43)-(45), the control law (55) and the observer (58)-(59), where \mathbf{q}_{di} and \mathbf{p}_{di} are the desired bounded joint and constrained positions, whose derivatives $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{di}$, $\ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{di}$, $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_{di}$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{p}}_{di}$ are also bounded, and they all satisfy constraint (6). Consider also l given regions defined by (67) for each subsystem, where the bounds $\mathbf{x}_{\max i}$, $i = 1, \dots, l$, are chosen according to

$$\mathbf{x}_{\max i} \leq \frac{\eta_i \alpha_i}{\left(1 + c_{0i} \left(\lambda_{\max}(\bar{\xi}_i) + \lambda_{\max}(\xi_i)\right) + \sqrt{n_i}\right)} \quad (68)$$

with α_i defined in Appendix B. Then, every dynamic and error signal remains bounded and asymptotic stability of tracking, observation and force errors arise, i. e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{q}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\tilde{q}}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} z_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{z}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \lambda_i = \mathbf{0}, \quad (69)$$

if the following conditions are satisfied

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{K}_{Ri}) \geq \mu_{1i} + 1 + \delta_i \quad (70)$$

$$k_{di} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{K}_{Ri}) + w_i}{\lambda_{hi}} \quad (71)$$

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{E}_i) \geq \delta_i + 1 \quad (72)$$

$$\lambda_{\min}(\xi_i \mathbf{K}_{Fi}) \geq \delta_i + 1, \quad (73)$$

where $w_i = \mu_{2i} + \frac{1}{4}(\lambda_{Di} + \mu_{3i} + \mu_{4i})^2 + \delta_i + \frac{1}{4}c_{1i}^2 a_i^2 b_i^2 + \frac{1}{4}c_{1i}^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(\mathbf{K}_{Fi})$, $E_i = \bar{\xi}_i \mathbf{B}_i^{-1} A_i + \xi_i \mathbf{B}_i^{-2} A_i + \bar{\xi}_i \mathbf{K}_{Fi} \mathbf{B}_i^{-1}$, δ_i a positive constant and μ_{1i} , μ_{2i} , μ_{3i} , μ_{4i} and λ_{Di} defined in Appendix D. Δ

The proof of the Theorem 4.1 can be found in Appendix D

Remark 4.1 The result of Theorem 4.1 is only local. Also, it is rather difficult to find analytically a region of attraction, but it should be noticed that it $\{it\}$ cannot be made arbitrarily large. This is to guarantee the convergence to zero of the tracking errors \tilde{q}_i and $\dot{\tilde{q}}_i$. However, this does not represent a serious drawback since for grasping purposes it is usual to give smooth trajectories with zero initial position errors. On the other hand, it is worthy pointing out that a controller-observer scheme is implemented for every robot separately, while only the knowledge of each constraint of the form (2) is required. Δ .

5. Simulation and Experimental Results

In this section, some simulation results are presented. To test the accuracy of the modeling approach, experimental results are carried out as well. To protect the manipulators of the cooperative system against possible damages, the position/force control law (55) has been used for validation purposes, the motors dynamics has to be taken into account. For the object equation of motion given in (10), it is $m_o = m_{obj} \mathbf{I}$,

$m_{obj} = 0.400\text{kg}$, and $\mathbf{g}_o^T = \{g_x \quad g_y \quad g_z\} = \{0 \quad 0 \quad -9.81\text{m/s}^2\}$. The object dimensions are $0.15\text{m} \times 0.15\text{m} \times 0.311\text{m}$. In (35) one has $\alpha_i = 10$ and $\beta_i = 100$. The robots models are given in Appendix A.

The palm frame of the whole system is at the base of the robot A465, with its x -axis pointing towards the other manipulator. The task consists in lifting the object and pushing with a desired force, so that the constraints in Cartesian coordinates are simply given by

$$\varphi_i = x_i - b_i = 0, \quad (74)$$

for $i = 1, 2$ and b_i a positive constant. The desired trajectories are given by

$$x_{d1} = 0.554 \text{ [m]} \quad x_{d2} = 0.865 \text{ [m]} \quad (75)$$

$$y_{d1,2} = 0.05 \sin(w(t-t_i)) \text{ [m]} \quad (76)$$

$$z_{d1,2} = (0.635 + 0.05 \cos(w(t-t_i)) - 0.05) \text{ [m]} \quad (77)$$

Note that the inverse kinematics of the manipulators has to be employed to compute \mathbf{q}_{di} . These trajectories are valid from an initial time $t_i = 10\text{s}$ to a final time $t_f = 70\text{s}$. Before t_i and after t_f the robots are in free motion. w is a fifth order polynomial designed to satisfy $w(t_i) = w(t_f) = 0$. The derivatives of w are also zero at t_i and t_f . By choosing (75)-(77), the robots will make a circle in the y - z plane. The only difference between the trajectories for robots A465 and A255 is the width of the object. Also, no force control is carried out until the manipulators are in the initial position to hold the object, at $(0.554, 0, 0.510)$ [m] for the first manipulator and $(0.865, 0, 0.510)$ [m] for the second one. The desired pushing forces are then given from $t = t_i = 10\text{s}$ to $t = t_f = 70\text{s}$ by.

$$f_{dx1,2} = 15(t-t_i)/10 \text{ [N]} \quad t_i \text{ s} \leq t < 20\text{s} \quad (75)$$

$$f_{dx1,2} = 15 + 5 \sin(3\pi(t-20)/40) \text{ [N]} \quad 20 \leq t < 60\text{s} \quad (76)$$

$$f_{dx1,2} = 15 - 7.5(t-60)/10 \text{ [N]} \quad 60 \leq t < t_f \text{ s} \quad (77)$$

and $f_{dy1,2} = f_{dz1,2} = 0$ [N]. Note that, for simplicity, the desired forces are expressed in the base coordinate frame of each robot.

The controller has also been digitalized for the simulation. The experiment lasts 80s. The object is held at $t=10\text{s}$. Before, the robots are in free movement and the control law (55) and the observer (58)-(59) are used with the force part set to zero (*i. e.* $\mathbf{Q}_i = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{J}_{\phi_i} = \mathbf{0}$). It is rather easy to prove that this scheme is stable for unconstrained motion. From $t=10\text{s}$ to $t=70\text{s}$ it is switched on, *i. e.*, the complete control-observer force scheme is employed only during this period of time. From $t=70\text{s}$ to $t=80\text{s}$ the robots go back to their initial positions in free motion. From $t=10\text{s}$ to $t=15\text{s}$ they begin pushing at their initial positions to hold the object, and from $t=15\text{s}$ to $t=20\text{s}$ they lift it to the position where the circle will be made. From $t=20\text{s}$ to $t=60\text{s}$ this is done while the desired force is changed for a sinus signal, as can be seen in Figure 6. Note that our purpose is to show that simulation results of the constrained system are acceptable by using the approach described in Section 3. For this reason, the desired forces (or positions) are not shown. Only the real and simulated signals are presented. As can be seen, there is a good match. Of course, simulation results are free of noise. Note also that, since we have not proposed any special method to simulate the moment when the object is held, *i. e.*, when the robots change from free to constrained motion, there is a peak at $t=10\text{s}$ in the simulation. From $t=60\text{s}$ to $t=65\text{s}$ the object is put down on the table and from $t=65\text{s}$ to $t=70\text{s}$, the robots diminish pushing. Figure 4 shows the simulation and experimental results of the joint coordinates, while Figure 5 shows the results in Cartesian coordinates. As can be appreciated, the results are good in both cases. On the other hand, the Figure 7 and 8 show only the experimental results, for demonstrate the accuracy of the controller-observer scheme. The Figure 7 show the observation error, as can be appreciated, they are pretty. Finally, Figure 8 show the input voltages. In can observed that there are not saturation problems. This demonstrates the efficacy of designing a decentralized controller.




Fig. 4. Tracking in joint coordinates. a) q_{11} . b) q_{12} . c) q_{13} . d) q_{21} . e) q_{22} . f) q_{23} . ----- experiment - - - simulation.




Fig. 5. Tracking in Cartesian coordinates. a) x_1 . b) y_1 . c) z_1 . d) x_2 . e) y_2 . f) z_2 . ----- experiment - - - simulation.




Fig. 6. Force measurements. a) λ_1 . b) λ_2 ---- experiment - - - simulation.




Fig. 7. Observation errors. a) z_{11} . b) z_{12} . c) z_{13} . d) z_{21} . e) z_{22} . f) z_{23} . --- experiment - - - simulation.




Fig. 8. Input voltages. a) v_{11} . b) v_{12} . c) v_{13} . d) v_{21} . e) v_{22} . f) v_{23} . ---- experiment - - - simulation.

6. Conclusions

In this chapter, we developed the model for two cooperative industrial robots holding a rigid object without friction. The dynamic model for the manipulators is obtained independently from each other with the Lagrangian approach. Once the robots are holding the object, their joint variables are kinematically and dynamically coupled. These coupling equations are combined with the dynamic model of the object to obtain a mathematical description for the cooperative system.

Besides, the tracking control problem for cooperative robots without velocity measurements is considered. The control law is a decentralized approach which takes into account motion constraints rather than the held object dynamics. By assuming that fingers dynamics are well known and that contact forces measurements are available, a linear observer for each finger is proposed which does not require any knowledge of the robots dynamics. Despite the fact that the stability analysis is complex, the controller and specially the observer are not.

Some experiments and simulations have been carried out to test the theoretical results. The overall outcome of the mathematical model compared with the real system can be considered good, which validates the approach used.

7. Appendix

A The A465 and A255 robot models.

This section presents the A465 and A255 robot models as well as the corresponding parameter values. The models used for implementation and simulation purposes include Coulomb friction term for both robots. The approach to model them can be found in any standard book for robotics (*e. g.* (Sciavicco & Siciliano 2000)). Recall that only the first three degrees of freedom of each manipulator are being considered. Additionally, since the actuators are DC motors, their dynamics must be taken into account. Thus, for each manipulator (in free motion), one has

$$H_i(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i + D_i\dot{q}_i + f_{ci}(\dot{q}_i) + g_i(q_i) = D_{mi}^{-1}D_{ki}v_i, \quad (78)$$

where $f_{ci}(\dot{q}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ represents the Coulomb friction term and D_{ni} and $D_{ki} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ are to be defined later. The motors inertias are included in the matrix $H_i(q_i)$ so as to have a minimum set of parameters. The elements of matrices $H_1(q_1)$, $C_1(q_1, \dot{q}_1)$, $f_{c1}(\dot{q}_1)$ and $g_1(q_1)$ of the model for Robot Arm A465 of CRS Robotics are computed as

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(1,1) &= \text{aux}_1 p_1 + \text{aux}_2 p_2 + \text{aux}_3 p_3 + \text{aux}_4 p_4 + \text{aux}_5 p_5 + \text{aux}_6 p_6 + \text{aux}_7 p_7 + p_8 \\ h_1(1,2) &= 0 \\ h_1(1,3) &= 0 \\ h_1(2,1) &= 0 \\ h_1(2,2) &= \frac{1}{2} p_1 + p_2 + 2s_3 p_3 + p_4 + p_9 \\ h_1(2,3) &= \frac{1}{2} p_1 + p_2 + s_3 p_3 + p_4 + p_5 \\ h_1(3,1) &= 0 \\ h_1(3,2) &= \frac{1}{2} p_1 + p_2 + s_3 p_3 + p_4 + p_5 \\ h_1(3,3) &= \frac{1}{2} p_1 + p_2 + p_4 + p_{10} \\ c_1(1,1) &= \text{aux}_8 p_3 + \text{aux}_9 p_5 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{12} \sin(2q_{12}) p_6 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{12} \sin(2q_{12}) p_7 \\ c_1(1,2) &= \dot{q}_{11} \cos(2q_{12} + q_{13}) p_3 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12} + 2q_{13}) p_5 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(q_{12}) p_6 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12}) p_7 \\ c_1(1,3) &= \text{aux}_{10} \cdot p_3 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12} + 2q_{13}) p_5 \\ c_1(2,1) &= -\dot{q}_{11} \cos(2q_{12} + q_{13}) p_3 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12} + 2q_{13}) p_5 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12}) p_6 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12}) p_7 \\ c_1(2,2) &= \dot{q}_{13} c_3 p_3 \\ c_1(2,3) &= (\dot{q}_{12} c_3 + \dot{q}_{13} c_3) p_3 \\ c_1(3,1) &= -\left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} c_3 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \cos(2q_{12} + q_{13})\right) p_3 - \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \sin(2q_{12} + 2q_{13}) p_5 \\ c_1(3,2) &= -\dot{q}_{12} c_3 p_3 \\ c_1(3,3) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{c1}(1) &= p_{14} \operatorname{sgn}(\dot{q}_{11}) \\
f_{c1}(2) &= p_{15} \operatorname{sgn}(\dot{q}_{12}) \\
f_{c1}(3) &= p_{16} \operatorname{sgn}(\dot{q}_{13}) \\
g_1(1) &= 0 \\
g_1(2) &= c_2 p_{17} + \sin(q_{12} + q_{13}) p_{21} \\
g_1(3) &= \sin(q_{12} + q_{13}) p_{18}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also, it is $D_1 = \operatorname{bloc\,diag}\{p_{11} \ p_{12} \ p_{13}\}$. $v_1^T = \{v_{11} \ v_{12} \ v_{13}\}$ is the input voltage. The motor

dynamics data are $D_{n1} = \operatorname{bloc\,diag}\left\{\frac{1}{r_{11}^2} \ \frac{1}{r_{12}^2} \ \frac{1}{r_{13}^2}\right\}$ and $D_{k1} = \operatorname{bloc\,diag}\left\{\frac{k_{a11}}{R_{a11}r_{11}} \ \frac{k_{a12}}{R_{a12}r_{12}} \ \frac{k_{a13}}{R_{a13}r_{13}}\right\}$.

Where r stands for the gear ratio, K_a is the torque constant and R_a is the armature resistance. The associated values are $r_{11} = r_{12} = r_{13} = 100$, $K_{a11} = K_{a12} = K_{a13} = 0.1424 \text{ Nm/A}$ and $R_{a11} = R_{a12} = R_{a13} = 0.84\Omega$.

The elements of the corresponding matrices for the Robot Arm A255 are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
h_2(1,1) &= \cos(2q_{22})\bar{p}_1 + (2c_5 + 2c_6)\bar{p}_2 + \bar{p}_3 \\
h_2(1,2) &= 0 \\
h_2(1,3) &= 0 \\
h_2(2,1) &= 0 \\
h_2(2,2) &= \bar{p}_4 \\
h_2(2,3) &= \cos(q_{22} - q_{23})\bar{p}_5 \\
h_2(3,1) &= 0 \\
h_2(3,2) &= \cos(q_{22} - q_{23})\bar{p}_5 \\
h_2(3,3) &= \bar{p}_6 \\
c_2(1,1) &= -\dot{q}_{22}\sin(2q_{22})\bar{p}_1 - (s_5\dot{q}_{22} + s_6\dot{q}_{23})\bar{p}_2 \\
c_2(1,2) &= -\dot{q}_{21}\sin(2q_{22})\bar{p}_1 - \dot{q}_{21}s_5\bar{p}_2 \\
c_2(1,3) &= -\dot{q}_{21}s_6\bar{p}_2 \\
c_2(2,1) &= \dot{q}_{21}\sin(2q_{22})\bar{p}_1 + \dot{q}_{21}s_5\bar{p}_2 \\
c_2(2,2) &= 0 \\
c_2(2,3) &= \dot{q}_{23}\sin(q_{22} - q_{23})\bar{p}_5 \\
c_2(3,1) &= \dot{q}_{21}s_6\bar{p}_2 \\
c_2(3,2) &= -\dot{q}_{22}\sin(q_{22} - q_{23})\bar{p}_5 \\
c_2(3,3) &= 0 \\
f_{c2}(1) &= \bar{p}_{10} \operatorname{sgn}(\dot{q}_{21}) \\
f_{c2}(2) &= \bar{p}_{11} \operatorname{sgn}(\dot{q}_{22}) \\
f_{c2}(3) &= \bar{p}_{12} \operatorname{sgn}(\dot{q}_{23}) \\
g_2(1) &= 0 \\
g_2(2) &= c_5\bar{p}_{13} \\
g_2(3) &= c_6\bar{p}_{14}.
\end{aligned}$$

For this robot one has $D_2 = \operatorname{bloc\,diag}\{\bar{p}_7 \ \bar{p}_8 \ \bar{p}_9\}$. The input voltages vector is given by

$v_2^T = \{v_{21} \ v_{22} \ v_{23}\}$. The motor dynamics data are $D_{n2} = \operatorname{bloc\,diag}\left\{\frac{1}{r_{21}^2} \ \frac{1}{r_{22}^2} \ \frac{1}{r_{23}^2}\right\}$ and

$D_{k2} = \text{bloc diag} \left\{ \frac{k_{a21}}{R_{a21}r_{21}}, \frac{k_{a22}}{R_{a22}r_{22}}, \frac{k_{a23}}{R_{a23}r_{23}} \right\}$. With $r_{21} = r_{22} = r_{23} = 72$, $K_{a21} = K_{a22} = K_{a23} = 0.0657 \text{ Nm/A}$ and $R_{a21} = R_{a22} = R_{a23} = 2.40\Omega$. Note that in the model of both robots we could have chosen the parameters in a different fashion to have a smaller set. However, we made the definitions according to the computation of the inertia of the links. The elements of the analytical Jacobian $J_{a1}(q_1)$ of robot A465 are given by

$$j_{a1}(1,1) = -a_{12}s_1c_2 - (d_{13} + d_{14})s_1\sin(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (79)$$

$$j_{a1}(1,2) = -a_{12}c_1s_2 + (d_{13} + d_{14})c_1\cos(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (80)$$

$$j_{a1}(1,3) = (d_{13} + d_{14})c_1\cos(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (81)$$

$$j_{a1}(2,1) = a_{12}c_1c_2 + (d_{13} + d_{14})c_1\sin(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (82)$$

$$j_{a1}(2,2) = -a_{12}s_1s_2 + (d_{13} + d_{14})s_1\cos(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (83)$$

$$j_{a1}(2,3) = (d_{13} + d_{14})s_1\cos(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (84)$$

$$j_{a1}(3,1) = 0 \quad (85)$$

$$j_{a1}(3,2) = a_{12}c_2 + (d_{13} + d_{14})\sin(q_{12} + q_{13}) \quad (86)$$

$$j_{a1}(3,3) = (d_{13} + d_{14})\sin(q_{12} + q_{13}), \quad (87)$$

and those of $J_{a2}(q_2)$ are:

$$j_{a2}(1,1) = -a_{22}s_4c_5 - a_{23}s_4c_6 - d_{24}s_4 \quad (88)$$

$$j_{a2}(1,2) = -a_{22}c_4s_5 \quad (89)$$

$$j_{a2}(1,3) = -a_{23}c_4s_6 \quad (90)$$

$$j_{a2}(2,1) = a_{22}c_4c_5 + a_{23}c_4c_6 + d_{24}c_4 \quad (91)$$

$$j_{a2}(2,2) = -a_{22}s_4s_5 \quad (92)$$

$$j_{a2}(2,3) = -a_{23}s_4s_6 \quad (93)$$

$$j_{a2}(3,1) = 0 \quad (94)$$

$$j_{a2}(3,2) = a_{22}c_5 \quad (95)$$

$$j_{a2}(3,3) = a_{23}c_6. \quad (96)$$

The constraint Jacobian matrix $J_{\varphi 1}(q_1)$ of the robot arm A465 is:

$$J_{\varphi 1}^T(q_1) = \begin{bmatrix} -a_{12}s_1c_2 - (d_{13} + d_{14})s_1\sin(q_{12} + q_{13}) \\ -a_{12}c_1s_2 + (d_{13} + d_{14})c_1\cos(q_{12} + q_{13}) \\ (d_{13} + d_{14})c_1\cos(q_{12} + q_{13}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (97)$$

and the constraint Jacobian matrix $J_{\varphi 2}(q_2)$ of the robot arm A255 is:

$$J_{\varphi 2}^T(q_2) = \begin{bmatrix} -a_{22}s_4c_5 - a_{23}s_4c_6 - d_{24}s_4 \\ -a_{22}c_4s_5 \\ -a_{23}c_4s_6 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (98)$$

Note that, for simplicity, both $J_{a2}^T(q_1)$ and $J_{\varphi 2}(q_2)$ are expressed with respect with an inertial system fixed at the base of robot A255.

$p_1 = 0.0055 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_2 = 0.0080 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_3 = 0.0024 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_4 = 0.0118 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_5 = 0.0041 \text{ kg m}^2$
$p_6 = 0.0009 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_7 = 0.0007 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_8 = 2.0007 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_9 = 11.800 \text{ kg m}^2$	$p_{10} = 2.8000 \text{ kgm}^2$
$p_{11} = 25.000 \text{ Nm s}$	$p_{12} = 35.000 \text{ Nm s}$	$p_{13} = 36.000 \text{ Nm s}$	$p_{14} = 0.2000 \text{ Nm s}$	$p_{15} = 2.5000 \text{ Nm s}$
$p_{16} = 2.5000 \text{ Nm}$	$p_{17} = 22.000 \text{ N m}$	$p_{18} = 11.000 \text{ N m}$		

Table 1. Physical parameters of robot arm A465.

$\bar{p}_1 = 0.2500 \text{ kg m}^2$	$\bar{p}_2 = 0.0500 \text{ kgm}^2$	$\bar{p}_3 = 0.5750 \text{ kg m}^2$	$\bar{p}_4 = 1.1000 \text{ kgm}^2$	$\bar{p}_5 = 0.0300 \text{ kgm}^2$
$\bar{p}_6 = 0.5700 \text{ kg m}^2$	$\bar{p}_7 = 3.2000 \text{ Nm s}$	$\bar{p}_8 = 1.8000 \text{ Nm s}$	$\bar{p}_9 = 1.2000 \text{ Nm s}$	$\bar{p}_{10} = 0.0150 \text{ Nm s}$
$\bar{p}_{11} = 0.8000 \text{ N m}$	$\bar{p}_{12} = 0.7000 \text{ N m}$	$\bar{p}_{13} = 0.0001 \text{ N m}$	$\bar{p}_{14} = 1.8000 \text{ N m}$	

Table 2. Physical parameters of robot arm A255.

$s_1 = \sin(q_{11})$	$c_1 = \cos(q_{11})$
$s_2 = \sin(q_{12})$	$c_2 = \cos(q_{12})$
$s_3 = \sin(q_{13})$	$c_3 = \cos(q_{13})$
$s_4 = \sin(q_{21})$	$c_4 = \cos(q_{21})$
$s_5 = \sin(q_{22})$	$c_5 = \cos(q_{22})$
$s_6 = \sin(q_{23})$	$c_6 = \cos(q_{23})$

Table 3. Auxiliary definitions.

$\text{aux}_1 = \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \cos(2q_{12} + 2q_{13})$
$\text{aux}_2 = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(2q_{12} + 2q_{13})$
$\text{aux}_3 = s_3 + \sin(2q_{12} + q_{13})$
$\text{aux}_4 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos(2q_{12} + 2q_{13})$
$\text{aux}_5 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(2q_{12} + 2q_{13})$
$\text{aux}_6 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos(2q_{12})$
$\text{aux}_7 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \cos(2q_{12})$
$\text{aux}_8 = \left[\dot{q}_{12} \cos(2q_{12} + q_{13}) + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{13} c_3 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{13} \cos(2q_{12} + q_{13}) \right] \frac{1}{\text{seg}}$
$\text{aux}_9 = \left[\frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{13} \sin(2q_{12} + 2q_{13}) + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{12} \sin(2q_{12} + 2q_{13}) \right] \frac{1}{\text{seg}}$
$\text{aux}_{10} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} c_3 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_{11} \cos(2q_{12} + q_{13}) \right] \frac{1}{\text{seg}}$

Table 4. Auxiliary variables in the model of the robot arm A465.

Tables 1. and 2 show the parameter values, and Tables 3 and 4 the auxiliary variables for both robots. The parameters for the different Jacobian matrices are presented in Table 5.

Robot arm A465	Robot arm A255
$d_{11} = 0.330$ [m]	$d_{21} = 0.381$ [m]
$a_{12} = 0.305$ [m]	$a_{22} = 0.254$ [m]
$d_{13} = 0.330$ [m]	$a_{23} = 0.254$ [m]
$d_{14} = 0.208$ [m]	$d_{24} = 0.183$ [m]

Table 5. Data of the different Jacobian matrices.

B Proof of Lemma 4.1

In this appendix Lemma 4.1 is proven, whose main assumption is that $\begin{bmatrix} s_i^T & r_i^T & \Delta F_i^T & \phi_i^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ is bounded by $x_{\max i}$ and tends to zero.

- a) First of all we show that Δp_i and $\Delta \dot{p}_i$ are bounded for all time, with $i = 1, \dots, l$.¹ To do this we use the fact that $J_{\varphi_i}(q_i)s_i = \Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i \Delta p_i - \bar{\xi}_i \phi_i - \xi_i \Delta F$ or

$$\Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i \Delta p_i = J_{\varphi_i}(q_i)s_i + \bar{\xi}_i \phi_i + \xi_i \Delta F. \quad (99)$$

The righthand side of equation (99) is bounded and tends to zero because of the assumption on x_i . Since the lefthand side of (99) represents a stable linear filter, both Δp_i and $\Delta \dot{p}_i$ must be bounded and tend to zero.

- b) The next step is to analyze the behavior of the tracking errors \tilde{q}_i and $\dot{\tilde{q}}_i$. Since x_i is bounded, so is s_i . According to (41), both s_{pi} and s_{fi} are bounded since they are orthogonal vectors. Note that s_{pi} can be written as

$$s_{pi} = Q_i(q_i)(\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i - \Lambda_i z_i) = (I - J_{\varphi_i}^+ J_{\varphi_i})(\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i - \Lambda_i z_i), \quad (100)$$

in view of the definition of $Q_i(q_i)$. Equation (100) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i = \underbrace{\Lambda_i z_i + Q_i(q_i)(\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i - \Lambda_i z_i)}_{\text{bounded}} - \underbrace{J_{\varphi_i}^+ J_{\varphi_i} \Lambda_i z_i}_{\text{bounded}} + \underbrace{J_{\varphi_i}^+ J_{\varphi_i}(\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i)}_{\text{bounded?}}. \quad (101)$$

One can be sure that the first terms in (101) are bounded because the case is being analyzed when x_i in (63) is bounded. The conclusion can be drawn from equations (13)-(14) (boundedness of $J_{\varphi_i}^+$ and J_{φ_i}), equations (51) and (63) (boundedness of z_i), and equation (100) (boundedness of $Q_i(q_i)(\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i - \Lambda_i z_i)$). It is then clear that if the last term of the

righthand side of (101) is bounded, then \tilde{q}_i and $\dot{\tilde{q}}_i$ must be bounded since the lefthand side of (101) represents a stable linear filter. Note then that

$$J_{\varphi_i} \dot{\tilde{q}}_i = \dot{p}_i - \dot{p}_{di} - (J_{\varphi_i} - J_{\varphi_{di}}) \dot{q}_{di} \quad (102)$$

is bounded, with $J_{\varphi_{di}} = J_{\varphi_i}(\dot{q}_{di})$. Thus, the lefthand side of (101) can only be unbounded if

$$J_{\varphi_i}^+ J_{\varphi_i} \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i = J_{\varphi_i}^+ J_{\varphi_i} \Lambda_i (q_i - q_{di})$$

is not bounded. But in fact this term will be bounded as long as q_i is. At this point we recall that, from Assumption 3.1, q_i must satisfy the constraint $\varphi_i(q_i) = 0$. Furthermore, it has been assumed that none of the robots is redundant nor it is in a singularity. Thus, the

¹ Note that we do this only for formality's sake, since these two errors are bounded and equal to zero for any time in view of the fact that all p_i , p_{di} , \dot{p}_i and \dot{p}_{di} .

constraint can only be satisfied by a finite bounded vector q_i . We can then conclude, that both \tilde{q}_i and $\dot{\tilde{q}}_i$ remain bounded as long as x_i is. To show that the tracking errors tend to zero whenever x_i does, we use the following approach. If $x_i \equiv 0$ then s_i becomes

$$Q_i(q_i)(\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i) + J_{\varphi_i}^+(q_i)(J_{\varphi_i}(q_i)\dot{q}_i - J_{\varphi_i}(q_{di})\dot{q}_{di} + \beta_i(\varphi_i(q_i) - \varphi_i(q_{di}))) = 0. \quad (103)$$

Suppose that $q_i \equiv q_{di}$, then (103) becomes

$$Q_i(q_i)\dot{\tilde{q}}_i + J_{\varphi_i}^+(q_i)J_{\varphi_i}(q_i)\dot{\tilde{q}}_i = \dot{\tilde{q}}_i = 0. \quad (104)$$

This shows that if $\|\tilde{q}_i\| \rightarrow 0$ then $\|\dot{\tilde{q}}_i\| \rightarrow 0$. In other words, by proving that \tilde{q}_i will tend to zero one can ensure that $\dot{\tilde{q}}_i$ will do it as well. Since homogeneous constraints are being used, the following relationship is satisfied

$$\Delta p_i = \varphi_i(q_i) - \varphi_i(q_{di}).$$

By developing a Taylor series around the desired trajectory q_{di} we have for $\varphi_i(q_i)$

$$\varphi_i(q_i) = \varphi_i(q_{di}) + \left. \frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial q_i} \right|_{q_i=q_{di}} (q_i - q_{di}) + \text{h. o. t.} \quad (105)$$

There exists a positive value η_i small enough such that if

$$\|q_i\| \leq \eta_i, \quad (106)$$

then the higher order terms in (105) can be neglected and the approximation

$$\Delta p_i = J_{\varphi_i}(q_{di})\tilde{q}_i, \quad (107)$$

becomes valid. The following discussion will be carried out assuming that (106) is holding. To prove that \tilde{q}_i tends to zero we require to find a dynamic equation which describes the behavior of this variable. It can be formed in the following fashion. From s_{pi} in (41) one gets

$$\tilde{q}_i^T s_{pi} = \tilde{q}_i^T \dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \tilde{q}_i^T \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i - \tilde{q}_i^T \Lambda_i z_i - \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \dot{\tilde{q}}_i - \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i + \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \Lambda_i z_i, \quad (108)$$

with $\bar{P}_i \triangleq J_{\alpha}^*(q_i)J_{\beta}(q_i)$. In view of the fact that

$$\tilde{q}_i^T \dot{\tilde{q}}_i = \|\tilde{q}_i\| \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{q}_i\|,$$

one can rewrite (108) as

$$\|\tilde{q}_i\| \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{q}_i\| = -\tilde{q}_i^T \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i + \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \Lambda_i \tilde{q}_i + \tilde{q}_i^T \Lambda_i z_i - \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \Lambda_i z_i + \tilde{q}_i^T s_{pi}. \quad (109)$$

To develop the righthand side of this equation we analyze the term $\tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \dot{\tilde{q}}_i$ first. From (102)

$$\Delta \dot{p}_i = J_{\varphi_i} \dot{\tilde{q}}_i + (J_{\varphi_i} - J_{\varphi_{di}}) \dot{q}_{di}. \quad (110)$$

By multiplying (107) by β_i and adding the result to (110) one gets

$$J_{\varphi_i} \dot{\tilde{q}}_i + \beta_i J_{\varphi_{di}} \dot{q}_{di} = \Delta \dot{p}_i - (J_{\varphi_i} - J_{\varphi_{di}}) \dot{q}_{di} + \beta_i \Delta p_i. \quad (111)$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \dot{\tilde{q}}_i &= \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^T (J_{\varphi_i} J_{\varphi_i}^T)^{-1} J_{\varphi_i} \dot{\tilde{q}}_i \\ &= -\beta_i \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \tilde{q}_i + \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^+ \Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^+ \Delta p_i - \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^+ (J_{\varphi_i} - J_{\varphi_{di}}) (\dot{q}_{di} - \beta_i \tilde{q}_i).\end{aligned}\quad (112)$$

Substituting in (109) one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{q}_i\| \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{q}_i\| &= -k_i \|\tilde{q}_i\|^2 + (k_i - \beta_i) \tilde{q}_i^T \bar{P}_i \tilde{q}_i - \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^+ (J_{\varphi_i} - J_{\varphi_{di}}) (\dot{q}_{di} - \beta_i \tilde{q}_i) \\ &\quad + \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^+ (\Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i \Delta p_i) + k_i \tilde{q}_i^T Q_i z_i + \tilde{q}_i^T s_{pi},\end{aligned}\quad (113)$$

where the definition $\Lambda_i \triangleq k_i I$ has been used. In view of Assumption 3.2, the following bound can be established

$$\left\| \tilde{q}_i^T J_{\varphi_i}^+ (J_{\varphi_i} - J_{\varphi_{di}}) (\dot{q}_{di} - \beta_i \tilde{q}_i) \right\| \leq \gamma_i \|\tilde{q}_i\|^2, \quad (114)$$

with

$$\gamma_i \triangleq c_{0i} L_i (v_{mi} + \beta_i \eta_i). \quad (115)$$

v_{mi} is a bound for the desired velocity vector \dot{q}_{di} , i. e. $\|\dot{q}_{di}\| \leq v_{mi}$ for all time, and c_{0i} and L_i are defined in (13)-(14). On the other hand, from (41) you have

$$s_{pi} = s_i - J_{\varphi_i}^+ (q_i) (\Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i \Delta p_i - \bar{\xi}_i \phi_i - \xi_i \Delta F_i). \quad (116)$$

By substituting (114)-(116) in (113), taking norms and dividing by $\|\tilde{q}_i\|$ one gets

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{q}_i\| \leq -\alpha_i \|\tilde{q}_i\| + \|s_i\| + \lambda_{\max}(\bar{\xi}_i) c_{0i} \|\phi_i\| + \lambda_{\max}(\xi_i) c_{0i} \|\Delta F_i\| + k_i \|z_i\|, \quad (117)$$

with

$$\alpha_i \triangleq k_i - |k_i - \beta_i| - \gamma_i. \quad (118)$$

Note that k_i , β_i , v_{mi} and η_i , can always be chosen so as to get $\alpha_i > 0$ and that the last four elements of the righthand side of (117) are bounded since x_i is. However, (117) is valid only if (106) holds. Thus, in the end, it is not enough for x_i to be bounded. We must find a bound $x_{\max i}$ such that (106) holds. In order to guarantee this, $x_{\max i}$ should appear in (117) explicitly. Of course, if $\|x_i\| \leq x_{\max i}$, then one has

$$\|x_i\|^2 = \|s_i\|^2 + \|r_i\|^2 + \|\phi_i\|^2 + \|\Delta F_i\|^2 \leq x_{\max i}^2, \quad (119)$$

with $r_i = \dot{z}_i + \Lambda_i z_i$. Since in (117) one has z_i and not r_i , it should be noted that every

element of r_i is given by $r_{ij} = \dot{z}_{ij} + k_i z_{ij}$, for $j = 1, \dots, n_i$. This is a stable linear filter

with gain $\frac{1}{k_i}$, i.e. one has $|z_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{k_i} \max |r_{ij}| \quad \forall t$. Thus, it is straightforward to show that

$$\|z_i\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n_i}}{k_i} x_{\max i}, \quad (120)$$

which allows to rewrite (117) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{q}_i\| \leq -\alpha_i \|\tilde{q}_i\| + \sigma_i, \quad (121)$$

with

$$\sigma_i \triangleq (1 + \lambda_{\max}(\bar{\xi}_i) c_{0i} + \lambda_{\max}(\xi_i) c_{0i} + \sqrt{n_i}) x_{\max i}. \quad (122)$$

From the Comparison Lemma (Khalil 2002), it is

$$\|\tilde{q}_i(t)\| \leq \frac{\sigma_i}{\alpha_i} + e^{-\alpha_i t} \left(\|\tilde{q}_i(0)\| - \frac{\sigma_i}{\alpha_i} \right) \quad (123)$$

for all time. Equation (106) will be satisfied for sure if

$$\|\tilde{q}_i(0)\| \leq \frac{\sigma_i}{\alpha_i} = \frac{(1 + \lambda_{\max}(\bar{\xi}_i)c_{0i} + \lambda_{\max}(\xi_i)c_{0i} + \sqrt{n_i})x_{\max i}}{\alpha_i} \leq \eta_i. \quad (124)$$

Equation (124) can be accomplished if

$$x_{\max i} \leq \frac{\eta_i \alpha_i}{1 + \lambda_{\max}(\bar{\xi}_i)c_{0i} + \lambda_{\max}(\xi_i)c_{0i} + \sqrt{n_i}}. \quad (125)$$

Finally, if $\|x_i\|$ tends to zero, it is clear from (117) that $\|\tilde{q}_i\|$ will do it as well. Recall that this implies the convergence to zero of $\|\dot{\tilde{q}}_i\|$.

- c) When x_i (and thus ΔF_i) tend to zero, $\Delta \lambda_i$ does not necessarily do it nor remains bounded. In order to prove that, one may use the fact that $J_{\phi_i}(q_i)s_i = \Delta \dot{p}_i + \beta_i \Delta p_i - \bar{\xi}_i \phi_i - \xi_i \Delta F_i = -\bar{\xi}_i \phi_i - \xi_i \Delta F_i$. The last equality is valid since constraint (6) must be satisfied. Thus you have

$$J_{\phi_i}(q_i)\dot{s}_i + \dot{J}_{\phi_i}(q_i)s_i = -\bar{\xi}_i \zeta_i - \xi_i \Delta \lambda_i = \bar{\xi}_i A_i \phi_i - \bar{\xi}_i B_i \Delta \lambda_i - \xi_i \Delta \lambda_i, \quad (126)$$

or

$$\Delta \lambda_i = -(\bar{\xi}_i B_i + \xi_i)^{-1} (J_{\phi_i}(q_i)\dot{s}_i + \dot{J}_{\phi_i}(q_i)s_i - \bar{\xi}_i A_i \phi_i), \quad (127)$$

Where (45) has been used. Since from (57) \dot{s}_i is bounded when x_i is, we conclude that $\Delta \lambda_i$ must be bounded (recall the assumption on \dot{q}_i). Finally, if x_i tends to zero then \dot{s}_i , s_i and ϕ_i do and we arrive to the conclusion that $\Delta \lambda_i$ tends to zero as well.

C Positive definiteness of $V_i(x_i)$ in (65)

To prove that $V_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}x_i^T (\text{block diag}\{H_i(q_i), H_i(q_i), R_i\})x_i$ in (65) is actually a positive definite function, recall first that such a function must satisfy that $V_i(0) = 0$ and $V_i(x_i) > 0$ for $x_i \neq 0$. Since $H_i(q_i)$ is a positive definite matrix, the single problem is that R_i in (66) is only semipositive definite. However, developing the term in (65) which involves R_i yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_i^T & \Delta F_i^T \end{bmatrix} R_i \begin{bmatrix} \phi_i \\ \Delta F_i \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \left(B_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi_i - B_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta F_i \right)^T N_i \left(B_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi_i - B_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta F_i \right), \quad (128)$$

since B_i is a positive definite diagonal matrix. In view of the fact that $N_i > 0$, (128) can only be zero if

$$\phi_i = B_i \Delta F_i. \quad (129)$$

On the other hand, note that $V_i(x_i)$ includes a term $\frac{1}{2}s_i^T H_i(q_i)s_i$ which can be zero only if $s_i = 0$. Otherwise, it is positive. But from (41) you have $s_i = s_{pi} + s_{fi}$, where s_{pi} and s_{fi} are

orthogonal, so that they both must be zero in order for S_i to be zero. In particular, one has $s_{fi} = J_{\varphi_i}^+(q_i)(\Delta\dot{p}_i + \beta_i\Delta p_i - \bar{\xi}_i\phi_i - \xi_i\Delta F_i)$, with $J_{\varphi_i}^+(q_i)$ full rank. Then, in view of constraint (6), you have that S_{fi} becomes zero only if $\bar{\xi}_i\phi_i + \xi_i\Delta F_i$ does, that is if

$$\phi_i = -\bar{\xi}_i^{-1}\xi_i\Delta F_i. \quad (130)$$

Comparing (129) with (130) one concludes that $\frac{1}{2}s_i^T H_i(q_i)s_i$ and (128) cannot be simultaneously zero unless both ϕ_i and ΔF_i are, because B_i , $\bar{\xi}_i$ and ξ_i are all positive definite diagonal matrices. In other words, $V_i(x_i) = 0$ if and only if $x_i = 0$. Thus, it is a (continuous) positive definite function.

D Proof of Theorem 4.1

Recall the following well known theorem (Khalil 2002, pp. 100)

Theorem D.1 *Let $x = 0$ be an equilibrium point for $\dot{x} = f(x)$ and $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain containing $x = 0$. Let $V : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuously differentiable function, such that $V(0) = 0$ and $V(x) > 0$ in $\mathbb{D} - \{0\}$, and $\dot{V}(x) \leq 0$ in \mathbb{D} . Then, $x = 0$ is stable. Moreover, if $\dot{V}(x) < 0$ in $\mathbb{D} - \{0\}$ then $x = 0$ is asymptotically stable.* Δ

To take advantage of Theorem D.1, we just have to find domains \mathbb{D}_i for which each $V_i(x_i)$ satisfies $\dot{V}_i(x_i) < 0$ in $\mathbb{D}_i - \{0\}$ (because each $V_i(x_i)$ is positive definite in \mathbb{R}^n). In doing so, one can prove that $x_i \rightarrow 0$ for all i . Then, Lemma 4.1 can be employed to analyze the behavior of the different error signals. Based on the discussion given in Appendix B, we define each domain \mathbb{D}_i as

$$\mathbb{D}_i = \{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \mid \|x_i\| \leq x_{\max i}\}, \quad (131)$$

where $x_{\max i}$ is chosen to satisfy (125) and cannot be done arbitrarily large. In \mathbb{D}_i one can define

$$\mu_{1i} \triangleq \max_{\|x_i\| \leq x_{\max i}} \|C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_{ri})\| \quad (132)$$

$$\mu_{2i} \triangleq \max_{\|x_i\| \leq x_{\max i}} \|C_i(q_i, s_i + \dot{q}_{ri})\| \quad (133)$$

$$\mu_{3i} \triangleq \max_{\|x_i\| \leq x_{\max i}} \|C_i(q_i, s_i + 2\dot{q}_{ri})\| \quad (134)$$

$$\mu_{4i} \triangleq M_{ei}(x_{\max i})\lambda_{4i} \quad (135)$$

$$\lambda_{Di} \triangleq \lambda_{\max}(D_i) \quad (136)$$

Note that it is straightforward to compute (132)-(136) as functions of the different constants defined throughout the paper, but we skip it for simplicity's sake. The next step is to compute the derivative of the Lyapunov function candidate in (65), which can be rewritten as

$$V_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}s_i^T H_i(q_i)s_i + \frac{1}{2}r_i^T H_i(q_i)r_i + \frac{1}{2}[\phi_i^T \quad \Delta F_i^T] \begin{bmatrix} N_i B_i^{-1} & -N_i \\ -N_i & N_i B_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_i \\ \Delta F_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the derivative of (65) along (42), (45), (57) and (62) can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_i(x_i) = & \frac{1}{2} s_i^T \dot{H}_i(q_i) s_i + \frac{1}{2} r_i^T \dot{H}_i(q_i) r_i - s_i^T C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) s_i - s_i^T K_{DRi} s_i \\
& + s_i^T K_{Ri} r_i + s_i^T J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i) (B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + K_{Fi} \Delta F_i) - s_i^T C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) s_i \\
& + s_i^T H_i(q_i) e_i(r_i) - r_i^T C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) r_i - r_i^T H_{rdi} r_i + r_i^T C_i(q_i, s_i + \dot{q}_i) r_i \\
& - r_i^T C_i(q_i, s_i + 2\dot{q}_i) s_i - r_i^T K_{DRi} s_i + r_i^T J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i) (B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + K_{Fi} \Delta F_i) \\
& + \begin{bmatrix} \phi_i^T & \Delta F_i^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} N_i B_i^{-1} & -N_i \\ -N_i & N_i B_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_i \\ \Delta \lambda_i \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

To simplify (137) one should take into account that $s_i^T K_{Ri} r_i - s_i^T K_{DRi} r_i = -s_i^T D_i r_i$ and that $s_i^T J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i) (B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + K_{Fi} \Delta F_i) = -\phi_i^T \bar{\xi}_i B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i - \phi_i^T (\bar{\xi}_i K_{Fi} + \xi_i B_i^{-1} A_i) \Delta F_i - \Delta F_i^T \xi_i K_{Fi} \Delta F_i$. The last equality is valid in view of Property 3.5, from (41) and by the fact that constraint (6) must be satisfied for p_i , \dot{p}_i , p_{di} and \dot{p}_{di} . Furthermore, one has

$$\begin{bmatrix} \phi_i^T & \Delta F_i^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} N_i B_i^{-1} & -N_i \\ -N_i & N_i B_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_i \\ \Delta \lambda_i \end{bmatrix} = -\phi_i^T N_i B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + \Delta F_i^T N_i A_i \phi_i$$

in view of (45). Recalling that $N_i = (\xi_i B_i^{-1} A_i + \bar{\xi}_i K_{Fi}) A_i^{-1}$ and defining

$E_i \triangleq \bar{\xi}_i B_i^{-1} A_i + \xi_i B_i^{-2} A_i + \bar{\xi}_i K_{Fi} B_i^{-1}$, (137) can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_i(x_i) \leq & -s_i^T K_{Ri} s_i - r_i^T H_{rdi} r_i - \phi_i^T E_i \phi_i - \Delta F_i^T \xi_i K_{Fi} \Delta F_i - s_i^T D_i r_i + s_i^T H_i(q_i) e_i(r_i) \\
& - r_i^T C_i(q_i, s_i + 2\dot{q}_i) s_i + r_i^T J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i) B_i^{-1} A_i \phi_i + r_i^T J_{\phi_i}^T(q_i) K_{Fi} \Delta F_i \\
& - s_i^T C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) s_i + r_i^T C_i(q_i, s_i + \dot{q}_i) r_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

by taking Property 3.2 into account. Since we are only interested in the behavior of $\dot{V}_i(x_i)$ for x_i in D_i , we have from (132)-(136)

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_i(x_i) \leq & -\lambda_{\min}(K_{Ri}) \|s_i\|^2 - \lambda_{\min}(H_{rdi}) \|r_i\|^2 - \lambda_{\min}(E_i) \|\phi_i\|^2 - \lambda_{\min}(\xi_i K_{Fi}) \|\Delta F_i\|^2 \\
& + \mu_{1i} \|s_i\|^2 + \mu_{2i} \|r_i\|^2 + (\lambda_{Di} + \mu_{3i} + \mu_{4i}) \|s_i\| \|r_i\| \\
& + c_{1i} b_i a_i \|r_i\| \|\phi_i\| + c_{1i} \lambda_{\max}(K_{Fi}) \|r_i\| \|\Delta F_i\|,
\end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

where c_{1i} is given in (14) and

$$b_i \triangleq \max\{b_{jj}^{-1}\} \tag{140}$$

$$a_i \triangleq \max\{a_{jj}\}. \tag{141}$$

a_{jj} and b_{jj} , with $j = 1, \dots, n_i$, are elements of A_i and B_i , respectively. The next step is to choose the different gains to guarantee that $\dot{V}_i(x_i) < 0$ in $D_i - \mathbf{0}$. First of all, consider $\lambda_{\min}(K_{Ri})$ in (70) and k_{di} in (71), such that one has from the first line of (139)

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (\mu_{1i} + 1 + \delta_i) \|s_i\|^2 - \left(\lambda_{hi} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}(K_{Ri}) + w_i}{\lambda_{hi}} \right) - \lambda_{\max}(K_{Ri}) \right) \|r_i\|^2 \leq \\
& - \delta_i \|s_i\|^2 - \delta_i \|r_i\|^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4} c_{1i}^2 a_i^2 b_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} c_{1i}^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(K_{Fi}) \right) \|r_i\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

because $w_i = \mu_{2i} + \frac{1}{4} (\lambda_{Di} + \mu_{3i} + \mu_{4i})^2 + \delta_i + \frac{1}{4} c_{1i}^2 a_i^2 b_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} c_{1i}^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(K_{Fi})$. Thus, (139) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \leq & -\delta_i \|\mathbf{s}_i\|^2 - \delta_i \|\mathbf{r}_i\|^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4} c_{1i}^2 a_i^2 b_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} c_{1i}^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(\mathbf{K}_{Fi}) \right) \|\mathbf{r}_i\|^2 \\ & - \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{E}_i) \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_i\|^2 - \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \mathbf{K}_{Fi}) \|\Delta \mathbf{F}_i\|^2 \\ & + c_{1i} a_i b_i \|\mathbf{r}_i\| \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_i\| + c_{1i} \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{K}_{Fi}) \|\mathbf{r}_i\| \|\Delta \mathbf{F}_i\|. \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

Finally, by considering $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{E}_i)$ in (72) and $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \mathbf{K}_{Fi})$ in (73) it is easy to conclude that

$$\dot{V}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \leq -\delta_i \|\mathbf{s}_i\|^2 - \delta_i \|\mathbf{r}_i\|^2 - \delta_i \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_i\|^2 - \delta_i \|\Delta \mathbf{F}_i\|^2, \quad (143)$$

or

$$\dot{V}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \leq -\delta_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2. \quad (144)$$

By applying Theorem D.1 one concludes that $\mathbf{x}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$. Now, from definition (51) one has directly

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\mathbf{z}}_i = \mathbf{0}.$$

Furthermore, in view of (131) one has $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq x_{\max i}$ (and thus $\|\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\| \leq \eta_i$ from the discussion in Appendix B). Thus, from Lemma 4.1 a) and b), we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \dot{\mathbf{p}}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i = \mathbf{0}.$$

To applied c) of Lemma 4.1, we only need to show that $\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}_i$ is bounded. This is certainly the case because $\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}_i$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_{di}$ are bounded. Thus we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \mathcal{A}_i = \mathbf{0}.$$

Finally, the stability of the whole system can be proven using

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^l V_i(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

It should be noted that a region of attraction has not been given explicitly. However, it is a subset of \mathcal{D}_τ and cannot be made arbitrarily large because of the fact that $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq \eta_i$ must hold for all time (and thus $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq x_{\max i}$ must be valid as well), with η_i small enough.

7. References

- Arteaga Pérez, M. (1998). On the properties of a dynamic model of flexible robot manipulators. *ASME Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*. Vol. 120, 8-14.
- Arteaga Pérez, M. & R. Kelly. (2004). Robot control without velocity measurements: New theory and experimental results. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*. Vol. 20, No. 2, 297-308.
- Baumgarte, J. (1972). Stabilization of constraints and integrals of motion in dynamical systems. *Comput. Meth. Appl. Mech. Eng.* Vol. 1, 1-16.
- Cole, A. (1990). Constrained motion of grasped objects by hybrid control. *Proceedings of the 1990 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. 1954-1960.
- Cole, A., P. Hsu & S. Sastry. (1992). Dynamic control of sliding by robot hands for *regrasping*. *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. Vol. 8, 42-52.

- Gudiño-Lau, J., M. Arteaga Pérez, L. Muñoz & V. Parra-Vega. 2004. On the control of cooperative robots without velocity measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*. Vol. 12, No. 4, 600–608.
- Gudiño-Lau, J. & M. Arteaga Pérez. 2005. Dynamic model and simulation of cooperative robots: a case study. *ROBOTICA*. Vol. 23, 615–624.
- Jankowski, K., H. ElMaraghy & W. ElMaraghy. 1993. Dynamic coordination of multiple robot arms with flexible joints. *International Journal of Robotics Research*. Vol. 12, No. 6, 505–528.
- Khalil, H. (2002). *Nonlinear Systems Third Edition*. U.S.A.: Prentice Hall. 746p.
- Khatib, O. (1987). A unified approach for motion and force control of robot manipulators: The operational space formulation. *IEEE Journal on Robotics and Automation*. Vol. 3, 43–53.
- Kuc, T., J. Lee & B. Park. (1994). Learning control of cooperating robot manipulators handling an unknown object. *IEEE International Conference on System*. Vol. 3, 3354–3339.
- Li, z. & S. Sastry. (1989). Grasping and coordinated manipulation by a multifingered robot hand. *International Journal of Robotics Research*. Vol. 8, No. 4, 33–50.
- Liu, G., J. Li & Z. Li. (2002). Coordinated manipulation of objects by multifingered robotic hand in contact space and active joint space. *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. Vol. 4, 3743–3748.
- Liu, Y., S. Arimoto, V. Parra-Vega & K. Kitagaki. (1997). Decentralized adaptive control of multiple manipulators in cooperations. *International Journal of Control*. Vol. 67, No. 5, 649–673.
- Mason, M. & J. Salisbury. (1985). *Robot Hands and the Mechanics of Manipulation*. London: The MIT Press.
- Montana, D. (1988). The kinematics of contact and grasp. *International Journal of Robotics Research*. Vol. 7, No. 3, 743–748.
- Murray, R., Z. Li & S. Sastry. (1994). *A Mathematical Introduction to Robotic Manipulation*. Boca Raton, Florida, U. S. A.: CRC Press.
- Naniwa, T., S. Arimoto & K. Wada. (1997). Learning and adaptive controls for coordination of multiple manipulators holding a geometrically constrained object. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots*. Vol. 1, 484–494.
- Orin, D. & S. Oh. (1981). Control of force distribution in robotic mechanisms containing closed kinematics chains. *ASME Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*. Vol. 102, 134–141.
- Parra-Vega, V. & S. Arimoto. (1996). A passivity-based adaptive sliding mode position-force control for robot manipulators. *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*. Vol. 10, 365–377.
- Parra-Vega, V., A. Rodríguez-Ángeles, S. Arimoto & G. Hirzinger. (2001). High precision constrained grasping with cooperative adaptive control. *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic System*. Vol. 32, 235–254.
- Schlegl, T., M. Buss, T. Omata & G. Schmidt. (2001). Fast dextrous regrasping with optimal contact forces and contact sensor based impedance control. *IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*. 103–109.

Sciavicco, L. & B. Siciliano. (2000). *Modeling and Control of Robot Manipulators*. 2th Edition: McGraw-Hill.

Yoshikawa, T. & X. Zheng. (1991). Coordinated dynamic control for multiple robotic mechanisms handling an object. *IEEE/RSJ International Workshop on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. 315–320.

IntechOpen



Mobile Robotics, Moving Intelligence

Edited by Jonas Buchli

ISBN 3-86611-284-X

Hard cover, 586 pages

Publisher Pro Literatur Verlag, Germany / ARS, Austria

Published online 01, December, 2006

Published in print edition December, 2006

This book covers many aspects of the exciting research in mobile robotics. It deals with different aspects of the control problem, especially also under uncertainty and faults. Mechanical design issues are discussed along with new sensor and actuator concepts. Games like soccer are a good example which comprise many of the aforementioned challenges in a single comprehensive and in the same time entertaining framework. Thus, the book comprises contributions dealing with aspects of the Robotcup competition. The reader will get a feel how the problems cover virtually all engineering disciplines ranging from theoretical research to very application specific work. In addition interesting problems for physics and mathematics arises out of such research. We hope this book will be an inspiring source of knowledge and ideas, stimulating further research in this exciting field. The promises and possible benefits of such efforts are manifold, they range from new transportation systems, intelligent cars to flexible assistants in factories and construction sites, over service robot which assist and support us in daily live, all the way to the possibility for efficient help for impaired and advances in prosthetics.

How to reference

In order to correctly reference this scholarly work, feel free to copy and paste the following:

Jorge Gudino-Lau and Marco A. Arteaga (2006). Dynamic Model, Control and Simulation of Cooperative Robots: A Case Study, Mobile Robotics, Moving Intelligence, Jonas Buchli (Ed.), ISBN: 3-86611-284-X, InTech, Available from:

http://www.intechopen.com/books/mobile_robotics_moving_intelligence/dynamic_model__control_and_simulation_of_cooperative_robots__a_case_study

INTECH
open science | open minds

InTech Europe

University Campus STeP Ri
Slavka Krautzeka 83/A
51000 Rijeka, Croatia
Phone: +385 (51) 770 447
Fax: +385 (51) 686 166
www.intechopen.com

InTech China

Unit 405, Office Block, Hotel Equatorial Shanghai
No.65, Yan An Road (West), Shanghai, 200040, China
中国上海市延安西路65号上海国际贵都大饭店办公楼405单元
Phone: +86-21-62489820
Fax: +86-21-62489821

© 2006 The Author(s). Licensee IntechOpen. This chapter is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike-3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/), which permits use, distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the original is properly cited and derivative works building on this content are distributed under the same license.

IntechOpen

IntechOpen