Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering 383

Joaquim Filipe Kurosh Madani Oleg Gusikhin Jurek Sasiadek *Editors*

Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics 12th International Conference, ICINCO 2015 Colmar, France, July 21–23, 2015 Revised Selected Papers



Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering

Volume 383

Board of Series editors

Leopoldo Angrisani, Napoli, Italy Marco Arteaga, Coyoacán, México Samarjit Chakraborty, München, Germany Jiming Chen, Hangzhou, P.R. China Tan Kay Chen, Singapore, Singapore Rüdiger Dillmann, Karlsruhe, Germany Haibin Duan, Beijing, China Gianluigi Ferrari, Parma, Italy Manuel Ferre, Madrid, Spain Sandra Hirche, München, Germany Faryar Jabbari, Irvine, USA Janusz Kacprzyk, Warsaw, Poland Alaa Khamis, New Cairo City, Egypt Torsten Kroeger, Stanford, USA Tan Cher Ming, Singapore, Singapore Wolfgang Minker, Ulm, Germany Pradeep Misra, Dayton, USA Sebastian Möller, Berlin, Germany Subhas Mukhopadyay, Palmerston, New Zealand Cun-Zheng Ning, Tempe, USA Toyoaki Nishida, Sakyo-ku, Japan Bijaya Ketan Panigrahi, New Delhi, India Federica Pascucci, Roma, Italy Tariq Samad, Minneapolis, USA Gan Woon Seng, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore Germano Veiga, Porto, Portugal Haitao Wu, Beijing, China Junjie James Zhang, Charlotte, USA

About this Series

"Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering (LNEE)" is a book series which reports the latest research and developments in Electrical Engineering, namely:

- Communication, Networks, and Information Theory
- Computer Engineering
- Signal, Image, Speech and Information Processing
- Circuits and Systems
- Bioengineering

LNEE publishes authored monographs and contributed volumes which present cutting edge research information as well as new perspectives on classical fields, while maintaining Springer's high standards of academic excellence. Also considered for publication are lecture materials, proceedings, and other related materials of exceptionally high quality and interest. The subject matter should be original and timely, reporting the latest research and developments in all areas of electrical engineering.

The audience for the books in LNEE consists of advanced level students, researchers, and industry professionals working at the forefront of their fields. Much like Springer's other Lecture Notes series, LNEE will be distributed through Springer's print and electronic publishing channels.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/7818

Joaquim Filipe · Kurosh Madani Oleg Gusikhin · Jurek Sasiadek Editors

Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics 12th International Conference, ICINCO 2015 Colmar, France, July 21-23, 2015 Revised Selected Papers



Editors Joaquim Filipe Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal Setúbal Portugal

Kurosh Madani University of Paris-EST Créteil (UPEC) Créteil France Oleg Gusikhin Ford Research and Advanced Engineering Dearborn, MI USA

Jurek Sasiadek Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Carleton University Ottawa, ON Canada

 ISSN 1876-1100
 ISSN 1876-1119
 (electronic)

 Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering
 ISBN 978-3-319-31896-7
 ISBN 978-3-319-31898-1
 (eBook)

 DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-31898-1
 ISBN 978-3-319-31898-1
 ISBN 978-3-319-31898-1
 ISBN 978-3-319-31898-1

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016935980

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

Preface

This book includes extended and revised versions of a set of selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics (ICINCO 2015) which is sponsored by the Institute for Systems and Technologies of Information, Control and Communication (INSTICC) and co-organized by the University of Haute Alsace. ICINCO is held in cooperation with the ACM Special Interest Group on Artificial Intelligence (ACM SIGAI), EUROMICRO, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI), Associação Portuguesa de Controlo Automático (APCA), The International Neural Network Society (INNS), Asia Pacific Neural Network Assembly (APNNA) and euRobotics AISBL (Association Internationale Sans But Lucratif). ICINCO is also technically co-sponsored by IEEE Control Systems Society (CSS) and IEEE Robotics and Automation Society and co-sponsored by International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC).

ICINCO 2015 received 214 paper submissions, including special sessions, from 42 countries in all continents, of which 44 % were orally presented (14 % as full papers). In order to evaluate each submission, a double-blind paper review was performed by the Program Committee. As in previous editions of the conference, based on the reviewer's evaluations and the presentations, a short list of authors were invited to submit extended versions of their papers for this book. The selected papers reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the conference as well as the logic equilibrium of the four tracks: Intelligent Control Systems and Optimization, Robotics and Automation, Signal Processing, Sensors, Systems Modelling and Control, and Industrial Informatics. The diversity of topics is an important feature of this conference, enabling an overall perception of several important scientific and technological trends.

Furthermore, ICINCO 2015 included four keynote lectures, given by internationally recognized researchers: Krzysztof Kozlowski (Poznan University of Technology, Poland), Gerhard Schweitzer (ETH Zurich, Switzerland), Oliver Brock (TU Berlin, Germany), and Faïz Ben Amar (Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Institut Systèmes Intelligents et de Robotique, France). We would like to express our appreciation to all of them and in particular to those who took the time to contribute to this book with a paper.

On behalf of the conference organizing committee, we would like to thank all participants, in particular all the authors, whose quality work is the essence of the conference and the members of the Program Committee, who helped us with their valuable expertise and diligence in reviewing the submitted papers. As we all know, organizing a conference requires the effort of many individuals. We wish also to thank all the members of our organizing committee, whose work and commitment were invaluable. Aiming to provide the potential readers with an objective overview of the latest advances in the four major topics of the conference mentioned above, we hope that this book will be relevant for all researchers and practitioners whose work is related to using informatics in control, robotics, or automation.

July 2015

Joaquim Filipe Kurosh Madani Oleg Gusikhin Jurek Sasiadek

Organization

Conference Co-Chairs

Joaquim Filipe, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal/INSTICC, Portugal Kurosh Madani, University of Paris-EST Créteil (UPEC), France

Program Co-Chairs

Oleg Gusikhin, Ford Research and Advanced Engineering, United States Jurek Sasiadek, Carleton University, Canada

Program Committee

Andrew Adamatzky, University of the West of England, UK El-Houssaine Aghezzaf, Ghent University, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Belgium Eugenio Aguirre, University of Granada, Spain Adel Al-Jumaily, University of Technology Sydney, Australia Yacine Amirat, University Paris Est Créteil (UPEC), France Nicolas Andreff, Femto-ST Institute, France Rui Araujo, University of Coimbra, Portugal T. Asokan, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, India Ruth Bars, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary Laxmidhar Behera, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, India Carsten Behn, Ilmenau University of Technology, Germany Karsten Berns, University of Kaiserslautern, Germany Mauro Birattari, IRIDIA-CoDE, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium Jean-louis Boimond, ISTIA-LISA, France Marvin Bugeja, University of Malta, Malta Edmund Burke, University of Nottingham, UK

viii

Kevin Burn, University of Sunderland, UK Kenneth Camilleri, University of Malta, Malta Giuseppe Carbone, LARM-Laboratory of Robotics and Mechatronics, Italy Alessandro Casavola, University of Calabria, Italy Riccardo Cassinis, University of Brescia, Italy Marco Castellani, University of Birmingham, UK Xu Cheng, Emerson Electric, United States Tsung-Che Chiang, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan Sung-Bae Cho, Yonsei University, Korea, Republic of Paul Christodoulides, Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus Chengbin Chu, Ecole Centrale Paris, France Feng Chu, University of Evry Val d'Essonne, France Daisuke Chugo, Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan Carlos Coello, CINVESTAV-IPN, Mexico James M. Conrad, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, United States Hugo Costelha, Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal Erik Cuevas, Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico Prithviraj (Raj) Dasgupta, University of Nebraska, United States Kamil Dedecius, Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Academy of Sciences of the CZ, Czech Republic Kyriakos Deliparaschos, Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus Mingcong Deng, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Japan Wenjie Dong, University of Texas Pan American, United States Xingye Dong, Beijing Jiaotong University, China António Dourado, University of Coimbra, Portugal Vasile Dragan, Romanian Academy, Romania Venky Dubey, Bournemouth University, UK Ioan Dumitrache, University "Polytechnica" of Bucharest, Romania Richard J. Duro, Universidade Da Coruña, Spain Vaclav Dvorak, Brno University of Technology, Czech Republic Marc Ebner, Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald, Germany Petr Ekel, Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais, Brazil Mohammed El-Abd, American University of Kuwait, Kuwait Simon G. Fabri, University of Malta, Malta Christophe Farges, Bordeaux University, IMS-UMR 5218 CNRS, France David Feil-Seifer, University of Nevada Reno, United States David Fernández-Llorca, University of Alcalá, Spain Antoine Ferreira, INSA Centre Val de Loire, France Juan J. Flores, University of Michoacan, Mexico Mauro Franceschelli, Università di Cagliari, Italy Georg Frey, Saarland University, Germany Toyomi Fujita, Department of Electronics and Intelligent Systems, Japan Mauro Gaggero, National Research Council of Italy, Italy Maria I. Garcia-Planas, Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya, Spain Ryszard Gessing, Silesian University of Technology, Poland

Lazea Gheorghe, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Paulo Gil, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal Giuseppina Gini, Politecnico di Milano, Italy Maria Gini, University of Minnesota, United States Arthur Gómez, Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brazil Amr Goneid, The American University in Cairo, Egypt Bhaskaran Gopalakrishnan, West Virginia University, United States Lucian Teodor Grigorie, University of Craiova, Romania Lech Grzesiak, Warsaw University of Technology, Poland Kevin Guelton, University of Reims Champagne-Ardenne, France Deepak Gupta, Wichita State University, United States Maki K. Habib, The American University in Cairo, Egypt Jörg Hähner, Universität Augsburg, Germany Wolfgang Halang, Fernuniversitaet, Germany Kensuke Harada, AIST, Japan Jennifer Harding, Loughborough University, UK Dominik Henrich, University of Bayreuth, Germany Suranga Hettiarachchi, Indiana University Southeast, United States Diana Hintea, Coventry University, United Kingdom Yasuhisa Hirata, Tohoku University, Japan Mathieu Hobon, ENSAM-LCFC, France Wladyslaw Homenda, Warsaw University of Technology, Poland Atsushi Imiya, IMIT Chiba University, Japan Gianluca Ippoliti, Universita' Politecnica delle Marche, Italy Mircea Ivanescu, University of Craiova, Romania Sarangapani Jagannathan, Missouri University of Science and Technology, United States Michael Jenkin, York University, Canada Wootae Jeong, Korea Railroad Research Institute, Korea, Republic of Michail Kalogiannakis, University of Crete, Greece Vikram Kapila, NYU Polytechnic School of Engineering, United States Tohru Kawabe, University of Tsukuba, Japan Graham Kendall, University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus, Malaysia Sarath Kodagoda, University of Technology Sydney, Australia Israel Koren, University of Massachusetts, United States Krzysztof Kozlowski, Poznan University of Technology, Poland Ondrej Krejcar, University of Hradec Kralove, Czech Republic Masao Kubo, Narional Defense Academy of Japan, Japan Barbara Kühnlenz, Coburg University of Applied Sciences, Germany Kolja Kühnlenz, University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Germany Nikolay Vladimirovich Kuznetsov, Saint-Petersburg State University, Russian Federation Sébastien Lahaye, Istia-LARIS, France Jimmy Lauber, University of Valenciennes, France Sangyoon Lee, Connecticut College, United States

Dimitri Lefebvre, Greah Université Le Havre, France Kauko Leiviskä, University of Oulu, Finland Gennady Leonov, Saint-Petersburg State University, Russian Federation Kang Li, Queen's University Belfast, UK Tsai-Yen Li, National Chengchi University, Taiwan Gordon Lightbody, University College Cork, Ireland Veronique Limère, Ghent University, Belgium Huei-Yung Lin, National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan Guoping Liu, University of South Wales, UK Paolo Lollini, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italy Antonio Mendes Lopes, University of Porto, Portugal Luís Seabra Lopes, University of Aveiro, Portugal Sérgio F. Lopes, University of Minho, Portugal Gonzalo Lopez-Nicolas, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain Martin Lukac, Tohoku University, Japan Danilo Maccio, National Research Council of Italy, Italy José Tenreiro Machado, Institute of Engineering, Polytechnic of Porto, Portugal Anthony Maciejewski, Colorado State University, United States Kurosh Madani, University of Paris-EST Créteil (UPEC), France Magdi S. Mahmoud, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia Frederic Maire, Queensland University of Technology, Australia Om Malik, University of Calgary, Canada Stamatis Manesis, University of Patras, Greece Fabio Marchese, Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca, Italy Philippe Martinet, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, France Alicja Mazur, Wroclaw University of Technology, Poland Ross McAree, University of Queensland, Australia Luis Merino, Pablo de Olavide University, Spain Konstantinos Michail, Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus Sanya Mitaim, Thammasat University, Thailand Sara Moein, Multimedia University, Malaysia Francesco Carlo Morabito, University Mediterranea of Reggio Calabria, Italy Cesar de Prada Moraga, Universidad de Valladolid, Spain Vladimir Mostyn, VSB-Technical University of Ostrava, Czech Republic Vassilis C. Moulianitis, University of the Aegean, Greece George Moustris, National Technical University of Athens, Greece Riccardo Muradore, University of Verona, Italy Shimon Y. Nof, Purdue University, United States Juan A. Nolazco-Flores, ITESM, Campus Monterrey, Mexico Andrzej Obuchowicz, University of Zielona Góra, Poland José Valente de Oliveira, Universidade do Algarve, Portugal Lei Pan, Southeast University, China Gordon Parker, Michigan Technological University, United States Igor Paromtchik, INRIA, France

Ignacio Parra-Alonso, University of Alcalá, Spain Pushparaj Mani Pathak, Indian Institute of Technology. India Dimitri Peaucelle, LAAS-CNRS, France Carlos Eduardo Pereira, Federal University of Rio Grande Do Sul-UFRGS, Brazil D.T. Pham, The University of Birmingham, UK Angel P. Del Pobil, Universitat Jaume I, Spain Nirvana Popescu, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania David Powers, Flinders University, Australia Radu-Emil Precup, Politehnica University of Timisoara, Romania Libor Preucil, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic José Ragot, Centre de Recherche en Automatique de Nancy, France Oscar Reinoso, Miguel Hernandez University, Spain Mihailo Ristic, Imperial College London, UK Cameron Riviere, Carnegie Mellon University, United States Juha Röning, University of Oulu, Finland Mehdi Roopaei, University of Texas at San Antonio, United States Yassine Ruichek, Université de Technologie Belfort-Montbeliard, France Jocelyn Sabatier, IMS Laboratory -Bordeaux University, France Marco Sabatini, Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Italy Priti Srinivas Sajja, Sardar Patel University, India Antonio Sala, Universidad Politecnica de Valencia, Spain Abdel-Badeeh Mohamed Salem, Ain Shams University, Egypt Jurek Sasiadek, Carleton University, Canada Hideyuki Sawada, Kagawa University, Japan Daniel Schmidt, University of Kaiserslautern, Germany Gerald Seet, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore João Sequeira, Instituto Superior Técnico/Institute for Systems and Robotics, Portugal Roman Sergienko, Institute of Telecommunications Engineering, Ulm University, Germany Madhavan Shanmugavel, Monash University, Malaysia Jinhua She, Tokyo University of Technology, Japan Masahiro Shiomi, ATR—Agent Interaction Design Lab, Japan Michael Short, Teesside University, United Kingdom Vasile Sima, National Institute for Research & Development in Informatics, Romania Dan Simon, Cleveland State University, United States Daniel Simon, INRIA, France Olivier Simonin, INRIA-LORIA, France Andrzej Sluzek, Khalifa University, United Arab Emirates Jorge Solis, Karlstad University/Waseda University, Sweden Stefano Squartini, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy Burkhard Stadlmann, Upper Austria University of Applied Sciences, Wels, Austria Olaf Stursberg, University of Kassel, Germany

Raúl Suárez, Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya (UPC), Spain

Abdelhamid Tayebi, Lakehead University, Canada Hakan Temeltas, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey Daniel Thalmann, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore Simon Thompson, AIST, Japan Gui Yun Tian, Newcastle University, UK Dan Tiba, Institute of Mathematics Academia Romana, Romania Sven Tomforde, Augsburg University, Germany Wa-Muzemba Tshibangu, Morgan State University, United States Avgoustos Tsinakos, University of Kavala Institute of Technology/Athabasca University of Canada, Greece Antonios Tsourdos, Cranfield University, UK Ali Emre Turgut, Universite Libre de Bruxelle, Belgium Spyros Tzafestas, National Technical University of Athens, Greece Bartlomiej Ufnalski, Warsaw University of Technology, Poland Angel Valera, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain Bram Vanderborght, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium Cesar Vargas-Rosales, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Campus Monterrey, Mexico Ramiro Velazquez, Universidad Panamericana, Mexico Federico Vicentini, National Research Council of Italy (CNR), Italy Arnoud Visser, Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Netherlands Ljubo Vlacic, Griffith University, Australia Damir Vrancic, Jožef Stefan Institute, Slovenia Bernardo Wagner, Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany Feng Wan, University of Macau, Macau Jingyu Wang, Northwestern Polytechnical University (NPU), China Long Wang, Peking University, China Shengwei Wang, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University Kowloon, Hong Kong H.M. Wee, Chung Yuan Christian University, Taiwan James Whidborne, Cranfield University, United Kingdom Warren White, Kansas State University, United States Qinmin Yang, Zhejiang University, China Gang Yao, Shanghai Maritime University, China Weiwei Yu, Northwestern Polytechnical University, China Ludek Zalud, Brno University of Technology, Czech Republic Jie Zhang, University of Newcastle, United Kingdom Primo Zingaretti, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy Loredana Zollo, Università Campus Bio-Medico, Italy

Additional Reviewers

Mihaela Barreau, University of Angers, France Lukas Exel, AES, Germany Saïd Moussaoui, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, France Pietro Muraca, DEIMES, Italy Hassen Riahi, ISTIA, France Maximilian Sand, Universität Bayreuth, Germany Johannes Schmölz, Coburg University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Germany Adrian Stoica, University "Polytechnica" of Bucharest, Romania Francesco Tedesco, University of Calabria, Italy Teodor Tiplica, LARIS/istia, France Tobias Werner, Universität Bayreuth, Germany

Invited Speakers

Krzysztof Kozlowski, Poznan University of Technology, Poland Gerhard Schweitzer, ETH Zurich, Switzerland Oliver Brock, TU Berlin, Germany Faïz Ben Amar, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Institut Systèmes Intelligents et de Robotique, France

Contents

Part I Invited Papers

Formation Control and Vision Based Localization of a System of Mobile Robots	3
Krzysztof Kozłowski and Wojciech Kowalczyk	
Path Tracking Controllers for Fast Skidding Rover	29
Part II Intelligent Control Systems and Optimization	
Gravitational Search Algorithm-Based Evolving Fuzzy Models of a Nonlinear Process	51
Speech Phoneme Classification by Intelligent Decision-Level Fusion Fréjus A.A. Laleye, Eugène C. Ezin and Cina Motamed	63
Genetic Algorithm for Automated X-Ray Diffraction Full-Profile Analysis of Electrolyte Composition on Aluminium Smelters Alexandr Zaloga, Shakhnaz Akhmedova, Igor Yakimov, Sergey Burakov, Eugene Semenkin, Petr Dubinin, Oksana Piksina and Eugene Andryushchenko	79
Part III Robotics and Automation	
Improving the 3D Positioning for Low Cost Mobile Robots	97

Improving the 5D Positioning for Low Cost Mobile Robots			
Rafael Socas, Sebastian Dormido, Raquel Dormido			
and Ernesto Fabregas			

Kinematics, Simulation, and Analysis of the Planar and Symmetric Postures of a Serial-Parallel Climbing Robot Adrián Peidró, Arturo Gil, José María Marín, Yerai Berenguer and Óscar Reinoso	115
A Standing Assistance Scheme Using a Patient's Physical Strength by a Load Estimation Considering the Muscle Arrangements	
of a Human Leg	137
Multimodal Image Registration and Visual Servoing	157
Trajectory Tracking Control of an Excavator ArmUsing Guaranteed Cost ControlAlexander Gurko, Oleg Sergiyenko, Juan Ivan Nieto Hipólito,Igor Kirichenko, Vera Tyrsa and Wilmar Hernandez	177
Computation of Curvature Skeleton to Measure Deformations in Surfaces Carlos M. Mateo, Pablo Gil and Fernando Torres	197
On Structure and Distribution of Software for Mobile Manipulators Andreas Schierl, Andreas Angerer, Alwin Hoffmann, Michael Vistein and Wolfgang Reif	209
Combination of HMM and DTW for 3D Dynamic Gesture Recognition Using Depth Only Hajar Hiyadi, Fakhreddine Ababsa, Christophe Montagne, El Houssine Bouyakhf and Fakhita Regragui	229
Model-Free (Human) Tracking Based on Ground Truth with Time Delay: A 3D Camera Based Approach for Minimizing Tracking Latency and Increasing Tracking Quality Philip Nicolai, Jörg Raczkowsky and Heinz Wörn	247
Highly Parallelizable Algorithm for Keypoint Detection in 3-D Point Clouds. Jens Garstka and Gabriele Peters	267
3D Modelling of Biped Robot Locomotion with Walking Primitives Approach in Simulink Environment Ramil Khusainov, Ilya Shimchik, Ilya Afanasyev and Evgeni Magid	287

Contents

Part IV Signal Processing, Sensors, Systems Modelling and Control	
Freezing Method Approach to Stability Problems	307
Scanning Techniques with Low Bandwidth Radar for Robotic Mapping and Localization Paul Fritsche and Bernardo Wagner	321
Pole Placement of Linear Time-Varying Discrete Systems and Its Application to Trajectory Tracking Control of Nonlinear Systems Yasuhiko Mutoh, Masakatsu Kemmotsu and Lisa Awatsu	337
Bayesian Quadrature Variance in Sigma-Point Filtering Jakub Prüher and Miroslav Šimandl	355
Adaptive Nonlinear Information Filters for Multiple Sensor Fusion Aritro Dey, Smita Sadhu and Tapan Kumar Ghoshal	371
Decentralized Control: Application to a Turboprop Engine Christophe Le Brun, Emmanuel Godoy, Dominique Beauvois, Bogdan Liacu and Ricardo Noguera	391
Author Index	411

Kinematics, Simulation, and Analysis of the Planar and Symmetric Postures of a Serial-Parallel Climbing Robot

Adrián Peidró, Arturo Gil, José María Marín, Yerai Berenguer and Óscar Reinoso

Abstract This chapter presents the kinematic analysis of a novel 10-degrees-offreedom serial-parallel redundant robot. The robot is designed for climbing and exploring 3D truss structures to execute maintenance and inspection tasks. First, the forward kinematic problem of the robot is solved. Then, since the general inverse kinematic problem is complex due to the kinematic redundancy, a simplified problem which assumes planar and symmetric postures is solved. Using a developed simulator, it is shown that these planar and symmetric postures are sufficient to execute many typical movements necessary to explore 3D structures, such as transitions between different beams or between different faces of a beam. Finally, the workspace of the robot when it adopts the planar and symmetric postures is analyzed for different designs, demonstrating the flexibility of these postures.

Keywords Biped robots · Climbing robots · Hybrid serial-parallel robots · Kinematics · Redundant robots · Simulation · Workspace

Systems Engineering and Automation Department, Miguel Hernández University, Av. de la Universidad s/n, 03202 Elche, Alicante, Spain e-mail: adrian.peidro@goumh.umh.es

URL: http://arvc.umh.es

A. Gil e-mail: arturo.gil@goumh.umh.es

J.M. Marín e-mail: jmarin@goumh.umh.es

Y. Berenguer e-mail: yberenguer@goumh.umh.es

Ó. Reinoso e-mail: o.reinoso@goumh.umh.es

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016

A. Peidró (⊠) · A. Gil · J.M. Marín · Y. Berenguer · Ó. Reinoso

J. Filipe et al. (eds.), Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics 12th International Conference, ICINCO 2015 Colmar, France, July 21-23, 2015 Revised Selected Papers, Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering 383, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-31898-1_7

1 Introduction

Many human-made vertical structures require periodic maintenance and inspection tasks. For example, the glass facades of skyscrapers must be cleaned, and the welded unions in the metallic skeletons of the buildings must be checked. Tasks like these are dangerous for human operators, who must work in environments difficult to access and are exposed to risks such as falling from height, contamination (e.g. inspections in nuclear or chemical facilities) or electrocution (e.g. maintenance of power transmission lines). To eliminate these risks, during the last two decades many researchers have been investigating the possibility of automating the execution of these tasks using climbing robots. Reference [11] presents an exhaustive analysis of the applications and design of climbing robots, as well as a comprehensive review of the locomotion and adhesion technologies.

Three-dimensional (3D) truss structures are present in many vertical structures such as bridges, towers and skeletons of buildings. These structures are typically constituted by a network of beams connected at structural nodes, and a high degree of mobility is required to explore them. Climbing robots for 3D trusses can be classified into two main types [13]: continuous-motion and step-by-step robots. Continuous-motion robots are faster, use wheels, and employ magnetism or friction to adhere to the structure [3, 14]. However, they usually have more difficulties to negotiate obstacles and their wheels may slip. Step-by-step robots have two grippers connected by a kinematic chain which has some degrees of freedom (DOF). Their name reflects their locomotion method: in each motion cycle, one gripper is fixed to the structure, whereas the kinematic chain moves the other gripper to the next attachment point of the structure, where it will be fixed. Then, the previously fixed gripper is released and a new motion cycle begins. During each motion cycle, these robots are equivalent to typical robot manipulators. Hence, they have a higher mobility that facilitates the avoidance of obstacles, but they are heavier, slower, and more complex.

The architecture of the kinematic chain of step-by-step robots can be serial, parallel, or hybrid. Serial architectures have larger workspaces than parallel ones, but they are less rigid and have a limited payload. The serial architectures have been the most explored ones in step-by-step climbing robots, with many different designs proposed by different authors. For example, [5] presents a 6-DOF robot to explore 3D metallic structures. Since the robot is powered by a battery, the movements are optimized to reduce the energy consumption and increase its autonomy. Another 4-DOF serial climbing robot is presented in [13]. Other authors propose robots inspired by inchworms, with 5 and 8 DOF [8, 12]. Reference [10] presents a similar modular robot whose number of DOF can be increased connecting more modules in series. Finally, [16] presents 3-DOF robots that can individually explore 3D trusses or can be combined with other robots to form more complex kinematic chains with increased maneuverability.

Parallel climbing robots have also been studied. These architectures offer a higher payload-to-weight ratio than serial robots, but their workspace is more limited. In [2],

the authors propose using a Gough-Stewart platform for climbing truss structures, pipelines and palm trees. The robot adheres to the structure using grippers or embracing it with its annular platforms.

Finally, hybrid climbing robots are composed of some serially connected parallel mechanisms, and they have the advantages of both architectures: high payload, maneuverability, and stiffness. A hybrid robot for climbing 3D structures is proposed in [15], where the authors combine a 3-RPR parallel robot with a rotation module connected in series. Another hybrid robot is proposed in [7]. In this case, the robot is biped and each leg is the serial combination of two 3-RPS parallel robots. Hence, the complete robot has 12 DOF.

This chapter presents a novel 10-DOF hybrid robot for climbing 3D truss structures. The robot is biped and each leg is the serial combination of two parallel mechanisms. The design of the robot makes it especially suitable to maneuver in 3D truss structures and perform transitions between planes with different orientations. In this chapter, we solve the forward kinematic problem of this robot. Also, we analyze a simplified case of the inverse kinematic problem in which the robot adopts planar and symmetric postures. As the simulations show, these postures suffice for exploring 3D structures. Finally, we study the workspace of the robot to assess the feasibility of exploring 3D structures using the planar and symmetric postures when the conditions of the problem (design parameters of the robot, initial position, etc.) change.

This chapter is organized as follows. The architecture of the robot is described in Sect. 2. Next, the forward kinematic problem is solved in Sect. 3. In Sect. 4, a simplified yet useful version of the inverse kinematic problem is solved. Then, Sect. 5 presents a tool that simulates the forward kinematics of the robot. This tool is used to demonstrate the execution of some example trajectories in a 3D structure. Section 6 analyzes the workspace of the robot to further study the usefulness of the aforementioned simplified inverse kinematic problem. Finally, the conclusions are exposed in Sect. 7.

2 Description of the Robot

Figure 1a shows a 3D model of the biped climbing robot. The robot has two identical legs (*A* and *B*) connected to the hip through revolute joints driven by motors (angles θ_A and θ_B). Each leg has three links: a core link and two platforms. The lower platform is the foot of the leg and carries the gripper that fixes the robot to the structure (the grippers are not considered in the kinematic analysis presented in this chapter). The upper platform is connected to the hip through the aforementioned revolute joint. Each platform is connected to the core link by means of two prismatic actuators in parallel and a passive slider.

The mechanism composed of the core link, one platform, and the two prismatic actuators that connect these two elements, is a closed-loop linkage that will be called hereafter "parallel module". The parallel modules are planar mechanisms that can



Fig. 1 a 3D model of the climbing robot. b A parallel module





be represented schematically as shown in Fig. 1b. Hence, each leg is the serial combination of the parallel modules 1 (which is connected to the foot) and 2 (which is connected to the hip). The prismatic actuators of each parallel module lie in opposite sides of the plane Π_j , which is one of the planes of symmetry of the core link of the leg *j* (see the side view in Fig. 1a). This is indicated with dashed lines in Fig. 2.

Figure 1a also shows some reference frames attached to different parts of the robot. In this chapter, the *X*, *Y*, and *Z* axes of reference frames will be represented in red, green, and blue colors, respectively. The frames H_A and H_B are fixed to the hip of the robot, whereas the frames *A* and *B* are respectively attached to the feet of the legs *A* and *B*.

The robot has 10 DOF: the rotation angles θ_A and θ_B , and the four prismatic actuators of each leg. In the next sections, the forward and inverse kinematic problems of the robot will be analyzed. After that, we will simulate the forward kinematics to demonstrate its ability to explore 3D structures.

3 Forward Kinematics

In this section, the forward kinematic problem (FKP) of the robot is solved. The problem considered here consists in calculating the position and orientation of one foot with respect to the other foot when the joint coordinates are known: the angles θ_A and θ_B and the lengths (l_{ij}, r_{ij}) of the linear actuators of the parallel modules $(i \in \{1, 2\}, j \in \{A, B\})$. First, the forward kinematics of the parallel modules is analyzed.

3.1 FKP of the Parallel Modules

Figure 1b shows the *i*-th parallel module of the leg j ($i \in \{1, 2\}, j \in \{A, B\}$). A parallel module is a closed-loop planar mechanism composed of a mobile platform connected to a base through two prismatic actuators with lengths l_{ij} and r_{ij} . The platform is constrained to only translate vertically and rotate. The forward kinematics consists in calculating the position y_{ij} and the orientation φ_{ij} of the mobile platform in terms of l_{ij} and r_{ij} . According to Fig. 1b, the relationship between (l_{ij}, r_{ij}) and (y_{ij}, φ_{ij}) is:

$$(p\cos\varphi_{ij} - b)^2 + (y_{ij} + p\sin\varphi_{ij})^2 = r_{ij}^2$$
(1)

$$(p\cos\varphi_{ij} - b)^2 + (y_{ij} - p\sin\varphi_{ij})^2 = l_{ij}^2$$
(2)

These equations can be combined to obtain an equivalent system. Adding together Eqs. (1) and (2) yields Eq. (3), whereas subtracting Eqs. (2) from (1) results in Eq. (4):

$$4bp\cos\varphi_{ij} = 2y_{ij}^2 + 2b^2 + 2p^2 - l_{ij}^2 - r_{ij}^2$$
(3)

$$4y_{ij}p\sin\varphi_{ij} = r_{ij}^2 - l_{ij}^2 \tag{4}$$

Solving $\cos \varphi_{ij}$ from Eq. (3) gives:

$$\cos\varphi_{ij} = \frac{2y_{ij}^2 + 2b^2 + 2p^2 - l_{ij}^2 - r_{ij}^2}{4bp}$$
(5)

Squaring Eq. (4):

$$16y_{ij}^2 p^2 (1 - \cos^2 \varphi_{ij}) = (r_{ij}^2 - l_{ij}^2)^2$$
(6)

Finally, substituting Eqs. (5) into (6) yields a cubic equation in $\Upsilon_{ij} = y_{ij}^2$:

$$\Upsilon_{ij}^{3} + k_{2}^{ij}\Upsilon_{ij}^{2} + k_{1}^{ij}\Upsilon_{ij} + k_{0}^{ij} = 0$$
(7)

where:

$$k_2^{ij} = 2b^2 + 2p^2 - l_{ij}^2 - r_{ij}^2$$
(8)

$$k_1^{ij} = \left[(b+p)^2 - \frac{l_{ij}^2 + r_{ij}^2}{2} \right] \left[(b-p)^2 - \frac{l_{ij}^2 + r_{ij}^2}{2} \right]$$
(9)

$$k_0^{ij} = b^2 (l_{ij} + r_{ij})^2 (l_{ij} - r_{ij})^2 / 4$$
(10)

Equation (7) always has three roots, two of which may be complex. For a given strictly positive root γ_{ij} of Eq. (7), two solutions are obtained for $y_{ij} = \pm \sqrt{\gamma_{ij}}$. For each of these two values of y_{ij} , $\cos \varphi_{ij}$ is calculated from Eq. (5), whereas $\sin \varphi_{ij}$ is obtained from Eq. (4):

$$\sin \varphi_{ij} = \frac{r_{ij}^2 - l_{ij}^2}{4y_{ij}p}$$
(11)

Once $\cos \varphi_{ij}$ and $\sin \varphi_{ij}$ are known, φ_{ij} is unequivocally determined in $(-\pi, \pi]$. If $\Upsilon_{ij} = 0$, then $y_{ij} = 0$ and $\cos \varphi_{ij}$ is calculated using Eq. (5). However, $\sin \varphi_{ij}$ cannot be calculated from Eq. (11) since $y_{ij} = 0$. Instead, $\sin \varphi_{ij}$ is calculated as follows:

$$\sin\varphi_{ij} = \pm \sqrt{1 - \cos^2\varphi_{ij}} \tag{12}$$

obtaining two solutions. It is shown in [9], using Sturm's Theorem, that Eq. (7) cannot have more than two non-negative roots. Since each non-negative root of Eq. (7) yields two different pairs (y_{ij}, φ_{ij}) , the FKP of each parallel module has four solutions at most.

Note that swapping the values of r_{ij} and l_{ij} neither affects Eq. (7) nor Eq. (5), but it changes the sign of sin φ_{ij} in Eq. (11). Hence, swapping r_{ij} and l_{ij} changes the sign of φ_{ij} , leaving y_{ij} unchanged. This can be observed in Fig. 1b, where swapping r_{ij} and l_{ij} is equivalent to rotating the figure π rad about the vertical Y axis. This fact will be exploited in Sect. 4 to analyze the inverse kinematics.

3.2 FKP of the Complete Robot

The forward kinematics of the complete robot consists in calculating the position and orientation of one foot with respect to the other foot when the ten joint coordinates are known. The problem will be solved using Homogeneous Transformation Matrices (HTMs). An HTM has the following form [4]:

Kinematics, Simulation, and Analysis of the Planar and Symmetric Postures ...

$$\mathbf{T}_{m/n} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{m/n} \ \mathbf{t}_{m/n} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1\times 3} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(13)

where $\mathbf{0}_{1\times 3} = [0, 0, 0]$. The matrix $\mathbf{T}_{m/n}$ encodes the position and orientation of a frame *m* with respect to another frame *n*. Indeed, $\mathbf{R}_{m/n} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ is a rotation matrix whose columns are the vectors of the frame *m* expressed in the basis formed by the vectors of the frame *n*, whereas $\mathbf{t}_{m/n} \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 1}$ is the position of the origin of the frame *m* in coordinates of the frame *n*.

The forward kinematics of one leg can be easily solved using HTMs. Figure 2 represents a generic leg $j \in \{A, B\}$. Each leg has two parallel modules whose bases are attached to the core link. The platform of the parallel module 1 is the foot of the leg, whereas the platform of the parallel module 2 is connected to the hip of the robot by means of a revolute joint. The variables $(y_{1j}, \varphi_{1j}, y_{2j}, \varphi_{2j})$ are obtained from $(l_{1j}, r_{1j}, l_{2j}, r_{2j})$ as explained in Sect. 3.1. All the reference frames of Fig. 2 are contained in the plane Π_j , which is one of the planes of symmetry of the core link of the leg *j* (see Fig. 1a). The transformation between the frame *j* (fixed to the foot) and the frame F_j (fixed to the core link) is:

$$\mathbf{T}_{F_j/j} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\varphi_{1j} & \sin\varphi_{1j} & 0 & y_{1j} \sin\varphi_{1j} \\ -\sin\varphi_{1j} & \cos\varphi_{1j} & 0 & y_{1j} \cos\varphi_{1j} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(14)

Similarly, the transformation between the frame G_j (attached to the platform of the parallel module 2) and the frame F_j is:

$$\mathbf{T}_{G_j/F_j} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\varphi_{2j} - \sin\varphi_{2j} & 0 & 0\\ \sin\varphi_{2j} & \cos\varphi_{2j} & 0 & y_{2j} - h\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(15)

where *h* is a geometric constant. Finally, a rotation θ_j about the *Y* axis of the frame G_j transforms it into the frame H_j , which is attached to the hip:

$$\mathbf{T}_{H_j/G_j} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta_j & 0 \sin \theta_j & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sin \theta_j & 0 \cos \theta_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

The position and orientation of the frame H_j with respect to the frame j is obtained as follows:

$$\mathbf{T}_{H_j/j} = \mathbf{T}_{F_j/j} \mathbf{T}_{G_j/F_j} \mathbf{T}_{H_j/G_j}$$
(17)

which completes the FKP of any generic leg j. Once the forward kinematics of each leg is solved, it is straightforward to calculate the position and orientation of the foot

of one leg $k \in \{A, B\} \setminus \{j\}$ with respect to the foot of the other leg *j*:

$$\mathbf{T}_{k/j} = \mathbf{T}_{H_j/j} \mathbf{T}_{H_k/H_j} \mathbf{T}_{k/H_k}$$
(18)

where $\mathbf{T}_{k/H_k} = (\mathbf{T}_{H_k/k})^{-1}$ and \mathbf{T}_{H_k/H_j} is the HTM that encodes the position and orientation of the frame H_k with respect to the frame H_j :

$$\mathbf{T}_{H_k/H_j} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{t}_{H_k/H_j} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1\times 3} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(19)

which is constant because both frames are attached to the same rigid body (the hip). **I** is the 3 × 3 identity matrix. Moreover, according to Fig. 1a: $\mathbf{t}_{H_B/H_A} = [t, 0, 0]^T = -\mathbf{t}_{H_A/H_B}$, where *t* is the distance between the parallel axes of the revolute actuators.

Note that, in theory, there are $4^4 = 256$ different solutions to the FKP of the complete robot. This is because the kinematic chain between the feet has four parallel modules connected in series and the FKP of each module has four real solutions at most.

4 Inverse Kinematics

The inverse kinematic problem (IKP) consists in finding the values of the joint coordinates necessary to attain a desired relative position and orientation between the feet of the robot, and it is necessary for planning trajectories. In this robot, ten joint coordinates are used to place and orient one foot with respect to the other foot, which makes it redundant. Hence, the IKP is underconstrained and one should expect infinitely many solutions. This redundancy makes it difficult to solve the general IKP of this robot. Fortunately, many important movements necessary to explore a 3D structure (e.g., walking in one dimension, changing between planes, etc.) can be executed using the configuration analyzed in this section, which reduces the number of variables and simplifies the IKP.

The configuration considered in this section is depicted in Fig. 3, where the foot j is fixed to the structure and the foot k is mobile $(j, k \in \{A, B\}, j \neq k)$. It is assumed that the Z axes of the frames attached to the feet are parallel and point in the same direction. Moreover, the origin of the frame attached to the foot k is contained in the XY plane of the frame attached to the foot j. In this situation, any variation in the length of the prismatic actuators of the parallel modules only produces planar motions of the frame k in the XY plane of the frame j. In this case, the position and orientation of the frame k relative to the frame j can be calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{T}_{k/j} = \mathbf{T}_{G_j/j} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & [t, 0, 0]^T \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 3} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{T}_{G_k/k} \right)^{-1}$$
(20)

Fig. 3 The Planar Symmetric Inverse Kinematic (PSIK) problem

where $\mathbf{T}_{G_j/j} = \mathbf{T}_{F_j/j} \mathbf{T}_{G_j/F_j}$. Moreover, it is assumed that the joint coordinates of the parallel modules of the two legs are related as follows:

$$l_{ik} = r_{ij}, \quad r_{ik} = l_{ij} \quad (i = 1, 2)$$
 (21)

This means that the joint coordinates of the parallel module i of the legs k and j are swapped. According to Sect. 3.1, this translates into:

$$y_{ik} = y_{ij}, \quad \varphi_{ik} = -\varphi_{ij} \quad (i = 1, 2)$$
 (22)

It can be graphically checked that Eq. (22) implies that the legs *k* and *j* are symmetric with respect to the line *L*, which is the axis of symmetry of the hip of the robot. Substituting Eqs. (22) into (20), the matrix $\mathbf{T}_{k/j}$ can be written only in terms of the variables of the leg *j* and has the following expression:

$$\mathbf{T}_{k/j} = \begin{bmatrix} -c(2\omega) - s(2\omega) \ 0 \ \mu \ (1 - c(2\omega)) \\ s(2\omega) - c(2\omega) \ 0 \ \mu \cdot s(2\omega) \\ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(23)

where $s(x) = \sin x$, $c(x) = \cos x$ and:

$$\mu = \left[t - 2(h - y_{1j} - y_{2j}) \sin \varphi_{2j} \right] / \left[2 \cos(\varphi_{1j} - \varphi_{2j}) \right]$$
(24)

$$\omega = \varphi_{1j} - \varphi_{2j} + \pi/2 \tag{25}$$

Thus, under the condition of planar and symmetric motion, the position and orientation of the foot k relative to the foot j can be defined by two parameters (μ , ω), which are indicated in Fig. 3. We define the Planar Symmetric Inverse Kinematic (PSIK) problem, which consists in calculating the joint coordinates (l_{1j} , r_{1j} , l_{2j} , r_{2j}) needed to achieve a desired position and orientation (μ , ω). Since the joint coordinates do not appear explicitly in Eqs. (24) and (25), the kinematic equations of the parallel



modules of the leg *j* must be included:

$$(p\cos\varphi_{1j} - b)^2 + (y_{1j} + p\sin\varphi_{1j})^2 = r_{1j}^2$$
(26)

$$(p\cos\varphi_{1j} - b)^2 + (y_{1j} - p\sin\varphi_{1j})^2 = l_{1j}^2$$
(27)

$$(p\cos\varphi_{2j} - b)^2 + (y_{2j} + p\sin\varphi_{2j})^2 = r_{2j}^2$$
(28)

$$(p\cos\varphi_{2i} - b)^2 + (y_{2i} - p\sin\varphi_{2i})^2 = l_{2i}^2$$
⁽²⁹⁾

Hence, the PSIK problem requires calculating $(l_{1j}, r_{1j}, l_{2j}, r_{2j}, y_{1j}, \varphi_{1j}, y_{2j}, \varphi_{2j})$ from Eqs. (24)–(29). Like the general inverse kinematic problem, the PSIK problem is underconstrained since eight unknowns must be obtained from six equations. However, the PSIK problem involves less variables and simpler equations. In the following section, we will show that some postures necessary to negotiate obstacles in a 3D structure can be analyzed solving the PSIK problem. Also, we will describe a method to choose appropriate solutions to the PSIK problem assuming that the lengths of the prismatic actuators of the parallel modules have upper and lower limits: l_{ij} and r_{ij} must be in $[\rho_0, \rho_0 + \Delta \rho]$, where $\rho_0 > 0$ is the minimum length of the actuators and $\Delta \rho > 0$ is their stroke.

5 Simulation

In this section, we will simulate the movements of the complete robot in an example 3D structure to validate the kinematic analyses of Sects. 3 and 4, and demonstrate the ability of the robot to explore the structure. More specifically, we will show how the robot can walk on a beam, perform transitions between different faces of the beams, and negotiate structural nodes.

To demonstrate these movements, we have developed a Java simulation tool that can be downloaded from http://arvc.umh.es/parola/climber.html (the latest version of Java may be required). The simulator implements the equations derived in Sect. 3 to solve the forward kinematics. As shown in Fig. 4, the simulator has a graphical window that shows the robot in the 3D test structure. The tool also has a window with a control panel where the user can modify the values of the ten joint coordinates, change the foot that is attached to the structure, or reset the simulation. It is important to remark that the simulation tool only implements the kinematic equations, without considering the dynamics of the robot (gravity is neglected) or the collisions between the robot and the structure. These advanced topics will be analyzed in the future.

Three reference frames are shown in the graphical window of the simulator: the world frame W (which is attached to one of the corners of the beam b_1 of the structure) and the frames A and B (which are attached to the feet of the legs). The fixed foot is indicated in orange color. When the user modifies the value of a joint coordinate, the forward kinematics is solved and the position and orientation of the free foot with respect to the frame W is calculated as follows:



Fig. 4 Interface of the tool developed to simulate the forward kinematics of the robot

$$\mathbf{T}_{k/W} = \mathbf{T}_{j/W} \mathbf{T}_{k/j} \tag{30}$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{k/j}$ is defined in Sect. 3.2, *j* denotes the fixed leg, and *k* denotes the mobile leg $(j, k \in \{A, B\}, j \neq k)$. As shown in Fig. 4, the translation and rotation submatrices of $\mathbf{T}_{A/W}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{B/W}$ are indicated to the user in an output window of the tool. According to Sect. 3.2, there are 256 solutions to the forward kinematics of the complete robot since each parallel module can have up to four different solutions. However, it will be shown next that only one solution is valid.

For the following simulations, we will assume that b = p = 4 cm, $\rho_0 = 19$ cm, and $\Delta \rho = 6$ cm, which means that the prismatic actuators must satisfy: r_{ij} , $l_{ij} \in$ [19, 25] cm. Solving the forward kinematics of a parallel module for these ranges of the joint coordinates, and plotting the solution y_{ij} versus r_{ij} and l_{ij} , results in the four surfaces shown in Fig. 5. Each surface is associated with one of the configurations labeled as follows: H^+ , X^+ , H^- , and X^- . The solutions H^+ and X^+ are indicated in Fig. 5; the solutions H^- and X^- are their respective mirror images with respect to the base of the parallel module. According to the design of the robot (see Sect. 2), the only valid solution is H^+ , since the other solutions are impossible due to mechanical interferences between different links of the legs. Moreover, Fig. 5 also provides a criterion for selecting the valid solution: the solution H^+ always has the highest y_{ij} coordinate.

Once the only valid solution to forward kinematics has been characterized, we will simulate the execution of an example trajectory in the structure, which is composed of the three beams b_1 , b_2 , and b_3 indicated in Fig. 4. At the beginning of the trajectory, the robot lies on the face f_1 of the beam b_1 , and the objective is to move the robot to the face f_4 of the beam b_3 , negotiating the structural node where the three beams intersect. Next, we will show that such a trajectory can be executed by a sequence of basic movements that can be used to reach any other point of the structure. The values of the remaining geometric parameters of the robot are: t = 15.6 cm, h = 16 cm, which correspond to the design parameters of the prototype currently under development.



Moreover, the side of the square cross section of the beams measures 12 cm, and the distance between the face f_2 of the beam b_2 and the origin of the frame W is 88 cm.

5.1 Phase 1: Walking Along a Beam

At the beginning of the trajectory (see Fig. 6a), the foot A is attached to the face f_1 of the beam b_1 , and the frame A has the following position and orientation:

$$\mathbf{t}_{A/W} = \begin{bmatrix} 6\\ -40\\ 5 \end{bmatrix} \text{cm}, \, \mathbf{R}_{A/W} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \ 0 \ 1\\ 1 \ 0 \ 0\\ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(31)

The number "6" in $\mathbf{t}_{A/W}$ means that the frame *A* is centered in the beam, whereas the number "5" is the size *f* of the feet, indicated in Fig. 1a. Initially, the joint coordinates have the following values: $\theta_A = \theta_B = 0$, $r_{ij} = l_{ij} = 21$ cm ($i \in \{1, 2\}, j \in \{A, B\}$). Starting from this configuration, Table 1 describes a simple sequence of movements that allows the robot to reach the vertical beam b_2 . In each step of the given sequence, we indicate only the joint coordinates that change with respect to the previous step.

5.2 Phase 2: Concave Change of Plane

Once the beam b_2 has been reached, it can be climbed to negotiate the structural node defined by the intersection of the three beams. The next objective is to perform



Fig. 6 Example trajectory where the robot moves along a beam of the structure

-		
Step	Joint coordinates	Description of the movements in each step
1	$r_{1B} = l_{1B} = 19 \text{ cm}$	Retract the actuators connected to the foot <i>B</i> to lift it (Fig. 6b)
2	$\theta_A = \pi$ rad	Rotate the robot about the leg A (Fig. 6c)
3	$r_{1B} = l_{1B} = 21 \text{ cm}$	Extend the actuators connected to the foot B until it touches the beam b_1 (Fig. 6d)
4	$r_{1A} = l_{1A} = 19 \text{ cm}$	Attach the foot <i>B</i> to the face f_1 . Release and lift the foot <i>A</i> retracting the actuators connected to it (Fig. 6e)
5	$\theta_B = \pi \text{ rad}$	Rotate the robot about the leg B (Fig. 6f)

Table 1 Sequence of movements in the first phase of the simulated trajectory

a concave transition between the faces f_1 and f_2 . Note that at the end of the previous phase (Fig. 6f), the Z axes of the frames attached to the two feet point in the same direction. Hence, the postures needed to change between these faces can be obtained solving the PSIK problem defined in Sect. 4.

Figure 7a indicates the input parameters needed to solve the PSIK problem: $\mu = 27.4$ cm, $\omega = \pi/4$ rad, and j = B. Substituting these values and the geometric parameters of the robot into Eqs. (24)–(29) yields:

$$\frac{15.6 - 2(16 - y_{1B} - y_{2B})\sin\varphi_{2B}}{2\cos(\varphi_{1B} - \varphi_{2B})} = 27.4$$
(32)

$$\varphi_{2B} - \pi/4 = \varphi_{1B} \tag{33}$$



Fig. 7 A trajectory that includes a concave transition between different planes

$$(4\cos\varphi_{1B} - 4)^2 + (y_{1B} + 4\sin\varphi_{1B})^2 = r_{1B}^2$$
(34)

$$(4\cos\varphi_{1B} - 4)^2 + (y_{1B} - 4\sin\varphi_{1B})^2 = l_{1B}^2$$
(35)

$$(4\cos\varphi_{2B} - 4)^2 + (y_{2B} + 4\sin\varphi_{2B})^2 = r_{2B}^2$$
(36)

$$(4\cos\varphi_{2B}-4)^2 + (y_{2B}-4\sin\varphi_{2B})^2 = l_{2B}^2$$
(37)

As discussed in Sect. 4, infinitely many solutions exist since there are eight variables to be solved from six equations. Next, we describe a way of choosing a proper solution to this underconstrained problem. First, Eq. (33) is used to eliminate φ_{1B} from Eq. (32). Then, φ_{2B} is solved from the resulting equation:

$$\varphi_{2B} = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{13.7\sqrt{2} - 7.8}{y_{1B} + y_{2B} - 16} \right)$$
(38)

This solution can be substituted into Eqs. (33)–(37) to express the joint coordinates $\{l_{1B}, r_{1B}, l_{2B}, r_{2B}\}$ in terms of $\{y_{1B}, y_{2B}\}$, which can be chosen so that $l_{iB}, r_{iB} \in [19, 25]$ (i = 1, 2). Figure 8 represents the curves of the (y_{1B}, y_{2B}) plane in which each joint coordinate equals 19 or 25; any point inside the shaded region R enclosed by these curves is a valid solution to the PSIK problem. For example, the solution $y_{1B} = y_{2B} = 22$ cm yields: $r_{1B} \approx 20.59536194$, $l_{1B} \approx 23.40761347$, $r_{2B} \approx 23.65623783$, and $l_{2B} \approx 20.34961301$, all in cm (these accurate values are



Fig. 8 Region of valid solutions to the PSIK problem

 Table 2
 Sequence of movements in the second phase of the simulated trajectory

Step	Joint coordinates	Description of the movements in each step
1	$l_{iA} = r_{iA} = 21 \text{ cm}$ $l_{2B} = r_{2B} = 21 \text{ cm}$ $l_{1B} = r_{1B} = 19 \text{ cm}$	Lift the foot <i>B</i> and place both legs perpendicular to the face f_2 , leaving some distance between the foot <i>B</i> and the face f_2 (Fig. 7b)
2	$\theta_B = \pi/2$ rad	Rotate the leg B about its own axis (Fig. 7c)
3	$r_{1B} = l_{1B} = 21 \text{ cm}$	Extend the actuators connected to the foot <i>B</i> until it touches the face f_2 (Fig. 7d)
4	$r_{1A} = l_{1A} = 19 \text{ cm}$	Attach the foot <i>B</i> to the face f_2 . Release and lift the foot <i>A</i> retracting the actuators connected to it (Fig. 7e)
5	$\theta_B = \pi \text{ rad}$	Rotate the robot about the leg B (Fig. 7f)

valid only for the simulation; in a real implementation we will have to deal with the finite precision of the sensors). This solution is used to perform a transition between the faces f_1 and f_2 (see Fig. 7a). After performing this transition, the foot A is attached to the beam b_2 , and the sequence of movements described in Table 2 is used to complete this phase.

5.3 Phase 3: Convex Change of Plane

At the end of phase 2, the Z axes of the frames attached to the feet are parallel to the beam b_2 and point in the same direction. Hence, the PSIK problem can be solved to determine the joint coordinates that permit performing a convex transition from the face f_2 to the face f_3 (the face f_3 is defined in Fig.9). Substituting $\mu = 11$ cm, $\omega = 3\pi/4$ rad, and j = B in Eqs. (24)–(29), and following the procedure detailed in Sect. 5.2, we can obtain the region of the (y_{1B}, y_{2B}) plane where $l_{iB}, r_{iB} \in [19, 25]$ cm (i = 1, 2). It can be checked that the solution



Fig. 9 A trajectory that includes a convex transition between different planes

Step	Joint coordinates	Description of the movements in each step
1	$l_{iA} = r_{iA} = 21 \text{ cm}$ $l_{2B} = r_{2B} = 21 \text{ cm}$ $l_{1B} = r_{1B} = 19 \text{ cm}$	Place both legs perpendicular to the face f_3 , leaving some distance between the foot <i>B</i> and the face f_3 (Fig. 9b)
2	$\theta_A = 3\pi/2$ rad	Rotate the robot about the leg A (Fig. 9c)
3	$r_{1B} = l_{1B} = 21 \text{ cm}$	Extend the actuators connected to the foot <i>B</i> until it touches the face f_3 (Fig. 9d)
4	$r_{1A} = l_{1A} = 19 \text{ cm}$	Attach the foot <i>B</i> to the face f_3 . Release and lift the foot <i>A</i> retracting the actuators connected to it (Fig. 9e)
5	$\theta_A = \pi$ rad	Rotate the leg A about its own axis (Fig. $9f$)

 Table 3 Sequence of movements in the third phase of the simulated trajectory

adopted in the previous section $(y_{1B} = y_{2B} = 22 \text{ cm})$ is also valid here, obtaining in this case: $r_{1B} \approx 24.85374622$, $l_{1B} \approx 19.20940403$, $r_{2B} \approx 21.99688208$, and $l_{2B} \approx 22.00311791$ (all in cm). For these values of the joint coordinates, the robot can perform a transition between the faces f_2 and f_3 (see Fig. 9a). After that, the foot *A* can be attached to the face f_3 .

After attaching the foot A to the face f_3 , the sequence of movements described in Table 3 is executed. After executing this sequence, solving exactly the same PSIK problem as in Sect. 5.2 permits the foot A of the robot to be attached to the face f_4 of the beam b_3 , which completes the trajectory.

6 Workspace of the PSIK Problem

In the previous section, it has been shown that the robot can explore orthogonal 3D structures combining the following three basic movements: (1) moving along a beam using the rotations { θ_A , θ_B } of the hip (Fig. 6), (2) performing a concave transition between two beams (Fig. 7), and (3) performing a convex transition between two faces of the same beam (Fig. 9). Moreover, the robot can perform the last two movements adopting planar and symmetric postures, which simplifies the inverse kinematic problem (PSIK problem defined in Sect. 4). However, this has been shown using an example where the geometry of the robot and of the structure, as well as the initial position of the robot, have particular values that guarantee the existence of solutions to the problem of exploring the structure.

The objective of this section is to determine if the robot will be able to explore 3D structures adopting planar and symmetric postures if its geometry deviates from the design used in Sect. 5, if the robot starts at a different position, or if the geometry of the structure is different. Regarding the geometry of the structure, we will analyze what happens when the width of the cross section of the beams varies, assuming that the structure is still orthogonal. To this end, we will study the workspace of the PSIK problem, which is the set of pairs (ω , μ) (variables defined in Fig. 3) that can be attained satisfying the joint limits. This workspace can be used to assess the ability of the robot to execute the three basic movements defined in the previous paragraph using the planar and symmetric postures of the PSIK problem, for different designs of the robot.

Figure 10a–f show the PSIK workspaces for different choices of the geometric design parameters of the robot, obtained using a Monte Carlo algorithm [1]. Each subfigure of Fig. 10 shows the different PSIK workspaces that are obtained when the corresponding geometric parameter of the robot is varied, keeping the remaining parameters at the default values used in Sect. 5, which are: b = p = 4, t = 15.6, h = 16, $\Delta \rho = 6$, and $\rho_0 = 19$ (all in cm). The curves that have the same color in each subfigure of Fig. 10 enclose the PSIK workspaces. This is illustrated in Fig. 10a, where the PSIK workspace for the default geometry, denoted by WS_d and enclosed by the red curves, has been shaded. It is evident from Fig. 10 that the shape of the PSIK workspace is most sensitive to the parameters p and $\Delta \rho$, whereas the shape changes little with b.

Figures 10a–f also show three vertical lines at $\omega = \pi/4$, $\omega = \pi/2$, and $\omega = 3\pi/4$. The lines $\omega = \pi/4$ and $\omega = 3\pi/4$ represent the concave (Fig. 7a) and convex (Fig. 9a) transitions, respectively. The line $\omega = \pi/2$ represents a posture that can be used to move the robot along a beam like an inchworm, extending and retracting the legs as shown in Fig. 11. This is an alternative gait to the one shown in Fig. 6, which uses the rotations of the hip to move along a beam. The segment of these vertical lines that lies within the PSIK workspace of a given geometry is the set of lengths μ that can be achieved for the corresponding value of ω . For example, for the default workspace WS_d in Fig. 10a and $\omega = \pi/4$, μ must be between μ_1 and μ_2 . Next, we will analyze



Fig. 10 PSIK workspaces for different values of the geometric design parameters of the robot. In the axes, μ is in cm and ω is in rad. **a** Varying *p*. **b** Varying *b*. **c** Varying ρ_0 . **d** Varying $\Delta \rho$. **e** Varying *t*. **f** Varying *h*



Fig. 11 An inchworm-like gait to move along a beam

Fig. 10 to discuss if the robot can perform convex and concave transitions using the planar and symmetric postures of the PSIK problem in three cases.

Case 1: The Geometry of the Robot is Modified. Can the robot perform convex and concave transitions if its geometry is different from the default one? As Fig. 10 shows, the vertical lines $\omega = \pi/4$ and $\omega = 3\pi/4$ (which represent the concave and convex transitions) intersect the PSIK workspace for most of the geometries, which means that both transitions are possible. However, for some designs obtained by increasing p or decreasing $\Delta \rho$, the workspace is too small and does not intersect these vertical lines. Thus, these designs should be avoided.

Case 2: The Initial Position of the Robot is Modified. Even if the PSIK workspace intersects the vertical line $\omega = \pi/4$, the robot may be unable to perform a concave transition between two beams (e.g. to climb to the beam b_2 in the example of Sect. 5.2) if the distance between the robot and the new beam is not adequate. This is because,

according to Fig. 10, for most of the geometries the feasible concave transitions (those obtained intersecting the PSIK workspace and the line $\omega = \pi/4$) require μ to be between a minimum value μ_1 and a maximum value μ_2 (e.g. see the default PSIK workspace WS_d in Fig. 10a). As a result, if the robot is too close ($\mu < \mu_1$) or too far ($\mu > \mu_2$) from the beam b_2 , the concave transition will be impossible.

This can be a problem if the distance between the robot and the new beam cannot be adjusted continuously, but only by means of discrete increments, like when using the gait shown in Fig. 6. With this gait, which uses the rotations $\{\theta_A, \theta_B\}$ of the hip, the robot can only travel a distance equal to an integer multiple of *t*. Thus, depending on the initial position of the robot, approaching the beam b_2 using this gait may eventually place the robot at a point too close or too far from the beam, without the possibility to finely adjust its position to make possible the execution of a concave transition.

Nevertheless, this can be avoided if the inchworm-like gait of Fig. 11 is used to approach the beam b_2 . With $\omega = \pi/2$, the robot travels a distance equal to 2μ , where μ can take any value from the line $\omega = \pi/2$ which lies inside the PSIK workspace for the considered geometry. Thus, using this gait permits the robot to continuously adjust its position along the beam b_1 to position itself at a proper distance from the beam b_2 to climb it performing a concave transition.

Case 3: The Width of the Beams is Modified. Even if the PSIK workspace intersects the vertical line $\omega = 3\pi/4$, the robot may be unable to perform a convex transition between different faces of a beam if the distance μ necessary to execute this transition (shown in Fig. 9a) is too large, since the point representing this transition in the (ω, μ) plane may lie outside the PSIK workspace of the considered geometry. For example, the convex transition of Fig. 9a, which is represented by the point P in Fig. 10d, can be performed using the default geometry because P lies inside the default PSIK workspace, but if the stroke of the linear actuators is decreased to $\Delta \rho = 5$ cm, P will lie outside the workspace and the transition will be infeasible.

As Fig. 9a shows, the distance μ necessary to perform a convex transition equals the sum of the size f of the foot (indicated in Fig. 1a) and 0.5 times the width of the cross section of the beam. This assumes that the fixed foot of the robot is placed at the middle of the cross section of the beam, which will be the most typical case, especially if grippers are used to adhere to the structure. Thus, if f is too large, and/or the beam is sufficiently wide, the robot may be unable to perform a transition between different faces of a beam.

In case the beams of a given structure are too wide to allow the robot to execute convex transitions between different faces of the beams, the design of the robot should be modified. One possibility is to reduce the size f of the feet. Another possibility is to modify some of the design parameters of Fig. 10 to increase the maximum value of μ that can be attained with $\omega = 3\pi/4$. Note that this maximum value changes little with the parameters $\{b, \rho_0, h\}$, whereas it increases when increasing $\{t, \Delta\rho\}$ or decreasing p.

To sum up, the analysis presented in this section reveals that by choosing an appropriate design for the robot, the planar and symmetric postures of the PSIK

problem provide a relatively high flexibility to explore 3D structures using the basic movements defined in this section. This is partly thanks to the possibility of precisely adjusting the position of the robot along a beam by means of the inchworm-like gait of Fig. 11. This result suggests that the architecture of the robot studied in this chapter may be modified to design a simpler robot based on the PSIK problem, with an actuation scheme in which a single actuator may simultaneously drive various joints, producing symmetric movements. This symmetry in the movements was previously identified by Balaguer et al. [6] as one of the key criteria for designing climbing robots, since this symmetry reduces the number of actuators and hence the overall weight of the robot.

7 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the kinematic analysis of a novel biped climbing robot with a hybrid serial-parallel architecture. The forward kinematic problem has been solved, obtaining the relative position and orientation between the feet in terms of the joint coordinates. The inverse problem is more difficult due to the redundancy of the robot. Hence, a simplified inverse problem which considers planar and symmetric postures has been analyzed. Using a developed simulation tool, it has been shown that the simplified problem is sufficient to perform some important movements which are necessary to explore 3D structures. Also, the workspace of this simplified inverse kinematic problem has been analyzed in depth for different designs of the robot. This analysis has shown that the planar and symmetric postures of the simplified problem are also useful when the robot starts at other positions or when the width of the beams varies, provided that the geometric parameters of the robot are chosen properly.

To exploit all the possibilities offered by the proposed kinematic architecture, the general inverse kinematic problem of the robot will be solved in the future. Other problems that will need to be addressed include the determination of the workspace and singularities of the complete robot (not just the PSIK workspace), the dynamic modeling, and the planning of trajectories avoiding collisions in more complex structures. Also, considering the flexibility of the planar and symmetric postures of the PSIK problem, we will optimize the architecture of the robot to obtain a more lightweight robot able to perform these planar and symmetric movements using less actuators, as discussed at the end of Sect. 6.

Acknowledgments This work was supported by the Spanish Government through the Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte under an FPU grant (Ref: FPU13/00413) and through the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad under Project DPI2013-41557-P.

References

- Alciatore, D., Ng, C.: Determining manipulator workspace boundaries using the Monte Carlo method and least squares segmentation. ASME Robot. Kinemat. Dyn. Controls 72, 141–146 (1994)
- Aracil, R., Saltaren, R.J., Reinoso, O.: A climbing parallel robot: a robot to climb along tubular and metallic structures. IEEE Robot. Autom. Mag. 13(1), 16–22 (2006)
- Baghani, A., Ahmadabadi, M.N., Harati, A.: Kinematics modeling of a wheel-based pole climbing robot (UT-PCR). In: Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, pp. 2099–2104 (2005)
- 4. Bajd, T., Mihelj, M., Munih, M.: Introduction to Robotics. Springer, Netherlands (2013)
- Balaguer, C., Giménez, A., Pastor, J.M., Padrón, V.M., Abderrahim, M.: A climbing autonomous robot for inspection applications in 3D complex environments. Robotica 18(3), 287–297 (2000)
- Balaguer, C., Giménez, A., Jardon, A.: Climbing robots' mobility for inspection and maintenance of 3D complex environments. Auton. Robots 18(2), 157–169 (2005)
- Figliolini, G., Rea, P., Conte, M.: Mechanical design of a novel biped climbing and walking robot. In: Parenti Castelli, V., Schiehlen, W. (ed.) ROMANSY 18 Robot Design, Dynamics and Control, CISM International Centre for Mechanical Sciences, vol. 524, pp. 199–206. Springer Vienna (2010)
- Guan, Y., Jiang, L., Zhu, H., Zhou, X., Cai, C., Wu, W., Li, Z., Zhang, H., Zhang, X.: Climbot: a modular bio-inspired biped climbing robot. In: Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, pp. 1473–1478 (2011)
- 9. Kong, X., Gosselin, C.M.: Generation and forward displacement analysis of RPR-RPR analytic planar parallel manipulators. ASME J. Mech. Design **124**(2), 294–300 (2002)
- Mampel, J., Gerlach, K., Schilling, C., Witte, H.: A modular robot climbing on pipe-like structures. In: Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Autonomous Robots and Agents, pp. 87–91 (2009)
- Schmidt, D., Berns, K.: Climbing robots for maintenance and inspections of vertical structures—a survey of design aspects and technologies. Robot. Autom. Syst. 61(12), 1288– 1305 (2013)
- 12. Shvalb, N., Moshe, B.B., Medina, O.: A real-time motion planning algorithm for a hyperredundant set of mechanisms. Robotica **31**(8), 1327–1335 (2013)
- Tavakoli, M., Marques, L., De Almeida, A.T.: 3DCLIMBER: climbing and manipulation over 3D structures. Mechatronics 21(1), 48–62 (2011)
- Tavakoli, M., Viegas, C., Marques, L., Norberto Pires, J., De Almeida, A.T.: OmniClimber-II: an omnidirectional climbing robot with high maneuverability and flexibility to adapt to non-flat surfaces. In: Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, pp. 1349–1354 (2013)
- Tavakoli, M., Zakerzadeh, M.R., Vossoughi, G.R., Bagheri, S.: A hybrid pole climbing and manipulating robot with minimum DOFs for construction and service applications. Ind. Robot Inter. J. 32(2), 171–178 (2005)
- Yoon, Y., Rus, D.: Shady3D: a robot that climbs 3D trusses. In: Proceedings of the 2007 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, pp. 4071–4076 (2007)