1 Introduction

In recent years, there appears an interest in robotic systems where nonholonomic rolling constraints are used not only for manipulation but also for locomotion. In such systems self-propelled movements are usually generated by creating imbalance and changing the system inertia. The applications of rolling-based locomotion systems vary from the planetary surface exploration [1] to the toy industry [2]. Different designs of spherical mobile robotic systems are reported in Refs. [3–6]. These vehicles can be useful when the usage of traditional machines is limited or undesirable.

It should be noted that the analysis of motion of a sphere rolling on a plane without slipping is a classical problem in rational mechanics. The motion of a dynamically symmetric ball with a gyroscope inside (and this was perhaps the first spherical robot!) was studied in Ref. [7]. The theoretical solution obtained there was verified under experiment where the ball rolled on a plane powered with likopodium. Note that from the viewpoint of analytical mechanics the main problem is the integrability of the motion equations in quadratures, and no notion of control is involved in the analysis. Whether or not the wealth of results obtained in analytical mechanics for rolling systems [8–10] can be utilized by control theorists and engineers yet remains to be seen.

One of the key problems in the control of nonholonomic systems with rolling constraints is the construction of motion planning algorithms. Typically, this problem is considered in the kinematic formulation [11–15], and in practical implementations the control system operates in the quasistatic mode [16–18]. The extension of the proposed motion planning algorithms to the dynamic domain is a very challenging, if not formidable, research problem. The main difficulty here is that in addition to the nonholonomic constraints one also has the configuration-dependent inertia and the gravity drift. This combination is rarely considered in the control literature, and the motion planning frameworks for such systems are not yet developed.2

It is also worth noting that the controllability analysis of nonholonomic systems with rolling constraints in dynamic formulation is highly nontrivial at best [19] and, in general, quite cumbersome [20]. In this situation, when the controllability analysis is not conclusive (or simply not feasible) and the controllability property needs to be hypothesized [20], the insight gained in the analysis of human movements in rolling-based manipulation and locomotion may prove helpful for attacking the motion planning problem.

It is interesting to note that trained humans and animals exhibit highly skillful movements when performing rolling-based locomotion tasks (see Fig. 1, reproducing the famous painting of Pablo Picasso “The Girl on a Ball”). Watching them performing locomotion feats on a rolling sphere in circuses, one can wonder about how these skills can be formalized in the form of a control strategy. To imitate the artistic movements, one could place a robotic mechanism on top of a spherical object. This system, however, would be extremely complex for an initial study, and it would be reasonable to resort to simplifications. In a simplified formulation, one could deal with a hemisphere and replace the robot with its center of masses projected on the main hemisphere plane. The driving principle for such a system would then be based on controlling the position of the center of mass and exploiting the nonholonomic rolling constraint to propel the hemisphere.

To extract the patterns of human movements in the control of this simplified system, one can resort to the virtual reality technology [21]. The model of a virtual hemisphere with the driving mass point is suitable for the implementation in haptic systems, because the mass point can be directly controlled by a human using a standard point-force haptic device. In a nutshell, this virtual reality haptic system would resemble the real manipulations shown in the right part of Fig. 1. Changing the position of the mass point by the haptic stylus would result into the mass redistribution and lead to the motion of the hemisphere, which can be realized in a haptic simulator. The development of such a simulator constitutes the main goal of this paper. Note that apart from discovering nontrivial motion strategies in the control of nonholonomic systems, the simulator itself can be used also for studying human motor behavior and for the development of games based on the physical modeling.

Several issues need to be addressed in the implementation of the haptic simulator. For the high fidelity force feedback, the simulation of the virtual rolling system needs to be synchronized with the haptic hardware frequency. This brings the requirement...
of high computational efficiency. For this purpose, the state-space
dynamics of the rolling system needs to be established in the
minimal form, as the often used representation employing
Lagrange multipliers [6] can be more costly for real-time computa-
tions. Next, the force feedback generation procedures, suitable
for the control of this system, need to be assessed, and the feas-
ibility of the haptic rendering needs to be tested under experiments
with human subjects.

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Sec. 2 we establish
the kinematic and dynamic models of the rolling system under
consideration. The architecture of a real-time haptic simulator
is described in Sec. 3. Here, we present a solver, integrating the state
and dynamics, and describe force generation procedures for the haptic
interaction. Initial experiments with human subjects, using the
haptic simulator developed, are reported in Sec. 4. In Sec. 5, we
discuss how the experimental patterns of human movements can
be captured using simple mathematical models. Finally, conclu-
sions are drawn in Sec. 6.

2 Mathematical Model

This section describes the kinematics and dynamics of a hemi-
sphere with a mass point moving on the equatorial plane of the
hemisphere. It is assumed that the hemisphere can roll on the
contact plane without slipping. The effects of rolling and spinning
friction are ignored.

2.1 Kinematic Model. To describe the system under consid-
eration, we introduce the following coordinate frames (see Fig. 2):
Σ₀ is an inertial frame fixed at the base, Σₙ is a frame fixed at
the center of the equatorial plane of the hemisphere, and Σₙ is a frame
fixed at the contact point. In addition, at the contact point we
introduce the contact frame of the object Σₜ, and the contact
frame of the plane Σₙ. In what follows, we will assume that the
frame Σₜ coincides with Σₜ and the frame Σₜ is parallel to Σₜ.

The position of a point on the sphere is parametrized as

\[ \mathbf{c}(u,v) = \mathbf{R}(u,v) \mathbf{R}(v) \mathbf{c}(0,0) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \sin u \cos v \\ -R \cos v \sin u \\ -R \cos u \sin v \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( R \) is the radius of the sphere. The elementary rotation
matrices around the axes \( x, y, \) and \( z \) are denoted by the corresponding
indices. In the parametrization (1) the origin is placed at the south
pole of the sphere. The geometrical meaning of the angular coordi-
nates \( u \) and \( v \) is established as follows. The vector \( \mathbf{c}(u,v) \) is
obtained by rotating the vector \( [0,0,-R]^T \) first around the \( x \)-axis
of \( \Sigma_0 \) through the angle \( v \) and then around the \( y \)-axis (of the frame
associated with the first rotation) through the angle \( u \). In
this parametrization the lower hemisphere is selected by imposing
the following constraints:

\[ -\pi/2 < u < \pi/2, \quad -\pi/2 < v < \pi/2 \]

The parametrization (1) defines the Gaussian frame \( \Sigma_{co} \) whose
orientation relative to \( \Sigma_0 \) is

\[ \mathbf{R}_c(u,v) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_u & \mathbf{c}_v \\ \mathbf{c}_v \times \mathbf{c}_u & \mathbf{c}_u \times \mathbf{c}_v \\ \mathbf{c}_u \times \mathbf{c}_v & \mathbf{c}_u \times \mathbf{c}_v \end{bmatrix} \]

where \( \mathbf{c}_u \triangleq \partial \mathbf{c}(u,v)/\partial u \) and \( \mathbf{c}_v \triangleq \partial \mathbf{c}(u,v)/\partial v \).
Having defined \( \mathbf{c}_u \) and \( \mathbf{c}_v \), one can write this matrix in the explicit form

\[ \mathbf{R}_c(u,v) = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos u & \sin u \sin v & \sin u \cos v \\ \cos v & \sin v & 0 \\ \sin u & \cos u \sin v & \cos u \cos v \end{bmatrix} \]

Note that this matrix can be composed of the elementary rotations
as \( \mathbf{R}_c(u,v) = \mathbf{R}_c(u) \mathbf{R}_c(v) \).

Define the contact angle \( \psi \) as the angle between the \( x \)-axes of
\( \Sigma_{co} \) and \( \Sigma_{co} \) (the \( z \)-axes of these frames are aligned as depicted in
Fig. 2). The orientation matrix of the sphere (the orientation of \( \Sigma_0 \)
relative to the base \( \Sigma_b \)) can be defined as follows. First, by super-
posing the axes of \( \Sigma_{co} \) with those of \( \Sigma_{co} \), we rotate \( \Sigma_{co} \) first by
\( \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) \) and then by \( \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \). Thus, \( \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) = \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \) and the orientation of \( \Sigma_{co} \) relative to \( \Sigma_{co} \) are defined as

\[ \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) = \begin{bmatrix} -\cos \psi \sin \psi & 0 \\ \sin \psi \cos \psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \]

Then, from closing the kinematic chains associated with the coor-
dinate frames, one obtains \( \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) = \mathbf{R}_c \triangleq \mathbf{I} \), where \( \mathbf{I} \) stands for the
unit \( 3 \times 3 \) matrix. Therefore \( \mathbf{R}_c \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) = \mathbf{I} \) and the orientation of the sphere are defined as

\[ \mathbf{R} \triangleq \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) \mathbf{R}_c(\tau) \mathbf{R}_c(\psi) \]

Let \( \mathbf{v} = [\mathbf{v}_x, \mathbf{v}_y, \mathbf{v}_z]^T \) and \( \omega = [a_x, a_y, a_z]^T \) be, respectively, the transla-
tional and rotational velocities of \( \Sigma_{co} \) relative to \( \Sigma_{co} \) Define
respectively, at the contact point. The relative position \( \mathbf{p} \) and the driving force \( \mathbf{F} \) can be parametrized as 
\[
\mathbf{p} = \hat{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{p}_o + \mathbf{r}_p, \quad \mathbf{F} = \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}_o + \mathbf{r}_p.
\]
where \( \hat{\mathbf{p}} = \{p_x, p_y\}^T \), \( \hat{\mathbf{F}} = \{F_x, F_y\}^T \), \( \mathbf{R} \) is the matrix of orientation of the frame \( \Sigma_o \) with respect to \( \Sigma_o \), and the projection matrix 
\[
\mathbf{N} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]
This matrix is necessary to keep the \( z \)-components of the projections of the vectors \( \mathbf{p} \) and \( \mathbf{F} \) onto the axes of the frame \( \Sigma_o \) zero.

The derivation of the dynamic model will be based on the use of D’Alembert’s principle [24]. Let \( \hat{\mathbf{r}}_p \) and \( \hat{\mathbf{p}}_p \) be the virtual displacements of the origin of \( \Sigma_o \) and the driving point, respectively, and \( \delta \mathbf{p}_o \) be the vector of infinitesimal rotation of \( \Sigma_o \). For the unconstrained system composed of the hemisphere and the point mass, D’Alembert’s principle can be written down as follows:
\[
\delta \mathbf{r}_p \cdot \{m \mathbf{v}_p + \omega_o \times m \mathbf{p}_o + \omega_o \times (\omega_o \times m \mathbf{p}_o) - m \mathbf{g}\} + \delta \mathbf{p}_o \cdot \{m \mathbf{p}_o \times \mathbf{v}_p + J_o \omega_o + \omega_o \times J_o \omega_o - \mathbf{p}_o \times m \mathbf{g}\} + \delta \mathbf{p}_p \cdot \{m \mathbf{v}_p - m \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{F}\} = 0
\]
where \( m \) is the mass of the hemisphere, \( m_p \) is the mass of the particle, \( \mathbf{p} \) is the vector of the center of mass of the hemisphere defined in the frame \( \Sigma_o \), \( J_o \) is the inertia tensor of the hemisphere with respect to the origin of \( \Sigma_o \), and \( \mathbf{g} \) is the gravity vector. Under the assumption that the hemisphere is homogeneous, \( \mathbf{p}_o = -\frac{1}{2} R \mathbf{k}_o \), \( J_o = J_o R^T \), where \( \mathbf{I} \) stands for the unit tensor.

First, we need to transform \( \delta \mathbf{r}_p \) in (17) to \( \delta \mathbf{r}_p \delta \mathbf{p}_o \) and \( \delta \mathbf{p}_p \) by \( \delta \mathbf{r}_p = \delta \mathbf{r}_p + \delta \mathbf{p}_o \times \mathbf{r}_p + \delta \mathbf{p}_p \) and \( \delta \mathbf{p}_o = \delta \mathbf{r}_p + \delta \mathbf{p}_o \times \mathbf{r}_p + \omega_o \times \delta \mathbf{r}_p + \delta \mathbf{p}_p \), and \( \omega_o \times J_o \omega_o = 0 \). Therefore, we transform Eq. (17) to the following form:
\[
\delta \mathbf{r}_p \cdot \{m \mathbf{v}_p + \omega_o \times m \mathbf{p}_o + \omega_o \times (\omega_o \times m \mathbf{p}_o) - m \mathbf{g}\} + \delta \mathbf{p}_o \cdot \{m \mathbf{p}_o \times \mathbf{v}_p + J_o \omega_o + \omega_o \times J_o \omega_o - m \mathbf{g}\} + \delta \mathbf{p}_p \cdot \{m \mathbf{v}_p - m \mathbf{g} - F\} = 0
\]
Here, the terms involving \( \mathbf{v}_p \) and \( \omega_o \) can be expanded further by the kinematical formulas 
\[
\mathbf{v}_p = \mathbf{v}_o + \omega_o \times \mathbf{p}_o + \dot{\mathbf{p}}_p + \dot{\mathbf{r}}_p, \quad \omega_o = \omega_o + \omega_o \times \mathbf{p}_o + 2 \omega_o \times \mathbf{p}_o + \mathbf{r}_p,
\]
Next, we transform the virtual displacement \( \delta \mathbf{r}_p \) in (18) to the point of contact, defined by the vector \( \mathbf{r}_c \) (see Fig. 3). The reason is to introduce variations in quasicoordinates that would vanish by virtue of the nonholonomic constraints [25]. Taking into account that \( \mathbf{r}_p = \mathbf{r}_c + \mathbf{p}_c \), \( \delta \mathbf{r}_p = \delta \mathbf{r}_c + \delta \mathbf{r}_p \mathbf{r}_c + \delta \mathbf{r}_c \mathbf{p}_c \), and \( \mathbf{p}_c = \mathbf{g} = 0 \), where \( \mathbf{p}_c = -R \mathbf{k}_o \), we transform Eq. (18) to the following form:
\[
\delta \mathbf{r}_c \cdot \{m \mathbf{v}_c + \omega_o \times m \mathbf{p}_c + \omega_o \times (\omega_o \times m \mathbf{p}_c) - m \mathbf{g}\} + \delta \mathbf{p}_o \cdot \{m \mathbf{p}_o \times \mathbf{v}_c + J_o \omega_o + \omega_o \times J_o \omega_o - m \mathbf{g}\} + \delta \mathbf{p}_c \cdot \{m \mathbf{v}_c - m \mathbf{g} - F\} = 0.
\]
the quasicoordinates, can be written down as \( \dot{\theta} = 0 \), and the corresponding terms in Eq. (19) do not enter the dynamic equations (the standard procedure based on the introduction of the Lagrangian multipliers moves the terms in the corresponding brackets to the constraint reactions [26]).

In deriving the motion equations from Eq. (19) we can eliminate the terms with \( \mathbf{v}_p \) using the fact that \( \dot{\mathbf{v}}_p + \mathbf{\omega}_o \times \mathbf{v}_p = 0 \), and, therefore, \( \dot{\mathbf{v}}_p = -\mathbf{\omega}_o \times \mathbf{v}_p \). Now, setting \( \delta \mathbf{p}_p, \delta \mathbf{\omega}_p \), and \( \delta \mathbf{\pi}_p \) as the independent variations, we obtain from Eq. (19) the dynamic equations for the mass point

\[
N^T \mathbf{R} [m_p \dot{\mathbf{v}}_p - m_p \mathbf{g}] = \mathbf{f}
\]

and for the hemisphere

\[
J_o \ddot{\mathbf{\omega}}_o - \mathbf{\rho}_o \times \mathbf{\omega}_o \times (m \mathbf{p}_p) + (m_p \mathbf{p}_p) \times m_p \dot{\mathbf{v}}_p - (m \mathbf{p}_p) \times m_p \mathbf{v}_p + m_p \dot{\mathbf{p}}_p \times (m \mathbf{p}_p) \times \mathbf{g} - (m \mathbf{p}_p - \mathbf{p}_p) \times \mathbf{F} = 0
\]

where \( J_o = J_s + m_p (\mathbf{\dot{\mathbf{p}}}_p + \mathbf{\dot{\mathbf{p}}}_p - \mathbf{\dot{\mathbf{p}}}_p) \) is the inertia tensor of the hemisphere at the contact point, and \( \mathbf{h} \) is the skew-symmetric operator such that \( a \times a = \mathbf{h} \).

3 Design and Implementation of the Haptic Simulator

To record and analyze human movements in the manipulation of the hemisphere rolling on the plane, we built a virtual reality haptic system. The system architecture is schematically shown in Fig. 4. The hardware part of the system is based on a point-force haptic device (PHANToM Premium 1.5 manipulator, 3DOF, maximum exeractable force 8.5 N) connected to a PC (dual core CPU, Intel Pentium 4, 3.0 GHz) through a PCI (Peripheral Component Interconnect) interface.

The software runs in two threads responsible for independent haptic and graphical renderings. In the haptic rendering loop, the Physical Simulator module integrates the system of first-order ordinary differential equations (ODEs), describing the evolution of the rolling system under a specified force input in the time domain. The state dynamics are simulated in real time (using fourth-order Runge–Kutta method [27] with constant step \( h = 0.001 \) s) and the haptic feedback is supplied to the human hand through the PHANToM stylus. Thus, the simulation is synchronized with the constant haptic feedback frequency (1000 Hz).

Similar to the architecture presented in Ref. [28], the ODE solver and the haptic feedback generation procedures are dynamically linked to the library of external constraints. When the application starts, the Physical Simulator module acquires in real time the position and velocity of the PHANToM stylus, calculates the haptic feedback force and the force applied to the virtual reality object, and integrates the ODEs to obtain the state of the system at the next moment of time. The geometric output of this module, the position and orientation of the hemisphere with the mass point, is rendered in the 3D Window by the graphical thread.

The History Unit module records all the time histories of the state variables as well as the haptic feedback forces. These data are recorded at 100 Hz, which is enough to analyze human movements in our manipulation task. The physical parameters of the rolling system as well as the initial and target values of the state variables are defined in the Configuration module. The graphical representation of the rolling system (referred to as a Virtual Reality Modeling Language (VRML) scene) is also defined in this module. Different segments (files) of the VRML scene are collected in the configuration repository. The VRML files define the geometry of the hemisphere and the mass point drawn as a small sphere on the main hemisphere plane.

The initial position of the rolling system is shown in Fig. 4. The graphical user interface, shown in Fig. 5, corresponds to the state of the rolling system after 30 s of haptic interaction. In this figure, the real-time scrolling window displays the evolution of the \( x \)-coordinate of the contact trajectory.

The rest of this section describes in detail the structure of the ODE solver and the haptic feedback force models in our simulator.

3.1 Solver. The state of the system under consideration (rolling hemisphere with moving mass point) can be described in terms of 12 variables. The 12-dimensional state vector

\[
\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{p}^T, \dot{\mathbf{p}}^T, \mathbf{\omega}^T_o, \mathbf{u}^T_o, \mathbf{u}^T_o, \theta]^T
\]

or \( \mathbf{x} = [x, y, \dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{y}_p, \theta_o, \dot{\theta}_o, \dot{\theta}_o, u_o, u_o, \theta]^T \) in the expanded form. The solver integrates the system of differential equations \( \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}) \), describing the evolution of the state vector \( \mathbf{x} \) under the input force \( \mathbf{f} \). To form the right-hand part \( \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}) \) of the state dynamics, we first need to define \( \mathbf{p} \) and \( \mathbf{\omega}_o \) as functions of \( \mathbf{x} \) and \( \mathbf{f} \). Upon expressing \( \mathbf{v}_p \) in Eqs. (20) and (21) through the state variables, one can represent the dynamic equations (20) and (21) in the following matrix form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H_{pp} & H_{ps} \\
H_{sp} & H_{ss}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\mathbf{p}} \\
\dot{\mathbf{\omega}}_o
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{h}_p \\
\mathbf{h}_s
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where

\[
H_{pp} = m_p \mathbf{I}
\]

\[
H_{ps} = -m_p N^T \mathbf{R}^T (\mathbf{\rho}_p - \mathbf{\rho}_p)
\]

\[
H_{sp} = m_p (\mathbf{\rho}_p - \mathbf{\rho}_p)^2
\]

\[
H_{ss} = \frac{J_c}{m_p} - m_p (\mathbf{\rho}_p - \mathbf{\rho}_p)^2
\]

\[
\mathbf{h}_p = \mathbf{f} - m_p N^T \mathbf{R}^T [\mathbf{\omega}_o \times (\mathbf{\omega}_o \times \mathbf{\rho}_p) + 2 \omega_o \times \dot{\mathbf{\rho}}_p - \mathbf{g}]
\]
Having formed the system matrices, one can define the accelerations
\[ \begin{bmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{\omega}_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{pp} & H_{ps} \\ H_{sp} & H_{ss} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \tau(x,f) \\ Q(x,f) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{pp} & \mathcal{H}_{ps} \\ \mathcal{H}_{sp} & \mathcal{H}_{ss} \end{bmatrix} \]  
and then compile the kinetic and dynamic equations (11)–(15) and (30) into the state-space form
\[ x \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{\omega}_p \\ \dot{u}_a \\ \dot{v}_a \\ \dot{u}_b \\ \dot{v}_b \\ \dot{\psi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{pp} & \mathcal{H}_{ps} \\ \mathcal{H}_{sp} & \mathcal{H}_{ss} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tau(x,f) \\ Q(x,f) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq X(x,f) \]

To be able to simulate the state dynamics (31) in real time, the numerical integration of the state equations must be synchronized with the constant haptic hardware frequency (1000 Hz). This constitutes higher requirements to the efficiency of the computation of the right-hand part of the state equations (31)). To increase the computational efficiency, one can reduce the inversion of the 5 × 5 system matrix in Eq. (30) to the inversion of a 3 × 3 matrix. Let us define
\[ \mathcal{H}_{ss} = (H_{ss} - H_{sp}H_{pp}^{-1}H_{ps})^{-1} \]
\[ \mathcal{H}_{ps} = -H_{sp}H_{pp}^{-1} \]
\[ \mathcal{H}_{pp} = H_{pp}^{-1} + H_{sp}H_{pp}^{-1}H_{ss} \]
The straight computation of the matrix blocks for the system under consideration leads to the following formulas:
\[ \mathcal{H}_{ix} = (J_e + m_p (\rho_p - \rho_s)k_i)^{-1} \]
\[ \mathcal{H}_{ip} = -N^T R^T (\rho_p - \rho_s) \mathcal{H}_{ix} \]
\[ \mathcal{H}_{ip} = -N^T R^T (\rho_p - \rho_s)R_N = \mathcal{H}_{ip} \]
\[ \mathcal{H}_{pp} = \frac{1}{m_p} I + N^T R^T (\rho_p - \rho_s)^T \mathcal{H}_{ix} R_N \]

Thus, in the calculation of the matrix (32) we need to inverse only the 3 × 3 matrix in Eq. (37). Note that this inverse matrix is never singular (unless the mass of the sphere \( m_s = 0 \)). Also note that in the software coding the last term (40) can be computed as
\[ \mathcal{H}_{pp} = (1/m_p) I + \mathcal{H}_{ps} \mathcal{H}_{ss}^{-1} \mathcal{H}_{sp} \]

3.2 Force Input. The input force \( f \) driving the point mass in the dynamic model, is to be defined from the force \( F_b \) developed at the human hand through the haptic interface. Typically, in the impedance-type haptic devices the force \( F_b \) is defined using virtual spring-damper models [30]. These models generate the haptic force \( F_b \) based on the position and velocity differences between the haptic proxy (the end-point of the PHANToM manipulator transformed to the virtual space) and a virtual object (the driven mass point, in our case). The haptic force is generated in real time and is supplied to the hardware interface.

Note that in programming the PHANToM manipulator the haptic force \( F_b \) is specified in the inertial (base) frame [31]. Let \( r_b \) and \( v_b \) be, respectively, the absolute position and velocity of the haptic point. The absolute position and velocity of the particle are defined as \( r_p = r_b + \rho_p \) and \( v_p = \omega_p \times (\rho_p - \rho_s) + \rho_p \), where coordinates of the center of the sphere are \( r_s = [u_s, v_s, R]^T \), and \( \rho_p = R N_p, \rho_s = R N_s \). Having defined these quantities, one can calculate the haptic force in the inertial frame. The following three solutions are implemented in our haptic simulator.

First method (M1). The haptic interaction between the human hand and the mass point is modeled by the elastic force with the spring and damping matrices proportional to the unit matrix
\[ F_b = -k_h (r_b - r_s) - k_u (v_b - v_s) \]
where \( k_h \) and \( k_u \) are the scalar stiffness and damping coefficients. To define the driving force \( f \) one needs to transform \( F_b \) into the moving frame \( \Sigma_o \), and then project it onto the main hemisphere plain. As a result, one obtains
\[ f = N^T R^T F_b \]
This method has one disadvantage. When the haptic force \( F_b \) is orthogonal to the main hemisphere plane it does not affect the motion equation. This may produce some unrealistic feeling for the user.

Second method (M2). This method is a simple modification of the first one. As before, we define the haptic force by Eq. (41). Then, we replace \( f \) in Eq. (28) with \( N^T R^T F_b \), and in Eq. (29) we replace the term \( R N_f \) with \( F_b \). From the perceptual point of view this method can be more realistic. In this model, when the haptic force \( F_b \) is orthogonal to the main hemisphere plane it does not affect the motion of the particle but it does affect the motion of the hemisphere.

Third method (M3). This method is similar to the second one but the haptic force here is defined differently
\[ F_b = -K_h (r_b - r_s) - K_u (v_b - v_s) \]
where \( K_h \) and \( K_u \) are the stiffness and damping matrices expressed in the inertial (base) frame. How do we specify them? Consider first the stiffness matrix. When there is no damping, Eq. (43) can be written as \( F_b^{(b)} = -K_h^{(b)} \Delta \mathbf{r}^{(o)} \). Here, by the upper superscript we denote the frame (the base \( \Sigma_b \) or the object \( \Sigma_o \)) in which a vector or tensor quantity is expressed. Since \( F_b^{(b)} = R F_b^{(o)} \) and \( \Delta \mathbf{r}^{(o)} = R \mathbf{r}^{(o)} \), we get \( F_b^{(b)} = -R K_h^{(b)} \Delta \mathbf{r}^{(o)} \triangleq -K_h^{(b)} \Delta \mathbf{r}^{(o)} \), and therefore
\[ K_b \triangleq K_h^{(b)} R R^T \]
Here, the stiffness matrix in the object frame can be specified as \( K_h^{(o)} = \text{diag}(k_{x_s}, k_{y_s}, k_{z_s}) \), where \( k_{x_s} \geq k_{y_s} \) and \( k_{z_s} \gg k_{x_s} \). If the coefficients are specified in this way, the user will feel the “plane constraint.” It will be harder to move the particle perpendicular to the main hemisphere plane compared with the “in-plane” movements. Thus, this method of modeling the haptic interaction can be more realistic.

The damping matrix in Eq. (43) is defined in the similar way. Specifically, we assign
\[ K_u \triangleq K_u^{(b)} R R^T \]
where the damping matrix in the object frame is \( K_u^{(o)} = \text{diag}(k_{x_{u_s}}, k_{y_{u_s}}, k_{z_{u_s}}) \), and \( k_{x_{u_s}} \gg k_{y_{u_s}} \) and \( k_{y_{u_s}} \gg k_{x_{u_s}} \).
It is instructive to clarify the differences among the three methods from the standpoint of perception. In the first method, when the haptic force \( F_b \) does not lie in the main hemisphere plane, its
out-of-plane component does not enter the motion equations. When it happens, the user may feel strange sensations, resulting from mismatching of the visual and haptic information and leading to unrealistic perception of the system behavior. This situation is excluded in the second and third methods, as we allow for the out-of-plane component of $F_h$ to influence the motion of the rolling system. Thus, these methods are expected to produce more realistic perception of the system behavior.

The difference between the second and third methods is only in the specification of the stiffness and damping tensors. Specifically, in the second method these tensors are isotropic (given by Eq. (41)) while in the third method they can be anisotropic (defined by Eq. (43)). Setting the coefficients of the anisotropic tensors in a right-handed coordinate system, the user to feel the main hemisphere plane as the out-of-plane movement of the haptic proxy would be felt with greater resistance. The idea of the anisotropic tensors is basically similar to that of the compliance control of robotic mechanisms in constrained movements [32]. In principle, the third method can produce more realistic perception. However, the design of the stable haptic interaction in this method becomes complex and requires special techniques [33,34].

### 4 Experiments

The experimental system, described in Sec. 3, was used for analysis of human movements in the manipulation of the virtual rolling system. In the experiments, the parameters of the system were configured as follows. The gravity acceleration and the masses of the driving point and the hemisphere were set to $9.81 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$, 1 kg, and 0.1 kg, respectively. The radius of the hemisphere was set as $R=4\text{ cm}$.

Four naive subjects (males, aged between 25 and 30 years old, three right-handed and one left-handed) participated in the experiments. The subjects were instructed to transport the hemisphere from the initial configuration, where all the state variables (Eq. (22)) are zero, to a final state and stop it there. At the initial configuration the system was at rest, with the main symmetry axis of the hemisphere vertical and the point mass being on the top of the hemisphere, as shown in the 3D Window block of Fig. 4. Before starting the movement the subject positioned the haptic proxy at the point mass and switched on the haptic interaction by pressing a button on the computer keyboard.

In the target configuration the vector $u_{co}$ was set as $\{-4, -4\}$ cm while the vectors $p$, $p$, $o$, and $u_{co}$ were set zero. The component $\psi$ of the state vector $x$ at the target configuration was not specified.

Geometrically, this means that at the target configuration the system is at rest, the main symmetry axis of the hemisphere is vertical, and the balancing point mass is on the top of the hemisphere, but the orientation of the hemisphere, defined at this state only by the angle $\psi$, can be arbitrary.

The subjects were requested to produce the reaching movements in a natural way, on their own pace, trading off the speed and the comfortability. A movement trial was considered to be successful if the movement task was completed within 4 min and within certain position and velocity tolerances. The subject was given an audio feedback, generated by the computer, if a trial was successful. In the course of preliminary evaluations, the following tolerances were specified: $\Delta \omega = \pm 0.01 \text{ rad/s}$ for the components of the angular velocity of the hemisphere, $\Delta u_{co} = \pm 0.4 \text{ cm}$ for the components of the contact point on the plane, $\Delta u_{co} = \pm \pi/18 \text{ rad}$ for the components of the contact point on the plane, $\Delta p = \pm 0.4 \text{ cm}$ and $\Delta p = \pm 0.4 \text{ cm/s}$ for the components of, respectively, the position and velocity of the driving mass point.

In the preliminary evaluations, we found that specifying the complete orientation at the target configuration made the reaching task much more complex. One can speculate that the acquisition of the necessary motor skills for such a task requires considerably more learning time.

### 4.1 Assessment of the Force Feedback Methods

The experiments with the human subjects were conducted in two days. On the first day we conducted a general evaluation of the subject performance. The subjects familiarized with the experimental setup, comprehended the reaching task, and performed movement trials. During these preliminary experiments we also conducted the assessment of the force feedback methods described in Sec. 3.2.

For the methods M1 and M2, the PHANToM stiffness and damping coefficients were set as, respectively, $k_x=250 \text{ N/m}$ and $k_y=10 \text{ N/s/m}$. It was found that when using the method M1, all the subjects could manipulate the rolling system and transport it to the target configuration. However, they mentioned strange sensations and inconveniences in the manipulation of the hemisphere when the hand movement was in the direction orthogonal to the equatorial plane. Compare with the method M1, the subjects found the method M2 easier and more comfortable.

In assessing method M3, we set $k_x=k_y=250 \text{ N/m}$, $k_{xy}=k_{yx}=10 \text{ N/s/m}$, and varied the ratio $\alpha=F_{xy}/F_{yx}$ from 1 to 4. When the ratio factor $\alpha$ was closed to or exceeded 4, the subjects evaluated the control as bumpy, uncomfortable, and unstable. While the exact stability analysis is out of the scope of this paper, the subjects’ perceptions can be partially explained by the apparatus limitations—the PHANToM manufacturer [7] does not recommend setting up the stiffness coefficients more than 800 Nm.

In the course of the experiments, it was found that when the ratio factor $\alpha$ varied from 1.5 to 2.5, the control of the hemisphere was stable, with smooth force sensations. As a result, the subjects manipulated the rolling system faster; two subjects could complete the reaching task within 40 s time interval several times. Overall, among the three methods for the generation of the feedback force, the subjects preferred method M3 (with $\alpha=2$) as more natural, comfortable, and realistic in perception. They sensed better the object reaction force and the inertial properties of the system.

Finally, it should be mentioned that in the assessment of the force feedback methods we also experimented with a special case when the driving force $f$, sent to the physical simulator, was calculated correctly but the haptic force $F_h$ was zeroed when applied to the hand through the PHANToM stylus. This corresponds to the visual-based control without the haptic feedback. In this case the subjects failed to produce the requested reaching movements. Even though the subjects could see that the point mass followed the hand movement, they could not control the system as the hemisphere motion became quite chaotic. They reasoned that the system became uncontrollable without the haptic feedback. This fact may evidence that the central nervous system cannot control constrained movements based only on visual information.

### 4.2 Experimental Results

On the second day of the experiments, the subjects performed 15 movement trials, using method M3 with $\alpha=2$, and the data were collected for analysis. In all the trials the movement task was completed successfully. However, the movement time was varied from 46 s to 170 s.

It is interesting to note that the subjects showed roughly similar motion patterns resulting possibly from a similar control strategy. When asked, after the experiments, about their perceptions, the subjects reported they felt easing control of the system if they visually concentrated on the position of the point mass and/or that of the haptic proxy. It appears that they paid visual attention mostly to the current and target contact points on the contact plane while controlling the motion of the hemisphere through the haptic feedback.

When asked about their movements, the subjects could not identify the specific trajectory of the hand. However, the general movement strategy, reconstructed from their comments, can be summarized as follows. First, they tried to slightly unbalance the hemisphere and then gently increase its precession. Having developed a certain level of the hemisphere precession, they tried to
keep it constant until the rolling system reached a vicinity of the target point at the contact plane. At the final stage of the maneuver, the subjects decreased the precession and tried to stabilize the angular movements of the hemisphere. This was produced by somewhat jerky, if not chaotic, movements of the hand. All the subjects mentioned that the choice of the precession axis and the precession speed is important for the successful steering of the rolling system.

There can be two reasons why all the subjects preferred this strategy. First, it appears to be conceptually simple and, therefore, it could be more comfortable. The second reason is not physical or physiological but rather social. The subjects could observe the trials of the current performer and discuss them between each other. So, once a successful motion strategy was picked by someone it could be reproduced by the others.

Two examples of the trajectory of the contact point in the contact plane are shown in Fig. 6. The trajectories are circularly curved and appear to be helical. The corresponding trajectories of the driving point mass in the equatorial plane of the hemisphere are shown in Fig. 7. To keep the graphs clean and readable, these trajectories are taken for 20 s intervals of time in the middle part of the movement depicted in Fig. 6. The trace of the curves in Fig. 7 is almost closed, and the curves themselves appear to be roselike. One may conjecture that one leaf of the rose corresponds to one spiral loop in Fig. 6. This roselike pattern was visible in all the subjects’ data. The number of leaves varied from 8 or 15 (on average 10). The leaf radius changed from 0.4 cm to 1.0 cm (on average 0.7 cm), while the outer radius of the roselike curve varied from 1.2 cm to 2.4 cm (on average 1.8 cm). Also, the time span featuring the roselike pattern varied from 18 s to 32 s (on average 23 s).

5 Simple Actuation Scheme

Having observed the pattern of human movements, reported in Sec. 4, we would like to explain its formation using, as much as possible, simple mathematical tools. In general, the hand trajectory is composed of the acceleration, the steady state precession, and the deceleration/stabilization phases. In what follows, we will be interested in capturing only the precession phase of this trajectory.

Assume for simplicity that the human can perfectly control and specify the trajectory \( p(t) \) of the mass point on the main hemisphere plane. From first equation in Eq. (23) we get

\[
H_{pp} \ddot{p} + H_{p\phi} \dot{\phi} = f + \dot{h}_p
\]  

(46)

where \( \dot{h}_p \triangleq (h_p)_{t=0} \) is defined by Eq. (28) with \( f=0 \). Let also \( \ddot{h}_p \triangleq (h_p)_{t=0} \). It is defined by Eq. (29) with \( f=0 \). Upon substituting Eq. (46) into Eq. (23), after some algebra one obtains
\[
\omega_0 = (H_{pp} - (\rho_0 - \rho_p)RN_{hp})^{-1}(h_{pp} - (\rho_0 - \rho_p)RN{h}_p) \quad (47)
\]

Note that under our assumption (the direct specification of \( p \)) the acceleration of the mass point \( \dot{p} \) does not influence the angular acceleration of the sphere as it does not enter the sphere dynamics ((47)).

The dynamics of the system under consideration can be described now in terms of eight state variables. The eight-dimensional state vector \( x = (\omega_0, \dot{u}_p, \dot{v}_p, \phi, \dot{\phi})^T \), or, in the expanded form \( x = (\omega_0, \omega, \dot{u}_p, \dot{v}_p, \dot{u}_p, \dot{v}_p, \dot{\phi})^T \). Since the trajectory of the mass point is specified explicitly as a function of time, the state dynamics \( \ddot{x} = X(x, p(t), \dot{p}(t)) \) are defined as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\omega}_0 \\
\dot{u}_0 \\
\dot{v}_0 \\
\dot{\phi}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
\ddot{Q}(x, p(t), \dot{p}(t)) \\
R\omega_0 \\
-\rho_0 \omega_0 \\
\rho_0 \omega_0 \sin \phi + \rho_0 \cos \phi \cos v_p \\
\rho_0 \omega_0 \cos \phi + \rho_0 \sin \phi \\
-\rho_0 \omega_0 \sin \phi + \rho_0 \cos \phi \tan v_p
\end{bmatrix} \quad (48)
\]

where \( \ddot{Q} \) is defined by the right-hand side of Eq. (47). By integrating the state dynamics ((48)), one finds that the state evolution \( x(t) \) and then estimates from Eq. (46) the driving force \( f(t) \) corresponding to the prescribed motion of the particle \( p(t) \).

To qualitatively capture the pattern of human movements, shown in Fig. 7, one may look for a family of roselike curves with an adjustable number of leaves. There are many such curves known in the literature [35]. In our study, we model the trajectory \( p(t) \) of the mass point as

\[
x_p(t) = r_1 \cos \varphi(t) + r_2 \cos(k \varphi(t)) \quad (49)
\]
\[
y_p(t) = r_1 \sin \varphi(t) - r_2 \sin(k \varphi(t)) \quad (50)
\]

This curves describes the trajectory of the end-point of a virtual double pendulum with the link lengths \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \), rotating in the equatorial plane of the hemisphere, as shown in Fig. 8. The links of the pendulum are rotated in the opposite directions, with the first link circulating \( k+1 \) times slower than the second one. If the parameter \( k \) is integer the curve is closed and it has \( k+1 \) leaves. To capture the precession phase of the human trajectory, one specifies the motion of the joint angle as \( \varphi(t) = \Omega t \), where \( \Omega \) is a constant parameter.

Note that the curve (Eqs. (49) and (50)) can be viewed as a partial case of epitrochoids. However, the double pendulum interpretation is more attractive. One can think of the double pendulum as a propeller, and it gives a mechanical analog for our actuation scheme.

The idea of the double pendulum actuation scheme can be supported by a simulation example. In the example, in accordance with the experimental data reported in Sec. 4, we set \( r_1 = 1.5 \) cm and \( r_2 = 0.8 \) cm. To obtain one closed cycle with nine leaves we set \( k = 8 \). The precession constant is set as \( \Omega = -\pi/10 \) rad/s, which corresponds to the clockwise rotation of the first link and counterclockwise rotation of the second link. The position of the driving mass point in the equatorial plane, defined by the curve (Eqs. (49) and (50)), is shown in Fig. 9. As can be seen, qualitatively, the roselike pattern of human movements is captured.

Having specified \( p(t) \), we then integrated the state dynamic equations ((48)). The motion is simulated on the time interval \([0, 35]\) s. Note that the initial position of the mass point is not zero, and in the simulation we start to move the hemisphere from the equilibrium state corresponding to \( p(0) \). This can be considered as a modeling uncertainty. Figure 10 shows the trajectory of the contact point on the contact plane. The trajectory resembles that shown in Fig. 6 (top). As can be seen, qualitatively, the basic features of this trajectory (the curvature of the trace and the spiral-like loops along the trace) are similar to those observed in the human movements.

While the comparison conducted may look optimistic and speaks in favor of the actuation scheme given by Eqs. (49) and (50), the real story of human manipulations is, most probably, still
the kinesthetic sensations provided by the feedback forces. When estimating the haptic feedback, the subjects preferred the one that provides the better feeling of the reaction from the main hemisphere plane. Experimental data recorded by the haptic system were analyzed and some common features of the human movement in the manipulation of the rolling system have been observed. In particular, it was found that the trajectory of the contact point in the contact plane appears to be helical, with its path being circularly curved. At the same time the trajectory of the driving mass point looks like a periodic rose curve. A simple actuation scheme, capturing this pattern of human movements, has been proposed and verified under simulation.

As we see it now, the haptic simulator presented in this paper can be used mainly for discovering nontrivial motion strategies in the control of nonholonomic systems with rolling constraints, as the analytical motion planning techniques for such systems are very hard to construct. Apart from the main purpose, we believe the simulator developed can be used also for studying human motor behavior and in gaming applications based on the physical modeling.

Several issues should be addressed in future research. First, it would be reasonable to include in our model the effects of rolling and spinning frictions ignored in the current study. Next, a rigorous analysis of the stability of the haptic interaction would be necessary for the finer tuning of the feedback force models with anisotropic stiffness and damping. Finally, it would be interesting to analyze the formation of the human trajectory not only in the middle (precession phase) part but also in the acceleration and deceleration phases. The prediction of the whole trajectory is, perhaps, an ambitious goal, but is worth trying.
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