MODELING AND CONTROL OF PINCHING 2D OBJECT WITH ARBITRARY SHAPE BY A PAIR OF ROBOT FINGERS UNDER ROLLING CONSTRAINTS
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Abstract. Modeling and control of grasping an object with arbitrary shape by a pair of robot fingers with hemispherical ends in a horizontal plane are proposed in a mathematical and computational standpoint. The curvature of an object contour is variable due to the change of the contact point between the finger tip and object surface. Therefore, not only the time parameter “t” but also the arclength parameter “s” are needed to describe motion of the overall fingers-object system. It is shown that Euler-Lagrange's equation of motion of the overall fingers-object system should be accompanied with the first-order differential equation of arclength parameter “s”, which traces out the object contour and at the same time the finger-tip circle. A control input, which is of the same category as the control input called “blind grasping”, is proposed to stabilize rotational motion of the object. The control input does neither use the kinematics information of the object nor any external sensing. Finally numerical simulations evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed model and control input.
1 INTRODUCTION

Hands have a lot of interesting properties such as redundant joint structure, soft material of a fingertip, and rolling contact. Humans easily pinch an object without considering the object shape. These facts have attracted many robotics researchers to analyze, model, control, and create robot hands Refs.[1] and [2]. However, most researches in robotics remain in kinematics or motion planning, centering the realization of force/torque closure for a stable grasp in a static sense. Rolling geometry between two objects with arbitrary shape was strictly discussed Ref.[3]. The research, however, remains in kinematic or semi-dynamic meaning. On the other hand, researchers in multibody dynamics have presented many models with constraints Refs.[4] and [5] without modeling physical interaction between a robot finger and an object with arbitrary shape even in a two-dimensional case. In fact, modeling of pinching with rolling contact that can take account of arbitrariness of the object shape has not yet been tackled.

Arimoto et al. Ref[6], around the year of 2000, first proposed a dynamic pinching model by a pair of robot fingers with hemispherical ends under rolling constraints when the shape of a pinched object is limited to flat surfaces. Stability of motion of the overall fingers-object system called “Stability on a manifold” is rigorously discussed in a mathematical sense since rolling constraints are reflected into the dynamics of the object as wrench vectors. The redundancy reduction problem of pinching by means of a pair of fingers with redundant joints for a required task is resolved in a local sense by applying the stability concept on an equilibrium manifold. The control strategy based on index finger-thumb opposability for stabilizing motion of the overall system, which is called “blind grasping”, is proposed Ref.[7], which does neither need object kinematic information nor need external sensing. The pinching model was extended in 2006 to a three-dimensional case Ref.[7]. A mathematical model is derived as a set of equations of motion of the fingers-object system under Pfaffian constraints due to rolling constraints and differential equations representing infinitesimal rotations of the pinched object. The shape of the 3D pinched object, however, has been restricted to flat surfaces.

In this paper, a new dynamical system with physical interaction, which expresses motion of pinching a 2D object with arbitrary shape by a pair of robot fingers with hemispherical ends (see Fig.1), is proposed and modeled in a mathematical and computational manner. The curvature

![Figure 1: A three-DOF finger robot manipulating a 2-D object pivoted at a fixed point](image.png)
of the object contour is variable according to the change of the contact point between the object surface and the rigid finger tip. Therefore the fingers-object dynamic equations, which should be accompanied with the update equation of arclength parameter “s”, are derived. A class of control signals called “blind grasping” is proposed for realizing stable grasping, without referring to object kinematics or using external sensing. It should be noted that the control signal is of the same as that in the case treating an object with flat surfaces Ref.[7]. In the case of one robot finger, the closed dynamics is derived, and it is shown that the given equilibrium state is satisfied from the aspect of a numerical simulation. Finally numerical simulations are carried out, for confirmation of the effectiveness of our proposed model and control input by implementing the derived mathematical model of physical interaction of rolling with the aid of a constrained stabilization scheme.

2 DYNAMICS

In order to show a key role of the rolling constraint, a mechanical setup of pinching a rigid object with arbitrary shape by one robot fingers with 3 DOFs shown in Fig.1 is investigated. The finger tip is made by rigid material and is of hemispherical shape. The object is pined at a point $O_m$ and rotates around it. In the coordinate system, numerical values of all angles are positive in counterclockwise direction. It is assumed that the $xy$-plane in the figure is horizontal and the effect of the gravity is ignored. We introduce the local coordinate $O_m$-$XY$ fixed at the object frame, and define unit vectors $r_X$ on the $X$ axis and $r_Y$ on the $Y$ axis (see Fig.2). The left-side contour of the object is expressed by a curve attached to the local coordinate $(X(s_1), Y(s_1))$ by virtue of an arclength parameter $s_1$ (see Fig.3). $P_1$ is the contact point between the finger tip and object surface, and $n_1$ the normal unit vector to the tangent vector $b_1$. The angle between the vector $n_1$ and $X$ axis expressed by $\theta_1$ is determined as follows:

$$\theta_1(s_1) = \arccos \left( \frac{X'(s_1)}{Y'(s_1)} \right)$$

$$X'$$

$$Y'$$

Figure 2: Relationship between local coordinate $O$-$XY$ and fingertip $O_{01}$
where \( X'(s_1) = \frac{dX(s_1)}{ds_1} \) and \( Y'(s_1) = \frac{dY(s_1)}{ds_1} \). \( \overline{P_1P_1'} \) is expressed in the local coordinate \((X(s_1), Y(s_1))\) as follows:

\[
\overline{P_1P_1'} = l_{n_1}(s_1) = -X(s_1) \cos \theta_1(s_1) + Y(s_1) \sin \theta_1(s_1)
\]  

(2)

In contrast, \( \overline{P_1P_1'} \) is expressed in the inertia frame \( O-xy \) as follows:

\[
\overline{P_1P_1'} = (x - x_{01}) \cos (\theta + \theta_1) - (y - y_{01}) \sin (\theta + \theta_1(s_1)) - r_1
\]  

(3)

Hence, the contact constraint between the finger tip and object surface is derived as the holonomic constraint:

\[
Q_1 = -(x - x_{01}) \cos(\theta + \theta_1(s_1)) - (y - y_{01}) \sin(\theta + \theta_1(s_1)) = -r_1 + l_{n_1}(s_1)
\]  

(4)

\( \overline{O_mP_1'} \) is expressed in the local coordinate \((X(s_1), Y(S_1))\) as follows:

\[
\overline{O_mP_1'} = l_{b_1}(s_1) = X(s_1) \sin \theta_1 + Y(s_1) \cos \theta_1
\]  

(5)

On the other hand, \( \overline{O_mP_1'} \) is expressed in the inertia frame as follows:

\[
R_1(t) = -(x - x_{01}) \sin(\theta + \theta_1) - (y - y_{01}) \cos(\theta + \theta_1) = l_{b_1}(s_1)
\]  

(6)

Rolling contact expresses that the robot fingertip rolls on the object surface without slipping. Thus the object’s velocity along the vector \( b_1 \) at the contact point \( P_1 \) must be equal to the finger tip’s velocity along the vector \( b_1 \) at the point, at instant \( t \), as follows:

\[
r_1 \frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} R_1(t) = 0
\]  

(7)
where \( \varphi_1 \) is defined as follows (see Fig.1):

\[
\varphi_1 = \pi + (\theta + \theta_1) - (q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{13}) \equiv \pi + (\theta + \theta_1) - p_1 \tag{8}
\]

where \( p_1 = q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{13} \). Eq.(7) can fortunately be integrated in the sense of Frobenius (see Ref.[8]). In fact, we define

\[
\overline{R}_1(t, s_1) = r_1\{\theta + \theta_1(s_1) - p_1\} + s_1 + R_1 - l_{b1}(s_1), \tag{9}
\]

and see that \( \partial\overline{R}_1(t, s_1)/\partial t = 0 \) is reduced to Eq.(7). It is found out that (see Ref.[8])

\[
\frac{d\overline{R}_1}{dt} = \frac{\partial\overline{R}_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial\overline{R}_1}{\partial s_1} \frac{ds_1}{dt} = 0 \tag{10}
\]

Then it is possible to define

\[
\hat{R}_1 = \overline{R}_1(t, s_1(t)) - \overline{R}_1(0, s_1(0)) \tag{11}
\]

By associating Lagrange’s multipliers \( f_1 \) and \( \lambda_1 \) with the constraints \( Q_1 = 0 \) (Eq.4) and \( \hat{R}_1 = 0 \) (Eq.11) respectively, we define a Lagrangian:

\[
L = \frac{1}{2}q_1^T G_1 q_1 + \frac{1}{2}I\dot{\theta}^2 - f_1 Q_1 - \lambda \hat{R}_1 \tag{12}
\]

where \( q_1 = (q_{11}, q_{12}, q_{13})^T \), \( G_1(q_1) \) denotes the inertia matrix, and \( I \) denotes the inertia moment of the object. By applying the variational principle, the dynamic equations of the overall finer-object system are derived as follows:

\[
I\ddot{\theta} - f_1 l_{b1}(s_1) - \lambda \dot{n}_1(s_1) = 0 \tag{13}
\]

\[
G_1(q_1) \dot{q}_1 + \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \dot{G}_1 + S_1 \right\} \dot{q}_1 + f_1 J_1^T(q_1) n_1(\theta) \dot{\lambda}_1 \left\{ J_1^T(q_1) b_1(\theta) - r_1 e_1 \right\} = u_1 \tag{14}
\]

where \( e_1 = (1, 1, 1)^T \), \( J_1 = \partial(x_{01}, y_{01})/\partial q_1 \),

\[
\begin{align*}
  n_1(\theta) &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta + \theta_1) \\ -\sin(\theta + \theta_1) \end{pmatrix}, \\
  b_1(\theta) &= \begin{pmatrix} \sin(\theta + \theta_1) \\ \cos(\theta + \theta_1) \end{pmatrix}
\end{align*} \tag{15}
\]

and \( u_1 \) stands for the control input. Because the arclength parameter \( s_1 \) depends on the time parameter \( t \), the parameter \( s_1 \) should be updated as follows:

\[
\frac{ds_1}{dt} = \frac{r_1}{1 + r_1 \kappa_1(s_1)} (\dot{p}_1 - \dot{\theta}) \tag{16}
\]

where \( \kappa_1 \) denotes the curvature of the object contour at a contact as follows:

\[
\kappa_1(s_1) = X''(s_1) Y'(s_1) - X'(s_1) Y''(s_1) \tag{17}
\]

It should be noted that the curvature \( \kappa_1(s_1) \) of the object contour appears in the update equation (Eq.(16)) but not in the overall Lagrange’s equations (Eqs.(13) and (14)).
3 CONTROL SIGNAL & CLOSED LOOP DYNAMICS

In order to immobilize rotational motion of the object, rotational motion \( -f_1l_{b1}(s_1) - \lambda_1l_{n1}(s_1) \) must be zero. By analogy with our previous control signals called “blind grasping” Ref.[7], we introduce the control input:

\[
    u_1 = -c_1 \dot{q}_1 - \left( \frac{f_d}{r_1} \right) J_1^T(q_1) \left( \frac{x_{01}}{y_{01}} - x \right) - r_1 \dot{N}_1 e_1 \tag{18}
\]

where

\[
    \dot{N}_1(t) = \gamma_1^{-1} r_1 \left( p_1(t) - p_1(0) \right) \tag{19}
\]

\( \gamma_1 \) and \( c_1 \) are positive constants, and \( p_1(0) \) an initial value of \( p_1(t) \). The first term of the right hand side of Eq.(18) plays a role of damping. The second term is introduced to cease the rotational moment of the object. The third term is introduced for saving excess movements of finger joints from the initial pose. Substituting the control input (Eq.18) into the overall finger hand side of Eq.(18) plays a role of damping. The second term is introduced to cease the rotational moment of the object. The third term is introduced for saving excess movements of finger joints from the initial pose. Substituting the control input (Eq.18) into the overall finger object system (Eqs.(13) and (14)) yields the following closed-loop dynamics:

\[
    I \ddot{\theta} - \Delta f_1 l_{b1}(s_1) - \Delta \lambda_1 l_{n1}(s_1) + S_N = 0 \tag{20}
\]

\[
    G_1(q_1) \ddot{\theta}_1 + \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \ddot{G}_1 + \dot{S}_1 \right\} \dot{\theta}_1 + \Delta f_1 J_1^T \dot{r}_1 \dot{q}(\theta) + \Delta \lambda_1 \left\{ J_1^T(q_1) \dot{b}_1(\theta) - r_1 e_1 \right\} + r_1 \Delta N_1 e_1 + c_1 \ddot{q}_1 = 0 \tag{21}
\]

where

\[
    \Delta f_1 = f_1 - \frac{f_d}{r_1} (r_1 + l_{n1}(s_1)) \quad \Delta \lambda_1 = \lambda_1 + \frac{f_d}{r_1} l_{b1}(s_1) \tag{22}
\]

\[
    \Delta N_1 = \dot{N}_1 + \frac{f_d}{r_1} l_{b1}(s_1) \tag{23}
\]

\[
    S_N = - \frac{f_d}{r_1} (r_1 + l_{n1}(s_1)) l_{b1}(s_1) + \frac{f_d}{r_1} l_{b1} l_{n1} \tag{24}
\]

4 ALGORITHMIC DESIGN OF THE SIMULATOR

In order to maintain the contact and rolling constraints (Eqs.(4) and (11)), it is convenient to use the “Constraint Stabilization Method”(CSM) Ref.[9]. These algebraic equations are applied to the CSM method, and the nonlinear 2-order simultaneous differential equations are obtained as follows:

\[
    \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
    \ddot{Q}_1 + \gamma_{f1} \dot{Q}_1 + \omega_{f1} Q_1 = 0 \\
    \ddot{R}_1 + \gamma_{\lambda1} \dot{R}_1 + \omega_{\lambda1} R_1 = 0
    \end{array} \right. \tag{25}
\]

where coefficients called CSM gains should be chosen to satisfy critical damping conditions as

\[
    \gamma_{f1} = 2 \sqrt{\omega_{f1}} \quad \gamma_{\lambda1} = 2 \sqrt{\omega_{\lambda1}} \tag{26}
\]

We define

\[
    \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
    Q_{1q1} = \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial \dot{q}_1} \quad Q_{1\theta} = \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial \theta} \quad Q_{1s1} = \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial s_1} \\
    \dot{R}_{1q1} = \frac{\partial \dot{R}_1}{\partial \dot{q}_1} \quad \dot{R}_{1\theta} = \frac{\partial \dot{R}_1}{\partial \theta} \quad \dot{R}_{1s1} = \frac{\partial \dot{R}_1}{\partial s_1}
    \end{array} \right. \tag{27}
\]
Then, Eq.(25) is expressed as

\[
Q_{1q_1}^T \ddot{q}_1 + Q_{1\theta} \ddot{\theta} + Q_{1s_1} \ddot{s}_1 + \left( \frac{dQ_{1q_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1q_1} \right)^T \dot{q}_1 \\
+ \left( \frac{dQ_{1\theta}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1\theta} \right)^T \dot{\theta} + \left( \frac{dQ_{1s_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1s_1} \right)^T \dot{s}_1 + \omega_{f1} Q_1 = 0 \tag{28}
\]

\[
\tilde{R}_{1q_1}^T \ddot{q}_1 + \tilde{R}_{1\theta} \ddot{\theta} + \tilde{R}_{1s_1} \ddot{s}_1 + \left( \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1q_1} \right)^T \dot{q}_1 \\
+ \left( \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1\theta}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1\theta} \right)^T \dot{\theta} + \left( \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1s_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1s_1} \right)^T \dot{s}_1 + \omega_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_1 = 0 \tag{29}
\]

Since the constraints \( Q_1 \) and \( \tilde{R}_1 \) differentiated with respect to \( s_1 \) fortunately become zero Ref.[8], that is, \( Q_{1s_1} = 0 \) and \( \tilde{R}_{1s_1} = 0 \), the Equations (28) and (29) are reduced to

\[
Q_{1q_1}^T \ddot{q}_1 + Q_{1\theta} \ddot{\theta} + \left( \frac{dQ_{1q_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1q_1} \right)^T \dot{q}_1 + \left( \frac{dQ_{1\theta}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1\theta} \right)^T \dot{\theta} + \omega_{f1} Q_1 = 0 \tag{30}
\]

\[
\tilde{R}_{1q_1}^T \ddot{q}_1 + \tilde{R}_{1\theta} \ddot{\theta} + \left( \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1q_1} \right)^T \dot{q}_1 + \left( \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1\theta}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1\theta} \right)^T \dot{\theta} + \omega_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_1 = 0 \tag{31}
\]

where

\[
\frac{dQ_{1q_1}}{dt} = \frac{\partial Q_{1q_1}}{\partial q_1}, \frac{\partial Q_{1q_1}}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial Q_{1q_1}}{\partial s_1} \tag{32}
\]

\[
\frac{dQ_\theta}{dt} = \frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial q_1}, \frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial Q_\theta}{\partial s_1} \tag{33}
\]

\[
\frac{d\tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{dt} = \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{\partial q_1}, \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{\partial s_1} \tag{34}
\]

\[
\frac{d\tilde{R}_\theta}{dt} = \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_\theta}{\partial q_1}, \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_\theta}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_\theta}{\partial s_1} \tag{35}
\]

It is important to note that \( \ddot{s}_1 \) is obtained by the update equation of arclength parameter \( s_1 \) (Eq.(16)). By virtue of these equations (Eqs.(30) and (31)) including the object shape parameters \( s_1 \) and \( \ddot{s}_1 \), dynamics of the overall finger-object system under the constraints composed of Eqs.(13), (14), (30), and (31) can be expressed as

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
G_1 & 0 & Q_{1q_1} & \tilde{R}_{1q_1} \\
0 & I & Q_{1\theta} & \tilde{R}_{1\theta} \\
Q_{1q_1} & Q_{1\theta} & 0 & 0 \\
\tilde{R}_{1q_1} & \tilde{R}_{1\theta} & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\ddot{q}_1 \\
\dot{\theta} \\
f_1 \\
\lambda_1
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \\ h_4 \end{pmatrix} \tag{36}
\]

where

\[
\begin{cases}
  h_1 = u_1 - \left\{ \frac{1}{2} G_1 + S_1 \right\} \ddot{q}_1 \\
  h_2 = 0 \\
  h_3 = - \left\{ \frac{dQ_{1q_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1q_1} \right\} \ddot{q}_1 + \left\{ \frac{dQ_{1\theta}}{dt} + \gamma_{f1} Q_{1\theta} \right\} \dot{\theta} + \omega_{f1} Q_1 \\
  h_4 = - \left\{ \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1q_1}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1q_1} \right\} \ddot{q}_1 + \left\{ \frac{d\tilde{R}_{1\theta}}{dt} + \gamma_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_{1\theta} \right\} \dot{\theta} + \omega_{\lambda1} \tilde{R}_1
\end{cases} \tag{37}
\]
The 2nd-order 6-simultaneous differential equations (eq.(36)) and first-order differential equation of arclength parameter “$s_1$” (eq.(16)) should be solved simultaneously so that they satisfy the principle of causality. A Runge-Kutta method can be applied to solve this differential system. The matrix of Eq.(36) is nonsingular in the situation considered in Fig.1, and the inversion of it can be carried out.

5 Numerical Simulation -PART I-

A numerical simulator is constructed, as discussed the previous chapter by using physical parameters of the finger-object system given in Table 1. Numerical simulation is carried out by applying our proposed control input (Eq.18) with the parameters of control gains and CSM gains given in Table 2 to the overall finger-object system (Eqs.(13) and (14)), in order to evaluate the stability of motion of the overall system. The curves $c(s_1)$ with local coordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Physical parameters of the fingers and object.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_i (i = 1, 2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Parameters of control signals &amp; CSM gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{f1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{A1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{f1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{A1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$(X(s_1), Y(s_1))$ is used in the simulations is given

$$X(s_1) = -0.03 + \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4 \times 50^2 \times s_1^2}}{2 \times 50} \quad (38)$$

$$Y(s_1) = \frac{\text{Asinh}(2 \times 50 \times s_1)}{2 \times 50} \quad (39)$$

It is noted that, because $s_1$ is the arclength parameter, $\sqrt{X'(s_1)^2 + Y'(s_1)^2} = 1$. The initial values of the simulation must be chosen to satisfy the rolling and contact conditions for execution of the simulation. The motion obtained by the simulation is depicted in Fig.4. If the closed-loop dynamics Eqs.(20) and (21) converge to the equilibrium state, it should satisfy

$$\ddot{q}_1 \rightarrow 0, \dot{\theta} \rightarrow 0, \dot{q}_1 \rightarrow 0, \dot{\theta} \rightarrow 0, -\Delta f_1 l_{b1}(s_1) - \Delta \lambda_1 l_{n1}(s_1) + S_N \rightarrow 0, \quad (40)$$
\[
\Delta f_1 J^T_1 n_1(\theta) + \Delta \lambda_1 \left\{ J^T_1 (q_1) b_1(\theta) - r_1 e_1 \right\} + r_1 \Delta N_1 e_1 \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (41)
\]

In fact, we confirm $\Delta f_1 \rightarrow 0$, $\Delta \lambda_1 \rightarrow 0$, $\Delta N_1$, and $S_N \rightarrow 0$, which mean the convergence to the equilibrium state (Eqs. (40) and (41)) to some extent of satisfaction as shown in Figs 5 ∼ 9. The stable grasping is confirmed from the results of numerical simulation.
6 DYNAMICS -PART II-

In this section, the modeling and control proposed by the previous sections are extended to the stability problem of pinching an object by a pair of robot fingers. Similarly to $\theta_1$ (Eq.(1)), $\theta_2$ (see Figs.11 and 12) is determined as follows:

$$\theta_2(s_2) = \arctan \left( \frac{X'(s_2)}{Y'(s_2)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)

where $X'(s_2) = \frac{dX(s_2)}{ds_1}$ and $Y'(s_2) = \frac{dY(s_2)}{ds_2}$. Similarly, the contact constraint of the left side of the object is derived as the holonomic constraint:

$$Q_2 = (x - x_{02}) \cos(\theta + \theta_2(s_2)) - (y - y_{02}) \sin(\theta + \theta_2(s_2)) = -(r_2 + l_{n2}(s_2))$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)

where

$$l_{n2}(s_2) = X(s_2) \cos \theta_2(s_2) - Y(s_2) \sin \theta_2(s_2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (44)

In a similar way, the rolling constraint at the right hand finger is derived as follows:

$$r_2 \frac{\partial \varphi_2}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} R_2(t) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)

where

$$R_2(t) = -(x - x_{02}) \sin(\theta + \theta_2(s_2)) - (y - y_{02}) \cos(\theta + \theta_2(s_2)) = l_{o2}(s_2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (46)

$$l_{o2}(s_2) = X(s_2) \sin \theta_2(s_2) + Y(s_2) \cos \theta_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

$$\varphi_2 = -\pi + (\theta + \theta_2) - (q_{21} + q_{22})$$

$$= -\pi + (\theta + \theta_2) - p_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

Figure 10: A pair of robot fingers grasping an object with arbitrary shape
Figure 11: Geometrical relationship of the right side of an object

Figure 12: Relationship between fingertips $O_{01}$ and $O_{02}$, and local coordinate $O$-XY

and $p_2 = q_{21} + q_{22}$. Equation (45) can be integrated as discussed in Eq.(7) (see Ref.[8]). Similarly we define

$$\tilde{R}_2 = \mathbf{T}_2(t, s_2(t)) - \mathbf{T}_2(0, s_2(0))$$

(49)

where

$$\mathbf{T}_2(t, s_2) = -r_2\{\theta + \theta_2(s_2) - p_2\} + s_2 + R_2 - l_{b2}(s_2)$$

(50)
and \( \partial \overline{R}_2(t, s_2)/\partial t = 0 \) leads to Eq.(45). It is possible to confirm the following (see Ref.[8]):

\[
\frac{d \overline{R}_2}{dt} = \frac{\partial \overline{R}_2}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \overline{R}_2}{\partial s_2} \frac{ds_2}{dt} = 0
\]  

(51)

By associating Lagrange’s multipliers \( f_i \) and \( \lambda_i (i = 1, 2) \) with the constraints \( Q_i \) and \( R_i (i = 1, 2) \) respectively, we define a Lagrangian:

\[
L = \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}_i^T G_i(q_i) \dot{q}_i + \frac{1}{2} M(\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2) + \frac{1}{2} I \dot{\theta}^2 - \lambda_1 \dot{R}_1 - \lambda_2 \dot{R}_2 - f_1 Q_1 - f_2 Q_2
\]  

(52)

where \( q_2 = (q_{21}, q_{22})^T, G_2(q_2) \) denotes the inertia matrix for finger 2, \( M \) denotes the mass of the object. From the variational principle, the Lagrange equation of motion of the overall fingers-object system is derived:

\[
G_i(q_i) \ddot{q}_i + \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \dot{G}_i + S_i \right\} \dot{q}_i - f_i J_i^T(q_i) n_i - \lambda_i \left\{ J_i^T(q_i) b_i - r_i e_i \right\} = u_i, i = 1, 2
\]  

(53)

\[
M(\ddot{x} \dot{y}) + f_1 n_1 + f_2 n_2 + \lambda_1 b_1 + \lambda_2 b_2 = 0
\]  

(54)

\[
I \ddot{\theta} - f_1 Y_1 + f_2 Y_2 + \lambda_1 l_1 n_1 - \lambda_2 l_2 n_2 = 0
\]  

(55)

where \( e_2 = (1, 1)^T, J_2^T = \partial(x_{02}, y_{02})/\partial q_2, \)

\[
n_2(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta + \theta_2) \\ -\sin(\theta + \theta_2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad b_2(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \sin(\theta + \theta_2) \\ \cos(\theta + \theta_2) \end{pmatrix}
\]  

(56)

Similarly the parameter \( s_2 \) should be updated as follows:

\[
\frac{ds_2}{dt} = \frac{r_2}{1 + r_2 \kappa_2(s_2)} \left( \dot{p}_2 - \dot{\theta} \right)
\]  

(57)

where \( \kappa_2 \) denotes the curvature of the right side of the object contour as follows:

\[
\kappa_2(s_2) = -X''(s_2)Y''(s_2) + X'(s_2)Y''(s_2)
\]  

(58)

### 7 Control Signal -PART II-

In this chapter, we extend our proposed control input (Eq.(18)) to the model of two robot fingers pinching an object with arbitrary shape. The control scheme is of the same category as the control input called “blind grasping” Ref.[8], which need neither use the kinematic information of the object nor use any external sensing; It is possible to stabilize the object without consideration of the difference between the two sides of the object’s contour. The control input is proposed as follows:

\[
u_i = -c_i \dot{q}_i - \left( \frac{f_i}{r_1 + r_2} \right) J_i^T(q_i) \begin{pmatrix} x_{01} - x_{02} \\ y_{01} - y_{02} \end{pmatrix} - r_i \hat{N}_i e_i, \quad i = 1, 2
\]  

(59)

where

\[
\hat{N}_i(t) = \gamma_i^{-1} r_1 \left( p_i(t) - p_i(0) \right), \quad i = 1, 2
\]  

(60)

\( \gamma_i \) and \( c_i (i = 1, 2) \) are positive constants, and \( p_i(0) \) initial values of \( p_i(t) \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). The first and third terms are of the same meaning as Eq.(18). The second term is a signal based upon the opposable force between \( O_{01} \) and \( O_{02} \).
8 Numerical Simulation -PART II-

The construction method of the simulator stated in the chapter 4 is extended to the model of two robot fingers shown in Fig.10. We construct a numerical simulator based on physical parameters of the fingers-object system given in Table 3. Numerical simulation is executed with our proposed control input (Eq.59) using the parameters of control gains and CSM gains given in

Table 3: Physical parameters of the fingers and object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$l_{11} = l_{21} = l_{22}$</td>
<td>0.065 [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{12}$</td>
<td>0.039 [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{13}$</td>
<td>0.026 [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{11}$</td>
<td>0.045 [kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{12}$</td>
<td>0.025 [kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{13}$</td>
<td>0.015 [kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{21}$</td>
<td>0.045 [kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{22}$</td>
<td>0.040 [kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_i (i = 1, 2)$</td>
<td>0.010 [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>0.063 [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.040 [kg]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Parameters of control signals & CSM gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f_d$</td>
<td>0.500 [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>0.006 [Nms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_i (i = 1, 2)$</td>
<td>0.001 [s²/kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{f_i} (i = 1, 2)$</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{\lambda_i} (i = 1, 2)$</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{f_i} (i = 1, 2)$</td>
<td>$225.0 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{\lambda_i} (i = 1, 2)$</td>
<td>$900.0 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Motion of pinching a 2-D object with arbitrary shape by a pair of robot fingers
Figure 14: $\theta$

Figure 15: $f_1$

Figure 16: $f_2$

Figure 17: $\lambda_1$

Figure 18: $\lambda_2$

Figure 19: $\tilde{N}_1$

Figure 20: $\tilde{N}_2$

Figure 21: $s_1$

Figure 22: $s_2$

Figure 23: $\dot{q}_{11}, \dot{q}_{12}$ and $\dot{q}_{13}$

Figure 24: $\dot{q}_{21}$ and $\dot{q}_{22}$

Figure 25: $\dot{x}$

Figure 26: $\dot{y}$

Figure 27: $\dot{\theta}$
Table 4, in order to confirm the stability of motion of the overall fingers-object system (Eqs.(53) ~ (55)). The curves $c(s_i),(i=1,2)$ with local coordinates $(X(s_i), Y(s_i))$ in the simulations are given as follows (see Fig.11):

\[
X(s_1) = -0.03 + \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4 \times 50^2 \times s_1^2}}{2 \times 50}
\]

\[
Y(s_1) = \frac{\text{Asinh}(2 \times 50 \times s_1)}{2 \times 50}
\]

\[
X(s_2) = 0.065 - \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4 \times 10^2 \times s_2^2}}{2 \times 10}
\]

\[
Y(s_2) = \frac{\text{Asinh}(2 \times 10 \times s_2)}{2 \times 10}
\]

Motion of the overall fingers-object system is shown in Fig.13. The results of simulation show that all velocities of the dynamic equations (Eqs.(53) ~ (55)) converge to zero, and that all Lagrange’s multipliers converge to some constant values according to Figs.15 ~ 18 and 23 ~ 27. These results mean that motion of the overall system converges to some equilibrium state, and stable grasping is finally achieved from the viewpoint of numerical simulation.

9 CONCLUSION

In this paper, motion of the overall finger-object system with the arbitrary shape of an object is modeled in a mathematical and computational manner, and the system is extended to the mechanical setup of pinching an object by a pair of robot fingers. A control input is proposed to stabilize the object, in terms of neither the object kinematic information nor any external sensing. The control input is of the same as that in the case of handling an object with flat surfaces, despite the difference between object shapes. A design methodology of a numerical simulator is presented in our model. The proposed constraint stabilization method, including the arclength parameter “s” expressing the object posture and “ds/dt” obtained by the update equation of “s”, plays the crucial role to maintain the both contact and rolling constraints, during carrying out numerical simulations. These results based on the methodology demonstrate to confirm the stability of motion of the overall system and the effectiveness of our proposed control signals.
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