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SUMMARY
We present an efficient obstacle avoidance control algorithm for redundant manipulators using a new measure called collidability measure. Considering moving directions of manipulator links, the collidability measure is defined as the sum of inverse of predicted collision distances between links and obstacles. This measure is suitable for obstacle avoidance since directions of moving links are as important as distances to obstacles. For kinematic or dynamic redundancy resolution, null space control is utilized to avoid obstacles by minimizing the collidability measure: We present a velocity-bounded kinematic control law which allows reasonably large gains to improve the system performance. Also, by clarifying decomposition in the joint acceleration level, we present a simple dynamic control law with bounded joint torques which guarantees tracking of a given end-effector trajectory and improves a kinematic cost function such as collidability measure. Simulation results are presented to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

KEYWORDS: Redundant manipulators; Collidability measure; Velocity-bounded kinematic control; Torque-bounded dynamic control

1. INTRODUCTION
A robot manipulator is defined as redundant if it possesses more degrees of freedom than are required to achieve the desired position and orientation of the end-effector. The redundancy of such manipulators can be effectively used to keep within joint limits,12 to avoid singularities,3 and to optimize various performance criteria.2,4 Also, we can utilize redundancy to avoid obstacles in workspace.10–13

For obstacle avoidance control, many algorithms have been proposed based on pseudoinverse matrix.10–12 Baillieul17 proposed the extended Jacobian technique for solving the inverse kinematics problem, and applied this technique to obstacle avoidance for a class of planar robots and obstacles. In Khatib’s approach,14 redundant robots are controlled directly in the Cartesian space using a model-based control law, and obstacle avoidance is achieved using an artificial potential field concept. An important feature of this work is the use of simple geometric “primitives” for representing obstacles. However, the selection of representative points on manipulator links is not simple and the distance value doesn’t mean the minimum distance between link and obstacle. Rahmanian-Shahri and Troch15 presented a new method for on-line collision recognition for robot manipulators. For every link and every obstacle in the workspace, a boundary ellipse is defined such that there is no collision if the robot joints are outside these ellipses.

Many of the above mentioned redundancy resolution approaches require a potential function of distances between manipulator and obstacles. Most of the methods assumed that the necessary distance information was given from a higher control level or could be obtained from sensory devices. Gilbert, Johnson, and Keerthi16 developed an algorithm for computing the Euclidean distance between a pair of convex polytopes. However, the suggested distance algorithm is very complex. In all cases, obstacle avoidance control is acted even when manipulator links move away from obstacles. We are going to remedy this problem by considering moving directions of manipulator links with respect to obstacles.

While many authors have discussed how to specify null-space joint velocities (kinematic control), some have considered manipulator dynamics for obstacle avoidance control11 (dynamic control). Ma and Hirose17 presented an efficient method of including dynamic effects in the obstacle avoidance control of redundant manipulators. This approach is based on a decomposition technique, thus constructing a set of possible solutions for obstacle avoidance. Hsu et al.18 suggested a dynamic control law that guarantees tracking of null-space joint velocities while providing end-effector tracking. Even though the above dynamic control laws are useful, they didn’t consider bounds on joint driving torques. Without considering joint torque bounds, excessively large joint torques may be required which is impossible in practice. Hence, efficient kinematic/dynamic control method is necessary considering actuator saturation.

In this paper, we present an efficient obstacle avoidance control algorithm for redundant manipulators using a new measure called collidability measure. Considering moving directions of manipulator links, this measure is defined as the sum of inverse of predicted collision distances between links and obstacles. Using the collidability measure, we can reduce the magnitude of obstacle avoidance action considerably, especially when manipulator links move away from obstacles. Also, by clarifying decomposition in the joint acceleration level, we present a simple dynamic control law with bounded joint torques which guarantees tracking of a given end-effector trajectory while performing a
subtask such as decreasing collidability measure. In addition, we present velocity-bounded kinematic control law which allows reasonably large gain to improve the system performance.

This paper is constructed as follows: In Section 2, the collidability measure is defined and derived. In Section 3, velocity-bounded kinematic and torque-bounded dynamic control algorithms are derived for redundancy resolution. Simulation results are presented in Section 4 to illustrate the performance of the proposed algorithm. This paper ends with concluding remarks in Section 5.

2. COLLIDABILITY MEASURE

Consider a redundant manipulator with $n$ degrees of freedom in $m$ dimensional workspace ($n > m$). The forward kinematics and differential kinematics of the manipulator can be represented as

$$x_e = f(\theta)$$

$$\dot{x}_e = J(\theta) \dot{\theta}$$

where $x_e \in \mathbb{R}^m$ represents position and orientation of the end-effector, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents joint variables, $f(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a vector function describing the manipulator kinematics, and $J(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the end-effector Jacobian matrix. The general solution of Eq. (2) is

$$\dot{\theta} = J^+ \dot{x}_e + (I - J^+ J)g$$

where $J^+ = J^T (JJ^T)^{-1}$ is the pseudoinverse of $J$, $I \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the identity matrix, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an arbitrary vector in the joint-velocity space which can be used to resolve the redundancy at the velocity level in optimizing a suitable performance criterion.

We use $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ to denote the manipulator links and obstacles respectively. The manipulator and obstacles are represented by unions of objects as follows:

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_A} \mathcal{A}_i, \quad \mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{I}_C} \mathcal{C}_j$$

where $\mathcal{A}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_A = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ are manipulator links, and $\mathcal{C}_j, j \in \mathcal{I}_C = \{1, \ldots, n_c\}$ are $n_c$ obstacles. Consider a link-obstacle pair as shown in Figure 1. The problem is to determine a joint trajectory $\theta(t)$ of the manipulator so that its end-effector can move along the desired trajectory while the manipulator $A$ is kept away from obstacles $C$. Link $A_i$ is assumed to be a cylinder, which can be described as an ellipsoid containing the link centered at $y_{ic}$ in the link $i$ coordinate frame described as

$$\mathcal{A}_i(\theta) = \{T_i(\theta)y : (y - y_{ic})^T Q_i^T Q_i (y - y_{ic}) \leq 1\}$$

with

$$Q_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1/r_{ia} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/r_{ib} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/r_{ib} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $r_{ia}$ and $r_{ib}$ are scalar coefficients, and $T_i(\theta)$ is a homogeneous transformation matrix for link $i$ coordinate frame which consists of an orthogonal rotation matrix $R_i(\theta)$ and a position vector $p_i(\theta)$

$$T_i(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} R_i(\theta) & p_i(\theta) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$}

Obstacle $\mathcal{C}_j$ is assumed to be a general convex shape, which can be described as a spherical object containing the obstacle with radius $r_j$ centered at $x_{jc}$ described as

$$\mathcal{C}_j = \{x : (x - x_{jc})^T S_j^T S_j (x - x_{jc}) \leq 1\}$$

where

$$S_j = \begin{bmatrix} 1/r_j & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/r_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/r_j \end{bmatrix}.$$
In order to determine a unique solution of Eq. (3), an additional condition should be introduced, such as minimization of a performance index. Hence, we introduce a new performance measure called collidability measure for obstacle avoidance considering moving directions of manipulator links and obstacles, which is defined as the inverse of sum of predicted collision distances between links and obstacles.

Consider now the problem of finding the collidability measure of the link \( i \) and the obstacle \( j \). For simplicity of detecting collision between them, elliptical link \( \hat{s}_i \) and spherical obstacle \( \delta_j \) are viewed as expanded elliptical link \( s_i \) and shrunk point obstacle \( \hat{c}_j \), as shown in Figure 2(a):

\[
\hat{s}_i = \{ \mathbf{x} : (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)^T Q_i (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq 1 \} \\
\hat{c}_j = \{ \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_j \} 
\]

where \( \mathbf{x}_i = T_i(\mathbf{\theta}) \mathbf{y}_i \), and \( Q = (Q_i)^{-1} + S_j^{-1} - R_i \). Next, define \( \mathbf{x}_i \) as relative position between \( \mathbf{x}_j \) and \( \mathbf{x}_j \).

\[
\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i. 
\]

We assume that instantaneous movement of \( \mathbf{x}_i \) at time \( t \) is maintained during \( [t, t + \tau] \) for small \( \tau \). Then, the predicted motion of \( \mathbf{x}_i \) for primary task (tracking any arbitrary trajectory) is represented as follows:

\[
\mathbf{x}_i(t + \tau) = \mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{v}_i(t) \tau 
\]

\[
\mathbf{v}_i(t) = \dot{x}_i - \left( \frac{\partial T_i(\mathbf{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{\theta}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{\theta}}_i(t) \mathbf{y}_i 
\]

with

\[
\hat{\mathbf{\theta}}_i(t) = J^{-1}(\mathbf{\theta}) \mathbf{\dot{x}}_i(t) 
\]

where \( \mathbf{\dot{x}}_i(t) \) is the velocity of \( \mathbf{x}_i(t) \), \( \hat{\mathbf{\theta}}_i(t) \) is a desired joint velocity, \( \mathbf{x}_i(t) \) is a desired end-effector velocity.

Elliptical link \( \hat{s}_i \) will collide with point obstacle \( \hat{c}_j \) if the following conditions are satisfied.

\[
\mathbf{v}_i(t)^T Q_i \mathbf{x}_i < 0, (\mathbf{v}_i(t)^T Q_i \mathbf{x}_i)^2 - |Q \mathbf{v}_i|^2 (|Q \mathbf{x}_i|^2 - 1) \geq 0. 
\]

The predicted collision time \( t_p \) is obtained by solving

\[
(\mathbf{x}_i + t_p \mathbf{v}_i)^T Q_i (\mathbf{x}_i + t_p \mathbf{v}_i) = 1. 
\]

Then, the predicted collision time \( t_p \) and the predicted collision point \( \mathbf{x}_p \) are obtained as

\[
t_p = -\left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_i(t)^T Q_i \mathbf{x}_i - \sqrt{(\mathbf{v}_i(t)^T Q_i \mathbf{x}_i)^2 - |Q \mathbf{v}_i|^2 (|Q \mathbf{x}_i|^2 - 1)}}{|Q \mathbf{v}_i|^2} \right)
\]

Using the predicted collision point \( \mathbf{x}_p \), predicted collision points \( \mathbf{x}_{ip} \in \hat{s}_i \) and \( \mathbf{x}_{jp} \in \hat{c}_j \) are obtained as

\[
\mathbf{x}_{ip} = \mathbf{x}_i + R_i Q_i^{-1} \mathbf{x}_p \\
\mathbf{x}_{jp} = \mathbf{x}_j + (R_i Q_i^{-1} - I) \mathbf{x}_p
\]

Basically, the collidability measure \( c_{ij}(\mathbf{\theta}) \) is defined as the inverse of the predicted collision distance \( |\mathbf{x}_{ip} - \mathbf{x}_{jp}| \). In case Eq. (16) is not satisfied, collision will not happen. To make smooth variation of \( c_{ij}(\mathbf{\theta}) \) beyond the collision region, we assume the velocity vector \( \mathbf{v}_{ie} \) obtained by rotating \( \mathbf{v}_i \) to the origin, makes collision between \( \hat{c}_j \) and the boundary point of \( \hat{s}_i \). As shown in Figure 2(b), by counterclockwise rotation of \( \mathbf{v}_i \) with respect to the vector \( \hat{\mathbf{k}} \), \( \mathbf{v}_b \) can be obtained as follows:

\[
\hat{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{(Q \mathbf{v}_i) \times (-Q \mathbf{x}_i)}{|(Q \mathbf{v}_i) \times (-Q \mathbf{x}_i)|}
\]

\[
\phi = \cos^{-1}\left( \frac{(Q \mathbf{v}_i) \cdot (-Q \mathbf{x}_i)}{|Q \mathbf{v}_i| |Q \mathbf{x}_i|} \right) - \cos^{-1}\left( \frac{\sqrt{|Q \mathbf{x}_i|^2 - 1}}{|Q \mathbf{x}_i|} \right)
\]

\[
\mathbf{v}_b = Q^{-1} R_k(\phi) Q \mathbf{v}_e
\]

where \( \phi \) is the angle difference between \( Q \mathbf{v}_i \) and \( Q \mathbf{v}_b \), and \( R_k(\phi) \) is the rotation matrix. Given the velocity \( \mathbf{v}_b \), the boundary collision time \( t_b \) and the boundary collision point \( \mathbf{x}_b \) on the elliptical link \( s_i \) are obtained as

\[
t_b = \frac{(Q \mathbf{v}_b) \cdot (-Q \mathbf{x}_i)}{|Q \mathbf{v}_b| |Q \mathbf{x}_b|} = \frac{\sqrt{|Q \mathbf{x}_i|^2 - 1}}{|Q \mathbf{x}_i|} \\
\mathbf{x}_b = \mathbf{x}_i + t_b \mathbf{v}_b
\]

Using the boundary collision point \( \mathbf{x}_{ib} \), boundary collision points \( \mathbf{x}_{ib} \in \hat{s}_i \) and \( \mathbf{x}_{jb} \in \hat{c}_j \) are obtained as

\[
\mathbf{x}_{ib} = \mathbf{x}_{ib} + R_i Q_i^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{ib} \\
\mathbf{x}_{jb} = \mathbf{x}_{ib} + (R_i Q_i^{-1} - I) \mathbf{x}_{ib}
\]

Fig. 2. Collision between \( \hat{s}_i \) and \( \hat{c}_j \): (a) Predicted collision point \( \mathbf{x}_p \), (b) Boundary collision point \( \mathbf{x}_p \).
Finally, we can get the collidability measure obstacles is obtained as

\[ C_{ij}(\theta) = \sum_{i \in I_L, j \in I_c} c_{ij}(\theta) \]  

(33)

where \( \nabla_c \) is a constant matrix.\(^{20} \)

Then, the collidability measure and its partial derivative are obtained as follows:

(a) If the predicted contact point \( \mathbf{x}_p \) is obtained:

\[
c_{ij}^{\prime}(\theta) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}_{ij}|} \]  

(36)

\[
\frac{\partial c_{ij}(\theta)}{\partial \theta_k} = -\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}_{ij}|^2} \frac{\partial |\mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}_{ij}|}{\partial \theta_k}. 
\]  

(37)

(b) If the boundary contact point \( \mathbf{x}_b \) is obtained and

\[ 0 \leq \phi \leq \phi_{\max}: \]

\[
c_{ij}(\theta) = g(\phi) \]  

(38)

\[
\frac{\partial c_{ij}(\theta)}{\partial \theta_k} = \frac{\partial g(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta_k} 
\]  

\[
= \frac{\partial g(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \left( -\frac{(Q\dot{\mathbf{v}}_c \cdot Q\dot{\mathbf{v}}_c)^2}{|Q\mathbf{v}_c||Q(\mathbf{x}_b - \mathbf{x}_j)| \sin \phi} + \frac{2 \dot{\mathbf{v}}_c(\mathbf{x}_b - \mathbf{x}_j)}{|Q(\mathbf{x}_b - \mathbf{x}_j)| \tan \phi} \right). 
\]  

(39)

3. OBSTACLE AVOIDANCE CONTROL

In this section, two redundancy control algorithms—kinematic and dynamic—with actuator constraints are suggested using the collidability measure.

3.1 Velocity-bounded kinematic control

First, a kinematic redundancy control algorithm is developed considering a joint velocity limit, which allows us to use redundant degrees of freedom to perform a subtask while tracking the desired end-effector trajectory.

Let the joint velocity is bounded by

\[ |\dot{\theta}_i| \leq \dot{\theta}_i \max, \quad \forall i \in I_k \]  

(40)

where \( \dot{\theta}_i \max \) is the upper limit of each joint velocity. We can decompose \( \dot{\theta} \) in Eq. (3) into range space component \( \dot{\theta}_r = J^T \dot{\mathbf{v}}_c \) and null space component \( \dot{\theta}_n = (I - J^T J) \dot{\mathbf{g}} \). For obstacle avoidance, we use the collidability measure \( C(\theta) \) as an optimization criterion. Then, \( \mathbf{g} = \alpha \nabla C \) where \( \nabla C \) is the gradient of the collidability measure, and \( \alpha \) is a gain constant. When \( \mathbf{g} \) is large, excessively large null-space joint velocity \( \dot{\theta}_n \) is required to achieve the given subtask which violates joint velocity bound. To prevent such a case, we utilize a saturation function, as follows:

**Proposition 1:** Define a joint velocity saturation function as

\[
\text{Sat}(\dot{\theta}_i) = \min \left( 1, \left( \frac{\text{sgn}(\dot{\theta}_i) (\dot{\theta}_i \max - \dot{\theta}_i)}{\dot{\theta}_i \max} \right) \right) \dot{\theta}_i \]  

(41)

where \( (\dot{\theta}_i) \) and \( (\dot{\theta}_i) \) are \( i \)-th components of each vector, and \( \text{sgn}(\cdot) \) is a sign function. Then, each component of the
joint velocity $\dot{\theta} = \dot{\theta}_r + \text{Sat}(\dot{\theta}_n)$ satisfies the joint velocity bound $\dot{\theta}_{\text{max}}$.

Advantages are as follows: This velocity-bounded kinematic control law permits end-effector trajectory tracking while decreasing the possibility of collision via minimizing the collidability measure $C(\theta)$. Also, by using $\text{Sat}(\dot{\theta}_n)$ instead of $\dot{\theta}_n$, reasonably large $\alpha$ is allowed to improve the system performance.

3.2 Torque-bounded dynamic control

In this subsection, we derive a new dynamic redundancy control algorithm considering joint torque saturation. Differentiating Eq. (2), we obtain the differential relation between the end-effector acceleration and the joint acceleration.

$$\ddot{x} = J \ddot{\theta} + J \dot{\theta}.$$  

(42)

The general solution of Eq. (42) can be obtained using pseudoinverse as

$$\ddot{\theta}_r = \left( \frac{d\theta_r}{dt} \right)_r + \left( \frac{d\theta_n}{dt} \right)_r$$  

(43)

where $\ddot{\theta}_r = (I - J^* J) \dot{\theta}_r$ is a vector in the null space of $J$, and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an arbitrary vector in the joint acceleration space.

Consider the case where the solution of joint velocity is given as Eq. (3) with an arbitrary vector $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and we want to obtain the solution of joint acceleration. Differentiating Eq. (3), we obtain the differential Eq. (43) and some relations between them.

**Proposition 2:** Let’s decompose $\ddot{\theta}$ into range space component $\ddot{\theta}_r = J^* (\ddot{x} - J \dot{\theta})$ and null space component $\ddot{\theta}_n = (I - J^* J) h$. Then

$$\ddot{\theta}_r = \left( \frac{d\theta_r}{dt} \right)_r + \left( \frac{d\theta_n}{dt} \right)_r$$  

(44)

$$\ddot{\theta}_n = \left( \frac{d\theta_r}{dt} \right)_n + \left( \frac{d\theta_n}{dt} \right)_n$$  

(45)

$$h = g + (J^* J)^2 (\dot{\theta}_r - g).$$  

(46)

**Proof:** Since $J = (I - J^* J)(J^* J)^{-1} - J^* J J^*$ (see Ma and Hirose23), $(J^* J)^2 = (J^* J)^{-1} I$, and $J^* J = I$, we get

$$\frac{d\theta_r}{dt} = J^* \dot{x} + J^* \dot{x},$$

$$= J^* \dot{x} + \{(I - J^* J)(J^* J)^{-1} - J^* J J^* \} \dot{x},$$

$$= J^* (\dot{x} - J \dot{\theta}_r) + (I - J^* J) J^* (J^* J)^{-1} \dot{x},$$

$$= J^* (\ddot{x} - J \ddot{\theta}_r) + (I - J^* J) (J^* J)^2 \dot{\theta}_r.$$  

(47)

Adding the range-space and null-space terms of Eqs. (47) and (48), respectively, we get

$$\ddot{\theta}_r = \left( \frac{d\theta_r}{dt} \right)_r + \left( \frac{d\theta_n}{dt} \right)_r$$

$$= J^* (\ddot{x} - J \ddot{\theta}_r) - J^* J \ddot{\theta}_n$$  

(49)

$$\ddot{\theta}_n = \left( \frac{d\theta_r}{dt} \right)_n + \left( \frac{d\theta_n}{dt} \right)_n$$

$$= (I - J^* J)(J^* J)^2 \ddot{\theta}_r + (I - J^* J)(\dot{g} - (J^* J)^2 g),$$  

(50)

Adding Eqs. (49) and (50), we get $\ddot{\theta} = \ddot{\theta}_r + \ddot{\theta}_n$, with

$$h = g + (J^* J)^2 (\dot{\theta}_r - g).$$  

(51)

The general form of manipulator dynamics is given by

$$M(\theta) \ddot{\theta} + N(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = \tau.$$  

(52)

where $M(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric, positive definite inertia matrix, $N(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector containing nonlinear terms such as Coriolis, centrifugal, and gravitational forces, and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector of joint actuating torques. Given a desired trajectory, $x_d(\cdot)$, we want to choose $\tau$ so that the actual trajectory tracks the desired one, as well as achieving a subtask.

A dynamic control law to track a given workspace trajectory is obtained using Eqs. (43) and (52):

$$\tau = M \{ J^* (\ddot{x}_d + K_p e + K_v \dot{e} - J \dot{\theta}) + \phi_r \} + N$$  

(53)

where $e = x_d - x_s$ is the tracking error, $K_p$ and $K_v$ are constant feedback gain matrices, and $\phi_r$ in any vector in the null space of $J$. If the manipulator does not go through a singularity, then the control law Eq. (53) guarantees that the tracking error converges to zero.18

Next, consider the case where we are given a vector function $g = \alpha \nabla C(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for obstacle avoidance and we want to null space joint velocity to track the projection of $g$ onto the null space of $J$, we this is the same as asking that

$$\dot{e}_n = (I - J^* J) g - \dot{\theta}_n.$$

(54)

converge to zero. The following proposition shows how to choose $\phi_r$ to get the desired result.

**Proposition 3:** Assume that the manipulator does not go through a singularity. Let the control be given by Eq. (53) with

$$\phi_r = (I - J^* J)(\dot{g} + (J^* J)^2 (\ddot{\theta}_r - g) + K_n \dot{e}_n$$  

(55)

where $K_n$ is a positive definite feedback matrix. Then the tracking error $e$ converges to zero and the joint velocity converges to $g$ in the null space of $J$, i.e., $e_n \rightarrow 0$. 

Obstacle avoidance
Proof: Differentiating Eq. (54), we get $\frac{d\hat{e}_N}{dt}$ as

$$
\frac{d\hat{e}_N}{dt} = (I - J^* J)\hat{g} - (J^* J J^*)\hat{g}
$$

$$
= (I - J^* J)\hat{g} - J^* J(I - J^* J)\hat{g}
$$

since $J^* J + J^* J = (I - J^* J)(J^* J) + J^* J(I - J^* J)$. Substituting for $\hat{\theta}_N$ from Eqs. (53) and (55), we get

$$
\frac{d\hat{\theta}_N}{dt} = \left( \frac{d\hat{\theta}_N}{dt} \right)_R + \left( \frac{d\hat{\theta}_N}{dt} \right)_N
$$

$$
= (I - J^* J)(\hat{g} + J^* J\hat{e}_N) - (\hat{\theta}_N - \hat{\theta}_N)
$$

$$
- J^* J(I - J^* J)\hat{g} - \hat{\theta}_N
$$

since $J^* J + J^* J = (I - J^* J)(J^* J) + J^* J(I - J^* J)$. Hence, the purpose $\hat{\theta}_N = (I - J^* J)\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}_N$ belongs to the null space of $J$.

Define a Lyapunov function $\nu()$ by

$$
\nu = \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{e}_N \|^2.
$$

Then, $\dot{\nu}$ becomes

$$
\dot{\nu} = \hat{e}_N \cdot \frac{d\hat{e}_N}{dt}
$$

$$
= - \hat{e}_N (I - J^* J)K_N \hat{e}_N - \hat{e}_N J^* J \hat{e}_N
$$

$$
= - \hat{e}_N K_N \hat{e}_N
$$

since $(I - J^* J)^T = (I - J^* J), (I - J^* J)(I - J^* J) = (I - J^* J)$, and $(I - J^* J) = 0$. Since $\nu$ is positive definite and $\dot{\nu}$ is negative definite, $\| \hat{e}_N \|$ goes to zero monotonically.

Additionally, we can also obtain the same result from the dynamic control law, which is proposed by Hsu et al.\textsuperscript{18} as follows:

$$
\phi_N = (I - J^* J)(\hat{g} + K_N \hat{e}_N) - (J^* J \hat{e} + J^* J \hat{e}) (\hat{g} - \theta)
$$

$$
= (I - J^* J)(\hat{g} + K_N \hat{e}_N)
$$

since $(J^* J)^T \theta = (J^* J)^T \theta$. Our dynamic control law is much simpler than that of Hsu et al.\textsuperscript{18} because our method doesn’t need to compute $J^*$.

Let the joint torque is bounded by

$$
|\tau_i| \leq \tau_{i,\text{max}}, \quad i \in J_d.
$$

where $\tau_{i,\text{max}}$ is the upper limit of each joint torque. Decompose $\tau$ as $\tau = \tau_r + \tau_N$ where

$$
\tau_r = M J^* (\hat{x}_N + K_N \hat{e}_N + K_p \hat{e} - J \hat{\theta}) + N
$$

$$
\tau_N = M \phi_N
$$

In some cases, excessively large null space joint torque $\tau_N$ is required to achieve the given subtask. To prevent such a case, we utilize a saturation function as follows.

Proposition 4: Define a torque saturation function as

$$
Sat(\tau_{i,\text{max}}) = \min \left( 1, \frac{\min_{(\tau_{i,\text{max}}) = \tau_{i,\text{max}} (\tau_{i,\text{max}} = \tau_{i,\text{max}})} \frac{\text{sgn}(\tau_{i,\text{max}})}{\tau_{i,\text{max}}} \right) \tau_{i,\text{max}}
$$

Then, each component of the joint torque $\tau = \tau_r + Sat(\tau_{i,\text{max}})$ satisfies the torque bound $\tau_{i,\text{max}}$.

The function $(I - J^* J)\hat{g}$ can be thought of as the desired null space joint velocity, where $\hat{g} = \alpha \nabla C$. Hence, the purpose of this dynamic control law is to make the self-motion or the null space joint velocity $\hat{\theta}_N = (I - J^* J)\hat{\theta}$ track the projection of $\hat{g}$ on the null space of $J$, which is the same as asking that $\hat{e}_N$ should converge to zero. This dynamic control law permits end-effector trajectory tracking while decreasing...
the possibility of collision via minimizing the collidability measure.

Major advantages of the torque-bounded dynamic control law are as follows. Utilizing the decomposed $\dot{\theta}$ in Proposition 2, our dynamic control law is much simpler than that of Hsu et al. Also, by using $\text{Sat}(\tau_1)$ instead of $\tau_1$, reasonably large $\alpha$ is allowed to improve the system performance.

4. SIMULATION

Consider a four-link manipulator moving in three-dimensional space with two spherical obstacles. We choose parameters as follows: Link lengths ($l_i=1$ m, $i=1, \cdots, 4$), link masses ($m_i=10$ kg, $i=1, \cdots, 4$), inertia parameters ($I_i=5/6$ kgm$^2$, $i=1, \cdots, 4$).

First, the kinematic obstacle avoidance control is simulated with the desired trajectory, which is given as a straight line Cartesian path with a constant velocity $\dot{x}_d=[-1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0]^T$ m/sec for $t_f=2.0$ seconds. We choose $g = \alpha_1 \nabla C + \alpha_2 \nabla H$ to minimize the collidability measure $C(\theta)$ and maximize the manipulability measure $H(\theta)=\sqrt{\det(J^T J)}$, where $\alpha_1=-0.4$ and $\alpha_2=0.1$ are gain constants. Two spherical obstacles do uniform motion, and the joint velocity bound $\dot{\theta}_{\text{max}}=3$ rad/sec, $i=1, \cdots, 4$. Using kinematic control algorithm with the collidability measure, Figure 3(a) shows the resultant trajectory with moving obstacles. Joint velocities are shown in Figure 3(b).

For comparison, kinematic obstacle avoidance control with a conventional measure – inverse of minimum distance – is simulated. In this case, Figure 4(a) shows the resultant trajectory with moving obstacles. Joint velocities are shown in Figure 4(b). Comparing Figure 3(b) and Figure 4(b), the collidability measure produces much less joint motions or null-space joint motions than that of the conventional measure. Hence, the joint velocity norm of the collidability measure is reduced, which is shown in Figure 5 when compared with the conventional measure, because relative movements of manipulator links and obstacles are considered.

Next, the dynamic obstacle avoidance control is simulated. The desired trajectory is given as a straight line Cartesian path starting and ending with zero velocity, with constant bang-bang type acceleration/deceleration $\ddot{x}_d=[-1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0]^T$ m/sec$^2$. We use the same kinematic criteria
as in the case of kinematic control except $\alpha_1 = -0.292$ and $\alpha_2 = 0.1$, and $\tau_{\text{max}} = 300 \, \text{Nm}$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. In the case of dynamic obstacle avoidance control with the collidability measure, the resultant trajectory with moving obstacles is shown in Figure 6(a). In addition, Figure 6(b) shows joint torques for the collidability measure.

In the case of dynamic obstacle avoidance control with the conventional measure, Figure 7(a) shows the resultant trajectory with moving obstacles. Joint torques for the conventional measure are shown in Figure 7(b). Comparing Figure 6(a) and Figure 7(a), the amount of variation of configuration (or joint velocity) for obstacle avoidance with the collidability measure is much less than that with the conventional measure. This is because relative movements of manipulator links and obstacles are considered for obstacle avoidance. Also, joint torques in Figure 8 shows that obstacle avoidance control with the collidability measure is economic, since it requires much less joint torque than the conventional measure.

Various simulations are performed to reveal that our control algorithm with the collidability measure satisfies joint velocity or torque bound, and requires less null space control action for obstacle avoidance, leaving more actions possible for improving other measures such as manipulability measure.

5. CONCLUSION

We presented a new measure called **collidability measure** for obstacle avoidance control of redundant manipulators. Obstacle avoidance action is reduced remarkably, since the collidability measure is obtained based on the relative movements of manipulator links and obstacles, and produces less null space control action. We also clarified decomposition into range and null spaces in the joint velocity/acceleration level, and presented velocity-bounded kinematic control law and simple dynamic control law with bounded joint torque which guarantee asymptotic tracking of a desired trajectory while performing desired subtasks. These control laws satisfy joint velocity or torque bound, and allow a reasonable large gain constant to improve the system performance. Effectiveness of our control laws have been demonstrated with various simulations.
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