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1. INTRODUCTION

Two robots carrying a common object are a logical alternative for the case in which a single robot is not able to handle the load. Nevertheless, with two cooperative robots the resulting interaction forces have to be accommodated and consequently, in addition to position feedback, force control is also required (Hogan, 1985 and Siciliano, 1999).

There are two basic methods for force control, namely the hybrid position/force and the impedance schemes. The first method (Raibert and Craig, 1981) requires the separation of the task into two orthogonal subspaces corresponding to the force and the position controlled variables. Once established the subspace decomposition two independent controllers are designed. The second method (Hogan, 1985) requires a proper choice of the arm mechanical impedance through which the interaction forces are indirectly controlled to obtain an adequate response.

This paper studies the position/force control of two cooperative manipulators, using fractional-order (FO) algorithms (Oustaloup, 1995, Podlubny, 1999, Ferreira and Machado, 2003). In fact, the application of the fractional calculus is still in a research stage, but the preliminary results reveal properties that can be of importance in the scope of robotic control.

In this line of thought the paper is organized as follows. Section two presents the controller architecture for the position/force control of two robotic arms and section three introduces the fundamentals of the fractional-order algorithms based on these concepts. Section four develops several experiments for the analysis and the performance evaluation of FO and the PID controllers, for robots having several types of dynamic phenomena at the joints. Finally, section five outlines the main conclusions.

2. POSITION-FORCE CONTROL OF TWO ARMS

When two robots grasp an object (Fig. 1), and move it from one location to another, a coordinated motion is required. In order to get good performances it is necessary to specify no only the desired motion of each robot but also the corresponding handling force.

In the system under study the contact of the robot gripper with the load is modeled through a linear system with a mass $M$, a damping $B$ and a stiffness $K$. On the other hand, the dynamics of a robot with $n$ links interacting with the environment is modeled as:

$$\tau = H(q)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q}) + G(q) - J^T(q)F$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\tau$ is the $n \times 1$ vector of actuator torques, $q$ is the $n \times 1$ vector of joint coordinates, $H(q)$ is the $n \times n$
The mathematical definition of a derivative of fractional order $\alpha$ has been the subject of several different approaches. For example, we can mention the Laplace and the Grünwald-Letnikov definitions:

\[
D^\alpha [x(t)] = L^{-1}[s^\alpha X(s)] \\
D^\alpha x(t) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^k \Gamma(\alpha - k + 1) x(t - kh)
\]

where $\Gamma$ is the gamma function and $h$ is the time increment.

In this article we consider $FO$ controllers of the type:

\[
C(s) = K_0 + K_\alpha s^\alpha, \quad -1 < \alpha < 1
\]

For implementing (5) we adopt discrete-time $k = 4$ Padé approximations ($K$, $a_0$, $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$):

\[
C(z) = k \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i z^i / \sum_{i=0}^{k} b_i z^i
\]

both in the position ($P$) and force ($F$) loops.

4. CONTROLLER PERFORMANCES

This section analyzes the system performance both for robots ideal transmissions and robots with dynamic phenomena at the joints, such as backlash and flexibility. Moreover, we compare the response of $FO$ and classical $PID$ algorithms. In particular we adopt a $PD$ and a $PF$ in the position ($P$) and force ($F$) loops, respectively:

\[
\text{Position-}PD \text{~algorithm: } C(s) = K_p + K_D s \\
\text{Force-}PF \text{~algorithm: } C(s) = K_p + K_f s^{-1}
\]

Both algorithms were tuned by trial and error having in mind getting a similar performance in the two cases. By other words, the parameters were adjusted not only to get small overshoots and steady-state errors, but also to have similar performances in the $FO$ and $PID$ schemes in order to easy their comparison.

The resulting parameters were $\{K_0, K_\alpha, \alpha\} = \{7.9 \times 10^3, 190, 0.5\}$, $\{K_p, K_f, \alpha\} = \{10.4, 179, -0.2\}$ for the $FO$ and $\{K_p, K_D\} = \{10^2, 10^3\}$, $\{K_{p, f}\} = \{10, 10^2\}$ for the $PD/PI$, in the position and force loops, respectively.

In order to study the system dynamics we apply, separately, small amplitude rectangular pulses, at the position and force reference, that is, we perturb each
reference signal at a time with $\delta x_d = 10^{-3}$ m, $\delta y_d = 10^{-3}$ m, $\delta F_{x_d} = 1.0$ N and $\delta F_{y_d} = 1.0$ N. Afterward, we analyze the system performance both in the time and the frequency domains.

4.1 Time response

In order to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms we compare the response for robots with dynamical phenomena at the joints.

In all experiments the controller sampling frequency is $f_c = 10$ kHz for the operating point $A$ of the object and a contact force of each gripper of $(F_{x_d},F_{y_d})=(0.5,5) Nm$ for the $j$th ($j=1,2$) robot.

In a first phase we consider robots with ideal transmissions at the joints. Figures 3 and 4 depict the time response of the robots 1 and 2, under the action of the FO and the PD/PI algorithms.

In a second phase (Fig. 5) we analyze the response of robots with dynamic backlash at the joints (Stepanenko, 1986, and Dubowsky, 1987). For the $i$th joint gear, with clearance $h_i$, the backlash reveals impact phenomena between the inertias, which obey the principle of conservation of momentum and the Newton law:

$$\dot{q}_i' = \frac{\dot{q}_i f_i - \omega J_m + \dot{q}_m J_m (1+\varepsilon)}{J_i + J_m}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8a)

where $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ is a constant that defines the type of impact ($\varepsilon = 0$ inelastic impact, $\varepsilon = 1$ elastic impact) and $\dot{q}_i'$ and $\dot{q}_m'$ are the inertias velocities of the $i$th joint and motor after the collision, respectively. The parameter $J_i$ ($J_m$) stands for the link (motor) inertias of joint $i$. The numerical values adopted are $h_i = 1.8 \times 10^{-4}$ rad and $\varepsilon_i = 0.8$ ($i=1,2$).

In a third phase (Fig. 6) we study the performance of robots with compliant joints. For this case the dynamic model corresponds to model (1) augmented by the equations:

$$\tau = J_m q_m + B_m \dot{q}_m + K_m (q_m - q)$$ \hspace{1cm} (9a)

$$K_m (q_m - q) = J(q) \ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q}) + G(q)$$ \hspace{1cm} (9b)

where $J_m$, $B_m$ and $K_m$ are the $n \times n$ diagonal matrices of the motor and transmission inertias, damping and stiffness, respectively. In the simulations we adopt $K_m = 2 \times 10^5 Nm rad^{-1}$ and $B_m = 10^4 Nms rad^{-1}$ ($i=1,2$).

The time responses (Tables 1 to 4), namely the percent overshoot $PO\%$, the steady-state error $e_{ss}$, the peak time $T_p$, and the settling time $T_s$, reveal that, although tuned for similar performances in the first case, the FO is superior to the PD/PI in the cases with dynamical phenomena at the robot joints.

Fig. 3. Time response for the robot 1 under the action of the FO and the PD/PI algorithms, for a pulse perturbation $\delta x_d = 10^{-3}$m at the robot 1 position reference.
Fig. 4. Time response for the robot 1 under the action of the FO and the PD/PI algorithms for a pulse perturbation $\delta y_d = 10^{-3} \text{m}$ at the robot 1 position reference.

Fig. 5. Time response for the robot 1 with joints having backlash under the action of the FO and PD/PI algorithms for a pulse perturbation $\delta y_d = 10^{-3} \text{m}$ at the robot 1 position reference.

Fig. 6. Time response for the robot 1 with joints having flexibility under the action of the FO and PD/PI algorithms for a pulse perturbation $\delta y_d = 10^{-3} \text{m}$ at the robot 1 position reference.
Table 1 Parameters of the time response for a rectangular pulse $\delta x_d$ at the robot 1 position reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>C(s)</th>
<th>$PO%$</th>
<th>$e_{ss}$</th>
<th>$T_e$</th>
<th>$T_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>3.4 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>17 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>65 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>2.5 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>9 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>25 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlash</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.5 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>20 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>20 $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>25 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>25 $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.5 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>10 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>20 $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.0 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>25 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>25 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Time response parameters for rectangular pulse $\delta y_d$ at the robot 1 position reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>C(s)</th>
<th>$PO%$</th>
<th>$e_{ss}$</th>
<th>$T_e$</th>
<th>$T_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>4.1 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>23 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>70 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>2.6 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>9 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>50 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlash</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>30 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>40 $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>30 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>40 $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.9 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>40 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>45 $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.9 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>40 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>45 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Time response parameters for rectangular pulse $\delta F_{x_d}$ at the robot 1 force reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>C(s)</th>
<th>$PO%$</th>
<th>$e_{ss}$</th>
<th>$T_e$</th>
<th>$T_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>15 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>75 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>8.4 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>58 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>55 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlash</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>14 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>50 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>28 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>50 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>14 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>50 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>28 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>50 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Time response parameters for rectangular pulse $\delta F_{y_1}$ at the robot 1 force reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>C(s)</th>
<th>$PO%$</th>
<th>$e_{ss}$</th>
<th>$T_e$</th>
<th>$T_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>15 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>75 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>8.4 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>58 $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>55 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlash</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>55 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>60 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>5 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>60 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>PID</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>9.2 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>55 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>60 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.0 $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>5 $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>60 $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Frequency response

In order to compare the robustness of the algorithm, we analyze the system response for ideal robots and robots having flexible transmission.

Based on the time response to small perturbations at the position and force references, we can establish the frequency response, corresponding to linearized transfer functions around the operating point A.

Figures 7-8 show the closed-loop transfer functions $[X(j\omega)/X_d(j\omega)]$, $[Y(j\omega)/Y_d(j\omega)]$, $[F_x(j\omega)/F_x(j_d\omega)]$ and $[F_y(j\omega)/F_y(j_d\omega)]$ (where $X(j\omega)=F(j\delta X)$, $Y(j\omega)=F(j\delta Y)$, $F_x(j\omega)=F(j\delta F_x)$ and $F_y(j\omega)=F(j\delta F_y)$) for the FO and the PD/PI controllers, in both cases.

The charts reveal that the FO algorithms have a superior performance, namely a good robustness and larger bandwidth.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper compared the position/force control of two robots working in cooperation using a fractional-order and integer order control algorithms. The dynamic performance of two arms holding an object was analyzed both in the time and the frequency domains and the manipulators were also tested for several types of nonlinear phenomena at the joints.

The results demonstrate that the fractional-order algorithm is superior, revealing a good performance and a high robustness.
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Fig. 7. Closed loop frequency responses for the ideal robot 1, under the action of the FO and PD/PI algorithm, for pulse perturbations $\delta x_d$, $\delta y_d$, $\delta F_x$ and $\delta F_y$ at the robot 1 references.

Fig. 8. Closed loop frequency responses for the robot 1 with joints having flexibility, under the action of the FO and PD/PI algorithm, for pulse perturbations $\delta x_d$, $\delta y_d$, $\delta F_x$ and $\delta F_y$ at the robot 1 references.