## Evaluation scheme

Evaluation for each of the days is attached below

## Day-01: Optimization Intro and MATLAB warmup

- The first day is only warmup and is not evaluated

Day-02: Robot Design	[100]	
Five-bar workspace optimisation  Working code to obtain the solution for the constrained problem	[50] [ <b>25</b> ]	
<ul> <li>Q1. What do you observe upon solving the unbounded optimisation problem, i.e., what solution and what does it mean?</li> <li>Q2. What do you observe upon solving the bounded optimisation problem, i.e., what solution and what does it mean?</li> <li>Q3. How do the results compare with the two-link robot optimised using pen and part of the optimal values of Explain the resulting optima (why the link lengths and the offsets are so)</li> <li>Q4. (Bonus) Considering collision between the robot links and the human ellipse as a linear constraint by checking intersection between links and the ellipse</li> <li>Attachment point optimisation</li> <li>Working code of the unconstrained problem</li> </ul>	[5] s is the [5] per? [2.5]	
<ul> <li>Q1. Draw the flow-chart for the bi-level optimisation problem (design and forces)</li> <li>Q2. Draw ADG for the optimisation problem</li> <li>Q3. Plot objective function value vs iterations of the optimisation</li> <li>Q4. Qualitatively how do you choose the termination iterations</li> <li>Q5. What are the optimal values for the design variables? Add an image of</li> <li>the cables and the link.</li> <li>Q6. Modify the swarm size with atleast two different values and repeat the experime document how it affects the optimal value and the computation time.</li> <li>Q7. What are the function and convergance tolerance for the chosen algorithm in the programming and how does it affect the solution? (see linprog documentation)</li> </ul>	[5]	
Day-03: Control Synthesis		
2R-robot trajectory optimisation  Working code of the robot moving from [0,0,0,0] to [pi,0,0,0]	[50] [ <b>25</b> ]	
<ul> <li>Q1. Solve the problem using fmincon and provide reasons for your observations?</li> <li>Document the state and control values obtained for your chosen initial and f state values</li> <li>Document the motion of the robot as a gif/video</li> <li>Q2. Solve the problem using different algorithms available, `sqp`, `active-set`, `interior and note the following:         <ul> <li>Number of iterations</li> <li>Time taken</li> <li>Number of function evaluations</li> <li>Objective function value at optima</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	[2] [2]	

		0	Difference in the obtained solution by plotting the corresponding states and to	rques
			on the same plot	[1]
	-		w does the final solution change when: (change atleast to two values and docur	nent
		the sol	ution obtained with atleast one expected reason for the solution)	[7]
		0	tf is changed	[1]
		0	N is changed	[1]
		0	x0 is changed	[1]
		0	xf is changed	[1]
		0	g is changed	[1]
		0	l1, l2, m1, m2 are changed	[1]
		0	Difference in the obtained solution by plotting the corresponding states and to on the same plot	rques [1]
	_	Q4. Giv	ve a better initial guess for the states and see how the simulation time and itera	
			e solution quality changes (Ex. Use any interpolation between initial and final sta	
		initial g		[2]
	_	_	odify the bounds on states and control and see how the behavior of the solution	
			es? can you find a solution for a small value of control bounds? Why?	[2]
	_	_	nus). Modify the discretisation scheme from Euler to Hermite-Simphson or anot	
			cument the nature of the solution. See how system behavior changes	[2.5]
	_		nus). Give the obtained control input to the system and observe the system	,
			mance? Does the robot reach the final position as expected?	[2.5]
		•	· · ·	
Μι	JSCL	ılo-ske	letal robot trajectory optimisation	[50]
			ng code for the musculo-skeletal robot	[20]
		VVOIRII	is code for the museulo skeletal robot	[20]
	-	Q1. Ho	w does modifying these variables effect the solution obtained?	[5]
	-	Q2. Plo	ot the resulting states and control input	[3]
	-	Q3. Wr	rite a code similar to `robolinplot` to visualise the resulting trajectory of the	
			lo-skeletal robot	[5]
	-	Q4. Re	peat Q1-Q2, Q3.1-3.4, Q4, Q5 from the previous problem	[17]
Da	ay-(	04: Cc	o-design	[50]
2R	-pla	nar rol	bot: Bi-level optimisation	[50]
	•		ng code of the bi-level optimisation	[25]
			, source of the stricter optimisation	[20]
	-	Q1. Wł	nat is the trivial solution for link lengths when there are no constraints? Why?	[5]
	-	Q2. Ad	d a cost for control input (J), workspace, cost of the robot with appropriate weig	ghting
		to get a	a non-trivial solution? Qualitatively explain the solution.	[10]
	_	•	oose different weighting between cost functions and document the result of the	
			nical design variable values	[5]
	_		onus) Add strength constraints and re-optimise the problem and document and	[~]
	_			[[]
		qualita	tively explain the solution	[5]

Total score possible: 250

But since bonus is included you do not have to solve all the questions.