

Antonio Bicchi*
J. Kenneth Salisbury
David L. Brock

Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Contact Sensing from Force Measurements

Abstract

This article addresses contact sensing (i.e., the problem of resolving the location of a contact, the force at the interface, and the moment about the contact normals). Called "intrinsic" contact sensing for the use of internal force and torque measurements, this method allows for practical devices that provide simple, relevant contact information in practical robotic applications. Such sensors have been used in conjunction with robot hands to identify objects, determine surface friction, detect slip, augment grasp stability, measure object mass, probe surfaces, and control collision and for a variety of other useful tasks. This article describes the theoretical basis for their operation and provides a framework for future device design.

1. Introduction

Manipulation requires contact between a robot and an object. Although contact is the fundamental interaction that occurs in manipulation, most current robot systems do not adequately sense or use contact information. Instead, they rely on precisely pre-positioned objects and joint information to guide the robot into contact with these objects. As we move toward more general forms of manipulation in less structured environments, robots must rely on sensory (and, ultimately, perceptual) feedback. In many situations vision is a viable source of feedback about task states. However, when contact occurs, as in grasping and pushing operations, more precise and intrinsically mechanical information is required about the contact. The traditional approaches to monitoring and controlling such interactions fall into two categories: force sensing and tactile sensing. The "classic" approach to force sensing employs strain-sensitive elements in the wrist, drive train, and other arm structures to permit measurement and control of contact and assembly forces [see Whitney (1987) for an

overview]. This method focuses on the net contact force and does not address contact location and geometry. At the other extreme, tactile sensors have been used to sense the details of particular contacts. Such devices employ surface-mounted arrays of force-sensitive elements that can be used to reveal contact locations, shapes, and contact pressure distributions. See Nicholls and Lee (1989) and Howe and Cutkosky (1992) for extensive surveys of the technology.

An alternative approach, developed in detail here, relies on force and torque measurements to reveal a contact's location and force components. One of the simplest embodiments of this concept is shown in Figure 1. By measuring the moment m and the force f at the fixed end of the cantilever beam, both the position of a single contact and the magnitude of its normal component of force can be found as: $p = f$ and $c = m/f$. A two-dimensional version of this idea permits contact location and normal force measurement on a plane by simply measuring the force normal to the plane and two moments in the plane. One embodiment of this idea was patented by Peronneau (1972). It turns out that it is also possible to sense the location and force components of contacts occurring on a nonplanar body, under appropriate assumptions. Minsky (1972) mentions this idea in conjunction with a force sensing wrist on a robot.

Salisbury (1984) and Brock and Chiu (1985) described a structural and mathematical solution appropriate for robot fingertips that sense the location of point contacts




Fig. 1. Simple contact sensing.

*Antonio Bicchi is now with the Department of Electric Systems and Automation (DSEA) and Centro "E. Piaggio," Università di Pisa, via Diotisalva, 2, 56125 Pisa, Italia.

that transmit pure forces, along with the components of the contact forces themselves. Their approach has been reconsidered by Tsujimura and Yabuta (1988). Okada (1990) presented a suspension cell-based tactile sensor, very close in spirit to this sensing concept. Bichi (1989, 1990b) derived a complete solution that takes into account soft finger contact effects. Eberman and Salisbury (1990) describe how joint torque measurements in a robot arm may be used to determine the location of a contact on its links. The broad applicability of this concept warrants closer examination of the underlying mathematics and has provided motivation for this article.

This type of force-based contact sensing is inherently different from more traditional tactile sensing. The goal of most tactile sensing systems is to measure the pressure distribution over the area of contact in order to infer details about contact location and shape. However, the goal of force-based contact sensing is to measure the net force acting on a body and to use this datum to determine the properties of the contact through which the force is exerted. Because these sensors rely on measurements taken by sensing elements that are placed inside, rather than spread over, the contacting surface, they are also referred to as intrinsic tactile sensors.

Although the theory behind such sensors is relatively complex, in practice they are quite simple to build and utilize, and they offer enormous potential for improving robot manipulation dexterity. In this article we present the theoretical aspects of intrinsic contact sensing as a basis for device design and application. In Section 2, we survey three basic contact models: the *point contact without friction*, *point contact with friction*, and *soft finger contact*. The soft finger contact type is particularly important, as it describes the most common situation encountered in manipulation. In Section 3, we address the basic mathematics and mechanics of contact sensing and discuss when it is possible for a sensor to determine the location and the resultant force and moment of a contact, given internal force and moment measurements. Sections 4, 5, and 6 describe algorithms to solve the contact sensing problem. Section 4 presents a general, yet approximate, closed-form algorithm; Section 5 describes a closed-form, exact solution for a number of simple sensor surfaces; and Section 6 introduces a general iterative method. Section 7 describes some possible generalizations of the idea, and finally, in Section 8, numerical experiments are used to discuss the properties of the proposed algorithms. The Appendices contain proofs of the propositions introduced in the text.

2. Contact Types

The concept of contact *type* is basic to understanding force-based contact sensing. The contact type establishes

constraints on the forces that may be applied through the contact between two bodies (Mason and Salisbury 1985).

If the forces that act on a body sum to zero, the body is said to be in a state of static equilibrium. These forces may arise from actuators, body forces, and contacts with the environment. Although the net force and moment on a system in static equilibrium will sum to zero, there will be nonzero internal forces (i.e., structural stresses, contact forces, etc.). If measurements of some of the internal forces can be made, they can be checked for consistency with the expected effects of a particular load type and hence can be used to deduce information about the contact(s).

When arbitrary forces and moments can be transmitted through the contact (i.e., a *glued contact* type), not much may be said about the contact geometry given force measurements. However, common contact types impose constraints on the transmitted forces, in that their components are either unidirectional or limited by the friction cone. It is these constraints that make the intrinsic contact sensing practical.

A *point contact without friction* constrains the force applied to the body to be normal to the surface at the point of contact and the moment to be zero. There are only three unknowns—the two contact coordinates and the force magnitude—so ideally, only three independent force measurements would be required to reveal the contact location and force. If we precisely measure all three force components acting on the body, the associated wrench axis is a line that passes through the point of contact and is normal to the surface at that contact point.¹

A *point contact with friction* also constrains the force applied to the body to be a pure force, but it is no longer constrained to have a line of action normal to the surface at the point of contact. Because there are now five unknowns—the two contact coordinates and the three contact force components—ideally, only five independent force measurements are required to measure the contact location and force components. Again, if precise measurements are available, the associated wrench axis is a line that passes through the point of contact.

Finally, if the bodies are compliant, finite portions of the surface may come into contact, and if friction is present, torques may also be exerted. In this situation, often referred to as a *soft finger contact*, the wrench axis no longer necessarily passes through the contact location. We will show below that it is possible to define and solve for the contact location and force and moment components even in this rather general case.

1. The *wrench axis* is a generalization of the concept of a line of action of a force. When an arbitrary set of forces and torques acts on a body, they may be described canonically by a unique line along which a unique force acts, together with a unique moment exerted about the line (Hunt 1978).

2.1. Soft Finger Contact and the Contact Centroid

The soft finger contact type is the most general case among those considered above and to which intrinsic contact sensing can be applied. Point contacts with or without friction are particular cases of soft finger contacts. Indeed, this type of contact is also the most common in practical manipulation. For example, contacts through which humans manipulate objects are frequently of this type.

A soft finger contact occurs between two real (non-rigid, possibly inelastic) bodies mutually transmitting a distribution of contact tractions² over a finite area of contact. The tractions are assumed to be *compressive* (that is, to point at the interior part of the body; adhesive forces between bodies are therefore disregarded by this model). A complete characterization of contact-related phenomena, because of their distributed nature, would involve complex continuum mechanics relationships whose computation (if at all possible) is far beyond the capabilities of a real-time robot sensory and control system. A compact characterization of contact is necessary to render the sensing problem tractable. The traditional approach to tactile sensing consists of spatially sampling the traction distribution and is usually limited to sensing only normal force components. A more drastic compression of data is obtained by force-based contact sensing, which provides a reduced set of contact features useful for manipulation control. This is achieved by use of *equivalent sets* of forces. Roughly speaking, two sets of forces are equivalent if their large-scale effects are the same. The unknown distribution of contact tractions can be substituted with an equivalent force and moment, comprised of a *resultant force* (henceforth designated with the vector \mathbf{p}), and a *resultant moment*, \mathbf{q} . To completely describe the set of forces, a point must be provided through which the resultant force is applied. The choice of this point is not trivial in the soft finger case, because contact occurs over a whole area. We show in what follows that a very convenient point to use for representing soft finger contacts is the *contact centroid*, which we define as follows:

DEFINITION 1: CONTACT CENTROID. Given a surface S with an outward normal direction defined everywhere on it and a distribution Δ of compressive tractions applied on it, a contact centroid is a point on S such that a set of forces equivalent to Δ exists, having the following characteristics:

1. It is comprised of only a force and a torque.

2. The term *traction* (Johnson 1985) indicates a force per surface unit, comprised in general of a normal component (pressure) and tangential (friction) component.

2. The force is applied at that point and is directed into S .
3. The moment is parallel to the surface normal at that point.

A contact centroid has some very useful properties that render it a desirable point to sense. First, if contact occurs at a single point, the contact centroid coincides with that point. Thus, from force/torque measurements we obtain the contact location, a typical tactile sensing goal. Second, even if multiple points and/or finite areas are in contact, the contact centroid still contains useful geometric information, as articulated below.³

PROPOSITION 1: PROPERTY OF CONTACT CENTROIDS.

Consider a deformable body whose undeformed surface S is convex, and assume that a distribution Δ of compressive contact tractions is exerted on it. Consider a plane P that divides the surface of the body in two portions, confining every contact point in one half-space (see Fig. 2). Consider the projection of each contact point on P along the direction of the traction applied at the contact point itself. If all such projections are internal to the undeformed surface S , then the contact centroid lies on the same side of P where Δ is applied.⁴

The proof of this property takes a few steps and is presented in Appendix A. The significance of this property is related to the fact (to be proved shortly) that it is possible to give an expression of the contact centroid in terms of force/torque measurements only. Although an intrinsic contact sensor is not able to provide an *image* of the actual contact points, we have an idea about the contact distribution, since the contact points are required to “lie around” the contact centroid, given appropriate constraints on surface curvature, deformability, and friction (see Fig. 2).

As a corollary to the property above, consider a generic compressive distribution Δ whose tractions comply with Coulomb's friction law. Given the assumptions as described in Proposition 1, it is required that the projection of every friction cone on the plane P is inside the sphere S . Suppose we had a spherical sensor with a coefficient of friction $\mu = \tan \varphi$. Then the hypotheses of Proposition 1 are satisfied if every contact point falls within a cone of angle $\theta = \pi - 2\varphi$, as illustrated in

3. The concept of a contact centroid was not explicit in the initial definition of the soft finger contact given by Salisbury (1983); that definition was based on an assumption of a very small contact area. The contact centroid introduced by Bicchi (1989) allows for a broader applicability of the soft finger contact type. It should be noted that for flat surfaces, the contact centroid coincides with the center of friction introduced by Mason and Salisbury (1985).

4. We will show in Section 3 that for convex surfaces, the contact centroid is actually unique.




Fig. 2. The contact centroid has the property of being close to the actual contact area.

Figure 3A. In other words, if the contact area is “small” enough, then the contact centroid is a meaningful datum to calculate. For example, suppose a spherical sensor is pressed into a corner whose walls form an angle α and whose surface friction is given by φ . Then the conditions for the viability of the contact centroid are satisfied when $\alpha > 2\varphi$.

3. Problem Formulation

One possible implementation of a contact sensor consists of a surface, which we will call a *fingertip*, attached to a six-axis force/torque sensor. The force/torque sensor measures all three components of both the resultant force \mathbf{f} and the resultant moment \mathbf{m} with respect to the reference frame B , as shown in Figure 4. Note that the choice of the reference frame B is arbitrary, as we can easily express \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{m} in terms of any other coordinate frame fixed to B .

The fingertip surface can be described by the implicit relation

$$S(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{r} is a point in space defined with respect to B . The surface S should have continuous first derivatives, so that a normal unit vector can be defined at every point on S as

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{r})}{\|\nabla S(\mathbf{r})\|},$$

where ∇ indicates the gradient operator. Let \mathbf{c} be the contact centroid and \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} the force and moment applied at \mathbf{c} ; the latter two are equivalent to a “soft finger” contact. The measurable quantities \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{m} are related to the unknowns \mathbf{c} , \mathbf{p} , and \mathbf{q} , by force and moment balance equations,

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{p}, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{p}. \quad (3)$$




Fig. 3. A spherical sensor surface with friction coefficient $\mu = \tan \varphi$.




Fig. 4. Vector quantities and notation involved in the problem statement.

For soft finger contacts, the torque \mathbf{q} is parallel to the unit vector \mathbf{n} normal to the surface at the contact centroid \mathbf{c} ; hence

$$\mathbf{n} \propto \mathbf{q} = \frac{K}{2} \nabla S(\mathbf{c}), \quad (4)$$

for some constant K .

We call the above set of relations the *contact sensing problem*, which is stated as follows:

DEFINITION 2: CONTACT SENSING PROBLEM. Given the measurements \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{m} , together with a surface equation $S(\cdot) = 0$, determine the location of the contact centroid(s) \mathbf{c} , and the related contact force \mathbf{p} and moment(s) \mathbf{q} .

Note that because of the definition of contact centroid, we implicitly require that \mathbf{p} is compressive (i.e., directed into the surface) and that \mathbf{q} is normal to S . Expanding equations (1) through (4) yields a nonlinear system of 10 equations in 10 scalar unknowns (i.e., the nine components of \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{q} , \mathbf{c} , and K). However, by simply substituting equations (2) and (4) in equation (3), the problem is reduced to four equations in four unknowns. Because the problem is nonlinear, we need to determine if a solution exists and, if it does, if it is unique. In general, not much can be said about the existence of solutions, given arbitrary \mathbf{f} , \mathbf{m} , and S , as there is no guarantee we can find an equivalent soft finger contact. A solution exists, however, if the resultant force \mathbf{f} and moment \mathbf{m} are measurements consistent with the effects of a soft finger type traction distribution on a surface S .

If a solution exists, the following proposition holds about its uniqueness:

PROPOSITION 2: UNIQUENESS OF SOLUTIONS. A solution to the contact sensing problem is unique (if it exists), if and only if the sensor surface is convex (see proof in Appendix B).

Proposition 1 gives conditions on Δ and S that guarantee the existence of a contact centroid. According to Proposition 2, the contact centroid of a compressive distribution Δ on a convex surface is also unique.

As a final remark, the solution to equations (1) through (4) may not be trivial, and a closed-form solution may not be found except for the simplest surfaces. In the following sections, we will present three methods for solving these equations.

4. Point Contact Solution

The first closed-form method we present for solving the contact sensing problem utilizes more restrictive assumptions than those specified above. In particular, we assume the local torque \mathbf{q} about the contact normal is zero. In other words we assume the contact model is a *point contact with friction*, as described in Section 2. This assumption can lead to good results and a simple solution for a large number of practical cases. The *wrench axis* of the force system is given by

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_0 + \lambda \mathbf{f}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathbf{r}_0 = \frac{\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{m}}{\|\mathbf{f}\|^2}. \quad (6)$$

The wrench axis is a line through \mathbf{r}_0 and parallel to \mathbf{f} , parameterized by λ . This line intersects the convex surface S in at most two locations: one corresponding to a force pulling out of the surface and one corresponding to

a force pushing into the surface. Because we do not allow adhesive forces, we can determine the contact centroid as the intersection point for which the contact force is directed into the surface; that is,

$$\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{c}) < 0. \quad (7)$$

When the local torque \mathbf{q} is not zero, the point found by this method differs from the contact centroid. Therefore we will denote with \mathbf{c}' the vector found using this so-called “wrench axis” or “point contact” method.

Note that the assumption $\mathbf{q} = 0$ can be checked out directly from force/torque measurements by means of the equivalent relationship $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m} = 0$. It should be pointed out that the point \mathbf{c}' does not have any of the properties of contact centroids, so it could in principle lie far away from the actual location of the contact area. Yet, point \mathbf{c}' retains a valuable meaning in real conditions as an easy-to-compute approximation of the contact centroid. To give an estimate of the distance between \mathbf{c}' and the contact centroid \mathbf{c} , let \mathbf{e} represent the difference vector $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{c}' - \mathbf{c}$. Suppose two sets of forces— \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} applied at \mathbf{c} , and \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{t} applied at \mathbf{c}' —are both equivalent with the actual set of contact forces; hence they are equivalent with each other. The balance equation of moments about \mathbf{c} can be written as

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{t} + \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{p}.$$

Such a vector equation is solved by any \mathbf{e} of the form

$$\mathbf{e} = \frac{(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{t}) \times \mathbf{p}}{\|\mathbf{p}\|^2} + \nu \mathbf{p}. \quad (8)$$

Recalling that, after the definition of wrench axis, \mathbf{t} is parallel to \mathbf{p} and that, by definition of contact centroid, \mathbf{q} is normal to the surface, we can rewrite equation (8) as

$$\mathbf{e} = \frac{\mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{p}_t}{\|\mathbf{p}\|^2} + \nu \mathbf{p},$$

where $\mathbf{p}_t = \mathbf{p} - (\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{n}$ is the tangential (friction) component of the contact resultant force. Because the error vector \mathbf{e} is the sum of two mutually orthogonal vectors, its length is at least as large as

$$\|\mathbf{e}\| \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{q}\| \|\mathbf{p}_t\|}{\|\mathbf{p}\|^2}.$$

In view of this result, it can be observed that the distance between the point found by the wrench axis method and the contact centroid grows quickly as friction increases. Then, the approximation of the contact centroid with point \mathbf{c}' should be avoided if high-friction and/or compliant materials are employed in building the fingertips. Numerical examples are provided in the discussion section.

5. Solution for Ellipsoidal Surfaces

The main advantage of the wrench axis method is that the contact location problem is reduced to that of finding the intersection of a line with a surface. However, this method has two major drawbacks. First, it does not provide information about the moment exerted through a soft finger contact, and second, it only approximates the contact centroid. In this section we solve the contact sensing problem and avoid such shortcomings. However, to guarantee a closed-form algorithm and to simplify calculations, the fingertip surface will be restricted to belong to a specific class of surfaces—namely, quadratic forms of the type

$$S(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - R^2 = 0, \quad (9)$$

where \mathbf{A} is a constant coefficient matrix, and R is a scale factor used for convenience. Because the reference frame B can be moved arbitrarily, we can assume without loss of generality that \mathbf{A} can be written in diagonal form

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/\gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

To guarantee the uniqueness of solutions, the surface specification must be further restricted to convex portions of the quadratic form (for instance, one of the sheets of a double hyperboloid would be an appropriate sensor surface). In the interest of simplicity, however, we will consider in the following only general ellipsoids (i.e., definite positive \mathbf{A} matrices). In this case, the principal axes of the ellipsoid are given by $2\alpha R$, $2\beta R$, and $2\gamma R$, with $0 < 1/\alpha \leq 1$, $0 < 1/\beta \leq 1$, $0 < 1/\gamma \leq 1$.

It should be noted that ellipsoids are important for several reasons. First, ellipsoids approximate, up to the second order, any continuous convex surface. Second, very common surfaces, such as spheres, cylinders, and planes, can be regarded as limit cases of an ellipsoid. Finally, the ellipsoid assumption is standard in contact mechanics (e.g., the Hertzian theory of elastic contact).

Substituting equation (9) into equation (4) yields

$$\mathbf{n} = \frac{\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}}{\|\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}\|} \propto \mathbf{q} = K \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c}, \quad (10)$$

and substituting this and equation (2) into equation (3), we obtain

$$\mathbf{m} = K \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{f}. \quad (11)$$

Equations (9) and (11) form a system of four nonlinear equations and four unknowns that can be rewritten in the form

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{m} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c} = R^2, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{\Gamma}(K)$ is a 3×3 matrix whose elements are functions of K and of the measured force components f_1 , f_2 , and f_3 ,

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}(K) = \begin{pmatrix} K/\alpha^2 & f_3 & -f_2 \\ -f_3 & K/\beta^2 & f_1 \\ f_2 & -f_1 & K/\gamma^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The determinant of $\mathbf{\Gamma}(K)$ is given by

$$\det \mathbf{\Gamma}(K) = K(K^2 D^2 + \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}\|^2),$$

where $D = \det \mathbf{A}$. The matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma}(K)$ is singular for $K = 0$ (i.e., when the local torque \mathbf{q} is zero). In this case (which can be detected by the simple equivalent condition $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m} = 0$, as already mentioned), the contact centroid can be determined exactly by the wrench axis method. The value of the parameter λ in equation (5) corresponding to the intersection of the wrench axis with the ellipsoid surface is given by

$$\lambda = \frac{-\mathbf{f}'^T \mathbf{r}'_0 - \sqrt{(\mathbf{f}'^T \mathbf{r}'_0)^2 - \|\mathbf{f}'\|^2 (\|\mathbf{r}'_0\|^2 - R^2)}}{\|\mathbf{f}'\|^2},$$

where $\mathbf{f}' = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{r}'_0 = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r}_0$ (recall the definition of \mathbf{r}_0 in equation (6)).

Whenever $\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m} \neq 0$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}(K)$ has an inverse $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}(K)$ such that, by solving equation (12) for \mathbf{c} , we obtain

$$\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{m} = \frac{1}{\det \mathbf{\Gamma}} [K^2 D^2 \mathbf{A}^{-2} \mathbf{m} + K(\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{m} + (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m}) \mathbf{f}], \quad (14)$$

By substituting equation (14) into equation (13), a scalar equation in the only unknown K is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{c} &= R^2 \\ &= \frac{K^4 D^4 \|\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{m}\|^2 + K^2 \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{m})\|^2 + (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})^2 (\|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}\|^2 + 2K^2 D^2)}{K^2 (K^2 D^2 + \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}\|^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For such a sixth-order equation, a closed-form solution should not be expected in general because of Galois' theorem. For the particular surface assumed, though, we observe that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{m})\|^2 = D^2 [\|\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{m}\|^2 \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}\|^2 - (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})^2],$$

so that equation (15) can be simplified in a biquadratic equation as

$$K^4 D^2 R^2 + K^2 [R^2 \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}\|^2 - D^2 \|\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{m}\|^2] - (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})^2 = 0.$$

Only one of the four possible K solving this equation is real and consistent with the hypothesis of nonadhesive contact and is given by

$$K = \frac{-\text{sign}(\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})}{\sqrt{2} R D} \sqrt{\sigma + \sqrt{\sigma^2 + 4 D^2 R^2 (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})^2}}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\sigma = D^2 \|\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{m}\|^2 - R^2 \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f}\|^2,$$

and

$$\text{sign}(x) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{for } x < 0 \\ 0, & \text{for } x = 0 \\ 1, & \text{for } x > 0 \end{cases}.$$

By substituting back K in equation (14) and equation (10), we obtain the complete solution for \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{q} , respectively.

5.1. Particular Cases

We will now develop solutions for some particular cases of practical importance—namely, the sphere, cylinder, and plane.

5.1.1. Sphere

For a spherical sensor surface of radius R centered at the origin of the force/torque reference frame B , the matrix \mathbf{A} equals the identity \mathbf{I}_3 , and $D = 1$. Hence,

$$K = \frac{-\text{sign}(\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})}{\sqrt{2}R} \sqrt{\sigma' + \sqrt{\sigma'^2 + 4R^2(\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m})^2}},$$

where $\sigma' = \|\mathbf{m}\|^2 - R^2 \|\mathbf{f}\|^2$.

The contact centroid location (for nonzero K) is given by

$$\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{K(K^2 + \|\mathbf{f}\|^2)} [K^2 \mathbf{m} + K \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{m} + (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m}) \mathbf{f}],$$

whereas, for $K = 0$, the contact centroid is found using equation (5) with

$$\lambda = -\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{f}\|} \sqrt{R^2 - \frac{\|\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{m}\|^2}{\|\mathbf{f}\|^4}}.$$

5.1.2. Cylinder

Consider a cylinder with an axis parallel to the z axis of the sensor frame B and circular cross section of radius R . Such surface can be described as the limit case of an ellipsoid with characteristic matrix given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/\gamma \end{pmatrix}$$

for $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. Applying the same limit to equation (16), we have

$$K = \frac{-\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m}}{\sqrt{R^2 \|\mathbf{f}^\perp\|^2 - \|\mathbf{m}''\|^2}},$$

where $\mathbf{f}^\perp = (f_1, f_2, 0)^T$ is the component of \mathbf{f} normal to the cylinder axis, and $\mathbf{m}'' = (0, 0, m_3)^T$ is the component of \mathbf{m} parallel to the same axis. If $K = 0$, the wrench

method (equation (5)) should be applied. Otherwise, the contact centroid on the cylindrical surface of the fingertip is given by

$$\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{K \|\mathbf{f}^\perp\|^2} [K^2 \mathbf{m}'' + K \mathbf{f}^\perp \times \mathbf{m} + (\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m}) \mathbf{f}].$$

5.1.3. Plane

An ellipsoid with matrix \mathbf{A} of the form

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\gamma & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\gamma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

degenerates, for $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$, in a couple of parallel planes perpendicular to the x axis of B , at a distance $\pm R$ from the origin. If $\mathbf{f}'' = (0, 0, f_3)^T$ is the contact force component parallel to the z axis, equations (16) and (14) become

$$K = \frac{-\mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{m}}{R \|\mathbf{f}''\|}$$

and

$$\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{f}''\|^2} (\mathbf{f}'' \times \mathbf{m} + R \|\mathbf{f}''\| \mathbf{f}).$$

It should be noted that the last formula holds even with $K = 0$.

6. Iterative Solution

The final method for solving the contact sensing problem is valid for any surface specification but implies an iterative algorithm to be run at each sensor sampling time. The computational efficiency of the algorithm is therefore of utmost importance for real-time applications.

As customary when dealing with the numerical solution of vector multivariate functions, we rewrite the problem equations in the relaxation method form

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^T &= (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^T = (\mathbf{c}^T, K/2); \\ \mathbf{g}^T(\mathbf{x}) &= (g_1(\mathbf{x}), g_2(\mathbf{x}), g_3(\mathbf{x}), g_4(\mathbf{x}))^T; \\ g_1(\mathbf{x}) &= x_4 \nabla S_1 - f_2 x_3 + f_3 x_2 - m_1; \\ g_2(\mathbf{x}) &= x_4 \nabla S_2 - f_3 x_1 + f_1 x_3 - m_2; \\ g_3(\mathbf{x}) &= x_4 \nabla S_3 - f_1 x_2 + f_2 x_1 - m_3; \\ g_4(\mathbf{x}) &= S(x_1, x_2, x_3). \end{aligned}$$

Standard algorithms [see, e.g., Dahlquist and Björk (1974)] for the iterative solution of such equations can be applied, perhaps the most notable being the Newton-Raphson method or its variations. The Jacobian matrix \mathbf{G} associated with the problem can be evaluated as

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} x_4 \mathbf{H} - \mathbf{f}_\otimes & \nabla S \\ \nabla S^T & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{H} is the Hessian of the surface S (that is, the matrix $H_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$), and \mathbf{f}_{\otimes} is the cross-product matrix of \mathbf{f} , such that $\mathbf{f}_{\otimes} \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{c}$.

Computing \mathbf{G} can be more or less time consuming, depending on the complexity of the surface S . Computing \mathbf{G}^{-1} , as required by Newton-Raphson's method, can be inconvenient for real-time applications. Furthermore, in this specific case, we have that \mathbf{G} is singular for $x_4 = K/2 = 0$, which means that this algorithm would present serious problems whenever the contact load has very little local torque \mathbf{q} .

It must be noted that, in general, the numerical solution of vector multivariate nonlinear equations is not a "nice" problem [see the related comments in Press et al. (1988)]; better algorithms are available for finding the extrema of multivariate scalar functions. A possible approach to the design of an algorithm for solving equation (17) is therefore to embed the root-finding problem in a minimization one.

Because the Jacobian matrix \mathbf{G} is not symmetric (its upper left minor is the sum of a symmetric and a skew-symmetric matrix), \mathbf{g} cannot be straightforwardly regarded as the gradient of some energy-like function to minimize. However, if we consider the equation

$$\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = 0,$$

we have that all the zeroes of \mathbf{g} are also zeroes of $\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{g}$, and $\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{g}$ is the gradient ("potential field") associated with the positive definite scalar function $V = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{g}$, whose absolute minimum is our solution.

Applying the well-known gradient-descent updating law to the k th estimate of \mathbf{x} , we have

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \lambda \nabla V(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}_k - \lambda \mathbf{G}_k^T \mathbf{g}_k.$$

It can be observed that the application of this gradient-descent technique to minimize an energy-like (Liapunov) function $V = \phi^T(\mathbf{q})\phi(\mathbf{q})$ is equivalent to the closed-loop inverse kinematic scheme proposed by Balestrino et al. (1984) and several others to invert the nonlinear kinematic relationship of a robot, $\phi(\mathbf{q})$. It can be shown with a Liapunov argument that this method is locally asymptotically convergent to the desired solution for appropriate choices of λ ; and, in fact, it is intuitive that for λ (i.e., step lengths) short enough in the steepest descent direction the V function will be always kept decreasing until a minimum is reached. A discussion on the optimal choice of λ has been provided by Das et al. (1989).

The local asymptotic convergence of the algorithm means, in our current application, that the correct contact point will be found provided that the initial guess is "close enough." To avoid getting "stuck" at an incorrect point, it would be desirable to assess global asymptotic

convergence. Unfortunately, the technique of embedding the root-finding problem in a minimization one is prone to generate such local minima, and some do exist in our specific problem even for surfaces as simple as spheres. From a practical point of view, those "false" roots are easily recognized (their residues $\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{g}$ are not zero). Moreover, if the contact being investigated changes its characteristics with continuity, starting the search from the previously obtained solution is very likely to lead to the actual solution.

7. Compound Surfaces

Many applications of intrinsic contact sensing use surfaces more complex than the simple geometries described above. However, the methods presented above can be easily extended to compound surfaces made of simpler surfaces if the compound surface is convex and the component surfaces share the same normal at their boundaries. For example, the fingertip sensors of the Salisbury robot hand are composed of a hemisphere on top of a cylinder of equal radius, as depicted in Figure 5. A solution for a compound surface is typically searched by trial and error. The contact centroids corresponding to the given load and to the complete ellipsoids to which the basic patches of the compound surface belong are calculated in succession. By virtue of the uniqueness property of contact centroids, the search can be stopped as soon as a contact centroid lying on the actual sensor surface is found.

If the sensor surface has sharp points, like the example depicted in Figure 6, a normal direction cannot be defined at those points, and the above discussed solution methods are not applicable directly. If the sensor or the object surfaces are compliant, this problem is not a major concern, as surface edges are "smoothed" out, and the properties of contact centroid guarantee that a meaningful result will be achieved anyway. However, if a rigid contact occurs on a sharp point of the sensor surface, no local torque is exerted; therefore, any point found by intersecting the wrench axis with the different surface patches should coincide with the actual contact point. Because, in general, noisy measurements are available, it may happen that no contact centroid actually lying on the sensor surface is found. In this case, a good approximation can be assumed




Fig. 5. The fingertip sensors of the Salisbury robot hand are composed of a hemisphere on top of a cylinder.




Fig. 6. A compound sensor surface with corners and edges.




Fig. 7. Fully sensorized robot arms can be constructed in principle using only force/torque measurements.

to be the point on the sensor surface closest to the calculated centroids. The worst case is when a whole edge of the sensor surface is in contact with the object. Because local torques can be exerted and no normal direction is defined, both methods discussed above would fail. However, the practical relevance of such cases is negligible.

More complex surfaces that do not comply with the above assumptions of convexity and regularity can be dealt with in some cases. For example, a typical manipulator arm is composed of individually convex surfaces but is not convex as a whole (Fig. 7). Eberman and Salisbury (1990) discussed the use of joint torque measurements to infer information about contacts occurring on the last link of the robot. On the other hand, a force/torque sensor at the base of the manipulator would sense contacts on any link but would not be able to distinguish among them. By the use of both base force/torque sensing and joint torque sensing, it is conceivable to realize a fully sensorized robot surface. A "whole hand" manipulation system, employing intrinsic contact sensors in each phalanx of its three fingers and in the palm, has been designed and a prototype finger built, as reported by Vassura and Bicchi (1989).




Fig. 8. A simple contact pattern used as an example.

8. Discussion

In this article we presented material on the mathematics and mechanics of intrinsic contact sensing and attempted to organize it into a coherent formulation of contact analysis from force measurement. The article's main contributions are perhaps the introduction of the concept of contact centroid, along with the proof of its geometric properties, and the presentation of mathematical methods to compute its location on a sensor surface. In this section we will briefly elaborate on these themes to underscore some interesting aspects.

The interest of the contact centroid for characterizing soft fingers contacts follows from its property of being located inside the convex hull enclosing every contact point. To illustrate this, a simple numerical example will be worked out. Assume that the real pattern of contact on the surface of a spherical sensor is comprised of only four points c_1, \dots, c_4 , located on top of the sphere as shown in Figure 8, and let $\pm\delta$ and $\pm 8\delta$ be the coordinates along the x -axis of points c_1, c_3, c_2 , and c_4 , respectively.

Let the local contact forces exerted at these points be $\mathbf{h}_1 = (-h_f, h_f, -1)$, $\mathbf{h}_2 = (-h_f, h_f, -1)$, $\mathbf{h}_3 = (h_f, h_f, -1)$, and $\mathbf{h}_4 = (h_f, h_f, -1)$, respectively. Table 1 gives the x -coordinates of the contact centroid \mathbf{c} (calculated through the algorithm proposed in Section 5) and of the point contact method point \mathbf{c}' (Section 4) corresponding to different values of δ and h_f .

As can be seen, the two results diverge as the distance δ , and the friction force h_f increase. Note also that for large values of δ , the contact centroid retains the characteristic of remaining inside the contact points, while the point obtained by the point contact method does not.

Another important advantage of the intrinsic contact sensing method is its ability to calculate the local torque originated from friction forces. The importance of these local torques in fine manipulation operations by robot hands has been often underestimated. To appreciate their role, however, it should be considered how humans can hold a stick horizontally by pinching it at one end be-

Table 1. Position of the contact centroid c and of the approximated (wrench axis method) point c' along the x-axis for different values of δ and h_f

h_f	δ		
	0.125	0.25	0.5
0.1	$c_x : 0.000$	$c_x : 0.000$	$c_x : 0.000$
	$c'_x : 0.005$	$c'_x : 0.010$	$c'_x : 0.020$
0.7	$c_x : 0.000$	$c_x : 0.005$	$c_x : 0.039$
	$c'_x : 0.164$	$c'_x : 0.329$	$c'_x : 0.658$
1	$c_x : 0.001$	$c_x : 0.010$	$c_x : 0.077$
	$c'_x : 0.250$	$c'_x : 0.500$	$c'_x : 1.000$

Table 2. Computation times for the three algorithms to solve the contact problem on a sphere*

Method	Execution time
Iterative	$473 \pm 13 \mu\text{sec/step}$
Wrench Axis	$232 \pm 6 \mu\text{sec}$
Ellipsoid	$486 \pm 13 \mu\text{sec}$

*The iterative method takes an average of 20 steps to converge under $1e-6$ error when input data are slowly varying.

tween two fingertips (with a gripping force of 10 N, the fingers can typically resist a torque of 40 Newton-millimeters and a vertical weight of 5 N).

The computational efficiency of the solving algorithms is of paramount importance in real-time applications of intrinsic contact sensing. Table 2 reports computation times for the same surface, a sphere centered in the origin. The algorithms described in Sections 4, 5, and 6 have been implemented and timed in a real-time environment running on a Motorola 68030 processor with mathematic coprocessor Motorola 68881. Note that the iterative algorithm is inferior to the other solutions, which are both fast enough to be claimed real-time. Another weakness of the iterative method is that the multiple solutions of equation (17) cannot be discriminated in advance of their actual computation. The iterative algorithm is then recommended only for finding a complete solution for nonellipsoidal surfaces (e.g., paraboloids) for which closed-form exact methods are not available.

To conclude the comparative analysis of the proposed algorithms, it must be noted that the exact method of Section 5 is also preferable to the wrench axis algorithm from a numerical stability point of view. In fact, as the formulation of the problem in terms of minimization of a quadratic error function given in Section 6 shows,

the contact problem is intrinsically stable. This is not true of the approximation that disregards local torques. Table 3 shows how small perturbations on the inputs (the force/torque sensor readings \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{m}) reflect in small perturbations in the calculated contact point for the method of Section 5, while they can lead to inconsistent (complex) results for the wrench axis method.

Devices based on the force-based contact sensing approach have been actually implemented and effectively employed in robotic hands. For a discussion on the realization of force/torque sensors on small robot fingertips, see Brock and Chiu (1985) and Bicchi and Dario (1987). The latter article discusses the application of optimal design techniques to miniaturized force/torque sensors; such approach is expanded in a more thorough treatment in Bicchi (1990a).

The applications of intrinsic contact sensors to robotic manipulation are numerous, and several have been experimentally verified. Although it is not possible to detail these applications here, they will be cited for reference:

1. The exploration of unknown objects by probing with an intrinsic tactile sensor, and the reconstruction of their surface profile has been described by Brock and Chiu (1985) and later by Tsujimura and Yabuta (1988). Both authors employed the point contact method algorithm. Bicchi (1989) reported explorations performed using the more precise algorithm of Section 5 and a hybrid control scheme that allowed continuous control of the normal component of contact force.
2. The capability of intrinsic contact sensors to evaluate the friction components of the contact force and the local torque (which is unique among other available sensing devices) has been used to measure the coefficients of friction of various objects (Bicchi 1989). This information in turn has been used to discriminate objects on the basis of their apparent friction and to plan subsequent slippage-safe operations of the hand.
3. A real-time control method for augmenting the stability of the grasp of unmodeled objects against slippage has been discussed and demonstrated (in a rather simple setting) by Bicchi et al. (1989).

The exploitation of contact sensory information is expected to allow improvements in many areas of fine manipulation control. Contact sensors such as those described in this article can provide direct, real-time, and reliable feedback of fundamental contact interaction characteristics. For instance, intrinsic contact sensors could be profitably used to improve the accuracy of the control of micromotions of manipulated objects or tools, especially in the presence of slipping and/or rolling contacts.

Table 3. Algorithm sensitivity analysis*

F/T Measurements	Method		
	Iterative	Wrench Axis	Ellipsoid
$\mathbf{f} = [-0.3 \quad -.04 \quad 0.01]$ $\mathbf{m} = [0.01 \quad 0.01 \quad 0.48]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.60 \quad 0.80 \quad 0.00]$	$\mathbf{c}' = [-0.60 \quad 0.80 \quad 0.00]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.60 \quad 0.80 \quad 0.00]$
$\mathbf{f} = [-0.3 \quad -.04 \quad 0.01]$ $\mathbf{m} = [0.01 \quad 0.01 \quad 0.49]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.66 \quad 0.75 \quad 0.04]$	$\mathbf{c}' = [-0.66 \quad 0.75 \quad 0.00]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.66 \quad 0.75 \quad 0.04]$
$\mathbf{f} = [-0.3 \quad -.04 \quad 0.01]$ $\mathbf{m} = [0.01 \quad 0.01 \quad 0.50]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.73 \quad 0.68 \quad 0.07]$	$\mathbf{c}' = [? \quad ? \quad ?]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.74 \quad 0.67 \quad 0.09]$
$\mathbf{f} = [-0.3 \quad -.04 \quad 0.01]$ $\mathbf{m} = [0.01 \quad 0.01 \quad 0.51]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.76 \quad 0.62 \quad 0.20]$	$\mathbf{c}' = [? \quad ? \quad ?]$	$\mathbf{c} = [-0.76 \quad 0.62 \quad 0.20]$

*Noise on the measurement of the second component of the measured moment \mathbf{m} is simulated. The centroid is computed for a unit radius sphere. Question marks indicate inconsistent (complex) results.




Fig. 9. Contact on a planar surface.

Appendix A

The contact centroid general property given in Section 2.1 will be proved in three steps, where properties of increasing generality are illustrated.

PROPERTY 1. If a distribution Δ of compressive contact tractions $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$ acts on a set of contact points $C = \{\mathbf{r}_c\}$ of a planar surface $P(\mathbf{r}) = 0$, the contact centroid of Δ on P lies inside the convex hull enclosing every point \mathbf{r}_c (Fig. 9).

Proof. Consider a line ρ on the contact plane P passing through at least one contact point \mathbf{r}_c and leaving all others on the same half-plane, as depicted in Figure 9. By Definition 1, a set of forces equivalent to the given contact set is comprised of a resultant force $\mathbf{p} = \int_P \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$ applied at the contact centroid, and a torque \mathbf{q} normal

to the contact plane. To satisfy the balance of moments about the line ρ , the contact centroid must lie on the same half-plane where the contact points lie. Considering the family of all such lines ρ , the convex hull results as the envelope of the family, and the thesis follows. \square

In other words, for a planar sensor with compressive forces, no matter how far away the contact points are from each other, the contact can be considered a “soft finger,” and the contact centroid lies inside the smallest convex polygonal line enclosing every contact point.

PROPERTY 2. Consider a convex surface $S(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ (Fig. 10) and a plane $P(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ intersecting S . Let \mathbf{n}' be the normal unit vector to P , pointing at the half-space where $P(\mathbf{r}) > 0$. Assume that a distribution Δ of contact tractions $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r})$ is exerted on a set C of points \mathbf{r}_c lying on P and internal to S , and assume that the tractions are compressive with respect to \mathbf{n}' (i.e., $\mathbf{n}'^T \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{r}_c) < 0$, for all \mathbf{r}_c). In these hypotheses, the contact centroid of Δ on S lies in the half-space $P(\mathbf{r}) > 0$.

Proof. Because of the first property of contact centroids, the distribution Δ of contact forces applied on C is equivalent to its resultant force \mathbf{p} applied to a contact centroid \mathbf{c}' on P , and torque \mathbf{q}' , such that \mathbf{c}' is inside S and \mathbf{q}' is parallel to \mathbf{n}' . We denote with \mathbf{c} , \mathbf{n} , and \mathbf{q} the contact centroid of Δ on S , the associated normal, and the local torque, respectively. Let $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}'$. The balance of moments about \mathbf{c}' can then be written as

$$\mathbf{q}' = \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{p}, \quad (18)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\xi' \mathbf{n}' = \xi \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{p}, \quad (19)$$




Fig. 10. Contact on a deformable surface.

where ξ and ξ' are scalar constants. By multiplying both members of equation (19) by \mathbf{p}^T , and by \mathbf{e}^T , we obtain two equations,

$$\xi' \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}' = \xi \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}, \quad (20)$$

$$\xi' \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}' = \xi \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}. \quad (21)$$

From the hypotheses above and from the definition of contact centroid, $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}' < 0$ and $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n} < 0$ (compressive contact). Hence, from equation (20), ξ and ξ' must have the same sign or be both zero.

If ξ and ξ' are not null and have the same sign, equation (21) implies that $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}'$ and $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}$ also have the same sign. Because S is convex and \mathbf{c}' is inside S , $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n} > 0$ for every \mathbf{e} . Therefore, $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}' > 0$; that is, \mathbf{e} points to the half-space $P(\mathbf{r}) > 0$, which was the thesis.

Otherwise, if both ξ and ξ' are zero, then from equation (19) it follows that \mathbf{e} and \mathbf{p} must be parallel. Let $\mathbf{e} = \zeta \mathbf{p}$. Again, using the fact that $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n} < 0$ (definition of contact centroid) and $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n} = \zeta \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n} > 0$ (convexity of S), we have that $\zeta < 0$. Because \mathbf{c}' is a contact centroid, $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}' < 0$. Finally, we have $\mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}' = \zeta \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}' > 0$. \square

Rephrased, this second property has some intuitive meaning. Consider a sensor with convex, compliant surface that is deformed by contact with a flat object. No adhesive forces are exerted, and the deformed surface stays inside the undeformed one. Because the deformed surface is not known, the contact centroid can only be calculated relative to the sensor's undeformed surface. However, the contact centroid is well behaved, in the sense that it will stay on the same side of the areas being touched (Fig. 10).

PROPERTY 3. Consider a deformable body whose undeformed surface $S(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ is convex, and assume that

a distribution Δ of compressive contact tractions is exerted on a set of contact points $C = \{\mathbf{r}_c\}$ of S . Consider a plane $P(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ that divides the surface of the deformed body in two portions, so that every contact point is confined in one half-space (see Fig. 2). Consider the projection of each contact point \mathbf{r}_c on P along the direction of the traction applied at \mathbf{r}_c . If all such projections lie inside the undeformed surface S , then the contact centroid on S of Δ lies on the same side of P where Δ is applied.

Proof. Because pure forces or tractions can be moved along their line of application without affecting the resultant force and torque of the set, this proposition is easily derived from property 2. \square

To give the best estimate of the location of contact points, the plane P can be chosen as the one that separates the smallest portion of S enclosing every contact point/area. If some contact points belong to P , it is required that the contact traction at those points be strictly compressive with respect to the plane.

Appendix B

PROPOSITION 2: UNIQUENESS OF SOLUTIONS. A solution to the contact sensing problem, described by equations (1) through (4) and by the definition of contact centroid, is unique (if it exists) if and only if the surface is convex.

Proof. The "if" part of the proposition can be demonstrated by contradiction. Assume that there are two points, \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{c}' , expressed in an arbitrary reference frame B , that are lying on a convex surface S and are solutions of the contact sensing problem. Consider the vector $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{c}' - \mathbf{c}$, as shown in Figure 11. Because of the surface convexity we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}' &> 0, \\ \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n} &< 0. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The balance of moments at point \mathbf{c} can be written as

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}' + \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{p}.$$

Because \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{q}' are parallel to \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{n}' , respectively, we can rewrite

$$\xi \mathbf{n} = \xi' \mathbf{n}' + \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{p}, \quad (23)$$

and, by multiplying both terms by \mathbf{p}^T , we have

$$\xi \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n} = \xi' \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n}'.$$

Because forces are assumed compressive, this implies that either $\xi \xi' > 0$ or $\xi = \xi' = 0$. If $\xi = \xi' = 0$, no local torques are exerted at \mathbf{c} nor at \mathbf{c}' , and those points lie on




Fig. 11. The contact centroid on a convex surface is unique.

a line parallel to \mathbf{p} . Because of the convexity of S , only one of the two intersections of such a line can satisfy the definition of contact centroid ($\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{n} < 0$). If $\xi \xi' > 0$, we multiply both terms of equation (23) by \mathbf{e}^T , and obtain

$$\xi \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n} = \xi' \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}'.$$

Together with the convexity condition (22), this implies that either $\xi \xi' < 0$, which is a contradiction, or $\mathbf{e} = 0$, which is the thesis. In addition, it can be shown that the uniqueness of the contact centroid holds if the surface is planar, provided that the contact tractions are strictly compressive.

To demonstrate the “only if” part, suppose the surface is not convex, as in Figure 12. Suppose there exist two distinct points such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n}' &< 0, \\ \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{n} &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Thus a compressive force in the direction of \mathbf{e} applied at either point yields identical sets of forces and moments. Hence the solution is not unique, and the statement is proved. \square

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge financial support from the following sources: the Systems Development Foundation, NASA (contract number NAG-9-319), Sandia National Laboratories (contract 75-2608), the Office of Naval Research University Research Initiative Program (Office of Naval Research contract N00014-86-K-0685), the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense (Office of Naval




Fig. 12. Concave surfaces may have nonunique contact centroids.

Research contract N00014-85-K-0124), and the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Progetto Finalizzato Robotica. Support for Antonio Bicchi at the M.I.T Artificial Intelligence Laboratory has been granted through the NATO-CNR joint fellowship n.215.22/07.

References

- Balestrino, A., De Maria, G., and Sciavicco, L. 1984. Robust control of robotic manipulators. *Proc. 9th IFAC World Congress*, vol. 6, pp. 80–85.
- Bicchi, A. 1989. Strumenti e metodi per il controllo di mani per robot. Ph.D. thesis, Università di Bologna, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering.
- Bicchi, A. 1990b. Intrinsic contact sensing for soft fingers. *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, Cincinnati, OH, pp. 968–973.
- Bicchi, A. 1990a. A criterion for the optimal design of multi-axis force sensors. MIT AI Lab Memo 1263. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Artificial Intelligence Laboratory.
- Bicchi, A., and Dario, P. 1987. Intrinsic tactile sensing for artificial hands. In Bolles, R., and Roth, B. (eds.): *Proc. 4th Int. Symp. on Robotics Research*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 83–90.
- Bicchi, A., Salisbury, J. K., and Dario, P. 1989. Augmentation of grasp robustness using intrinsic tactile sensing. *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Robotics and Automation*. Scottsdale, AZ: IEEE, pp. 302–307.
- Brock, D. L., and Chiu, S. 1985. Environment perceptions of an articulated robot hand using contact sensors. *Proc. ASME Winter Annual Meeting*, Miami, pp. 228–235.
- Dahlquist, G., and Björk, Å. 1974. *Numerical Methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Das, H., Slotine, J.-J. E., and Sheridan, T. B. 1988. Inverse kinematic algorithms for redundant systems. *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*. Philadelphia, PA: IEEE, pp. 43–48.
- Eberman, B. S., and Salisbury, J. K. 1990. Determination of manipulator contact information from joint torque measurements. In Hayward, V., and Khatib, O. (eds.):

- Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Howe, R. D., and Cutkosky, M. R. 1992. Touch sensing for robotic manipulation and recognition. In Khatib, O., Craig, J., Lozano-Pérez, T. (eds.): *Robotics Review 2*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 55–112.
- Hunt, K. H. 1978. *Kinematic Geometry of Mechanisms*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, K. L. 1985. *Contact Mechanics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mason, M. T., and Salisbury, J. K. 1985. *Robot Hands and the Mechanics of Manipulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Minsky, M. 1972. Manipulator design vignettes. MIT AI Lab Memo 267. Re-issued as MIT AI Lab Memo 267A, 1981. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Artificial Intelligence Laboratory.
- Nicholls, H. R., and Lee, M. H. 1989. A survey of robot tactile sensing technology. *Int. J. Robot. Res.* 8(3):3–30.
- Okada, T. 1990. A new tactile sensor design based on suspension-shells. In Venkataraman, S. T., and Iberall, T. (eds.): *Dextrous Robot Hands*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Peronneau, G. 1972 (April). Position-indicating system. US patent number 3,657,475.
- Press, W. H., Flannery, B. P., Teukolsky, S. A., and Vetterling, W. T. 1988. *Numerical Recipes in C*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Salisbury, J. K. 1983. Kinematic and force analysis of articulated hands. Ph.D. thesis. Stanford University.
- Salisbury, J. K. 1984. Interpretation of contact geometries from force measurements. In Brady, M., and Paul, R., (eds.): *Proc. 1st Int. Symp. on Robotics Research*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 565–577.
- Tsujimura, T., and Yabuta, T. 1988. Object detection by tactile sensing method employing force/torque information. *IEEE Trans. Robot. Automation* 5(4):444–450.
- Vassura, G., and Bicchi, A. 1989. Whole hand manipulation: Design of an articulated hand exploiting all its parts to increase dexterity. In Dario, P., Aebischer, P., and Sandini, G., (eds.): *Robots and Biological Systems*. NATO-ASI Series. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Whitney, D. E. 1987. Historical perspective and state of the art in robot force control. *Int. J. Robot. Res.* 6(1):3–14.