

## Master Thesis

# Morphology Optimization of a Tilt-Rotor MAV

Spring Term 2018



# Declaration of Originality

I hereby declare that the written work I have submitted entitled

## **Morphology Optimization of a Tilt-Rotor MAV**

is original work which I alone have authored and which is written in my own words.<sup>1</sup>

### **Author(s)**

Luca

Rinsoz

### **Student supervisor(s)**

Karen

Bodie

Zachary

Taylor

### **Supervising lecturer**

Roland

Siegwart

With the signature I declare that I have been informed regarding normal academic citation rules and that I have read and understood the information on 'Citation etiquette' (<https://www.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/main/education/rechtliches-abschluesse/leistungskontrollen/plagiarism-citationetiquette.pdf>). The citation conventions usual to the discipline in question here have been respected.

The above written work may be tested electronically for plagiarism.

---

Place and date

---

Signature

---

<sup>1</sup>Co-authored work: The signatures of all authors are required. Each signature attests to the originality of the entire piece of written work in its final form.

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Symbols</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Method</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Modelisation of MAVs . . . . .	4
2.2 Optimization problem . . . . .	4
2.3 Optimization tool . . . . .	4
2.4 Simulation Approach . . . . .	4
<b>3 Optimization Results</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Even Designs . . . . .	5
3.1.1 Platonic Solids . . . . .	5
3.1.2 Quad-copter . . . . .	5
3.1.3 Hexa-copter . . . . .	5
3.1.4 Octa-copter . . . . .	5
3.2 Odd Designs . . . . .	5
3.2.1 Tri-copter . . . . .	5
3.2.2 Penta-copter . . . . .	5
3.2.3 Hepta-copter . . . . .	5
3.3 Comparison of Different Designs . . . . .	5
<b>4 Simulation Results</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Hexa-copter . . . . .	7
4.2 Hepta-copter . . . . .	7
4.3 Octa-copter . . . . .	7
<b>5 Conclusion</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 Summary/Achieved . . . . .	9
5.2 Improvements . . . . .	9
5.3 Further Developement . . . . .	9
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>A UML: Activity Diagram</b>	<b>13</b>

# Abstract

Hier kommt der Abstact hin ...



# Symbols

## Symbols

$\phi, \theta, \psi$	roll, pitch and yaw angle
$\mathcal{F}_W$	inertial world frame
$\mathcal{F}_B$	inertial body frame
$\mathcal{F}_{P_i}$	i-th propeller frame
$p$	position of the MAV in $\mathcal{F}_W$
$\omega_B$	angular velocity of the MAV in $\mathcal{F}_B$
${}^W R_B$	rotation matrix from $\mathcal{F}_B$ to $\mathcal{F}_W$
${}^B R_{P_i}$	rotation matrix from $\mathcal{F}_{P_i}$ to $\mathcal{F}_B$
$R_X(\gamma)$	canonical rotation matrix about the $X$ axis of angle $\gamma$
$R_Y(\gamma)$	canonical rotation matrix about the $Y$ axis of angle $\gamma$
$R_Z(\gamma)$	canonical rotation matrix about the $Z$ axis of angle $\gamma$
$\alpha_i$	i-th propeller tilt angle
$\omega_i$	i-th propeller rotation speed
$\tau_{ext_i}$	i-th propeller counter rotation torque
$T_i$	i-th thrust
$m$	total mass of the MAV
$I_B$	body inertia of the MAV
$n$	MAV's number of propellers
$L$	MAV's arms length
$\kappa_f$	propeller thrust coefficient
$\kappa_m$	propeller drag coefficient
$g$	gravity constant

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ETH	Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule
MAV	Micro Aerial Vehicle
ROS	Robotic Operating System
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
cw	clockwise
ccw	counterclockwise





# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Rotary wing micro aerial vehicles (MAVs) have been well studied in academia and found a lot of applications in the world such as search operations [1], photography [2] or even toys [3]. They encountered such a broad success because of their agility and mechanical simplicity. Nevertheless, traditional multi-rotor vehicles are under-actuated, which means that they cannot control their torque and force independently [4]. They are thus unable to change their position without changing their orientation.

Recently the focus has been on designing MAVs able to perform more complex tasks such as camera motion for the film industry [5] or bridge inspection where huge resources (i.e. cranes and large man-power) are needed. The ultimate goal would be for a drone to be able to interact with its surrounding and apply forces to it, in order to perform maintenance where human can not access, or to do construction work in harsh environments.

To perform these tasks, an MAV has to be able to hover in any orientation, and for a proper disturbance rejection while manipulating, the drone must have the potential to accelerate instantaneously in any direction. Hence, the MAV has to be able to decouple its orientation and position control. A drone that has a decoupled force and torque control is referred to as an omni-directional MAV.

The problem of overcoming the under-actuation and achieving omni-directionality is not straightforward. To address this problem, several MAV's designs have been presented over the past years. For instance, in [5], Voliro (name of the vehicle) is based on a traditional hexa-copter (see Figure 1.1). The omni-directionality issue is addressed by adding motors to rotate the thrusters around their arm axis, thus allowing a control not only of the thrust produced by each propeller, but also on the orientation of this thrust. This tilting rotor system allows for decoupling the control of position and orientation. By using a control scheme based on an allocation technique, the system provides very good maneuverability.



Figure 1.1: Voliro [5].

In [4], the Omnicopter (name of the vehicle) is described. It is a drone with eight fixed rotors and the drone shape is the result of a mathematical optimization (see Figure 1.2) which maximizes the vehicle's agility with the constraint that its dynamical properties would be as independent as possible on the vehicle orientation.




Figure 1.2: Omnicopter [4].

In [6], the MAV is a fixed propeller multi-rotor. The design is also the result of an optimization, which tends to minimize the body volume, maximize the controllability of the system, avoid eventual aerodynamic interactions and maximizes the efficiency in performing manipulation tasks.

The idea presented in [7] is a mix between Voliro and the Omnicopter because the design is a modified hexarotor (see Figure 2.2), which achieves full control over the vehicle's position and orientation using manually tiltable propellers. The paper also provides a methodology to optimize the fixed tilting angles depending on the desired trajectory.



Figure 1.3: Hexacopter with manually tiltable rotors [7].

Yet, nothing in the literature is found about the morphology optimization of MAVs with tilting rotors. Hence the need for the present research project. The aim of this thesis is thus to design a morphology optimization problem for a tilt rotor MAV that accounts for the different factors that influence the morphology such as:

- Omni-directionality
- Flight efficiency
- Controllability

To reach this goal the chosen approach is to build an optimization engine that solves the optimization problem and returns different MAV designs. The most interesting designs are then tested in simulation.

In this report the methods used to build the optimization engine and to simulate the results are discussed. Afterwards, the results returned by the engine are shown and compared based on different criteria. Finally, the results gathered during the simulation phase are also discussed.

## Chapter 2

# Method

As explained in Chapter 1 the aim of this work is to find a drone design that is the result of an optimization problem, which tends to maximize the MAV's omnidirectionality, flight efficiency and controlability. To do so it is important to first state what are the parameters that define the design of an MAV. These parameters are defined as:

- $\beta$  (angles formed by the arms with the horizontal plane see Figure 2.1)
- $\theta$  (angles formed by the arms in the horizontal plane see Figure 2.1)
- $L$  (arm length)
- $n$  (number of propeller)




Figure 2.1: Quadcopter to illustrate the parameters that define the morphology of an MAV ( $n = 4$ ,  $\beta = [30, 30, 30, 30]^\circ$ ,  $\theta = [22, 22, 22, 22]^\circ$ , and  $L = 0.4[m]$ ).

To solve the problem an optimization engine is developed with Matlab<sup>®</sup>. This tool returns the aforementioned parameters along with other information on the corresponding MAV design. The interesting drone designs outputted by the tool are then simulated on Gazebo<sup>1</sup> and the control of the different models is achieved using a Robotic Operating System<sup>2</sup> (ROS) node.

This chapter first covers the theory needed to obtain a generalized mathematical model for a  $n$ -rotor MAV with an arbitrary morphology. Then, the optimization problem is defined. Afterwards, the optimization tool is described. In the end, the theoretical background needed to perform the simulations is covered.

<sup>1</sup>An open source robot simulator [8].

<sup>2</sup>An open source collection of software that help developers to create robot applications [9].

## 2.1 Modelisation of MAVs

The following dynamical model for an n-rotor MAV is greatly inspired from the model in [10].

**Assumptions**

**Assumptions**

**Assumptions**




Figure 2.2: Representation of the i-th tilting arm [10].

## 2.2 Optimization problem

Define morphology optimization problem

## 2.3 Optimization tool

Show resulting optimization tool.

## 2.4 Simulation Approach

## Chapter 3

# Optimization Results

Show results produced by the engine.

### 3.1 Even Designs

#### 3.1.1 Platonic Solids

#### 3.1.2 Quad-copter

#### 3.1.3 Hexa-copter

#### 3.1.4 Octa-copter

### 3.2 Odd Designs

#### 3.2.1 Tri-copter

Show tricopter.

#### 3.2.2 Penta-copter

#### 3.2.3 Hepta-copter

### 3.3 Comparison of Different Designs

$$\cos(\beta) = \sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)} \Rightarrow \beta = 35.26^\circ$$

$$F_{min} = 34.74, F_{max} = 42.55, M_{min} = 17.42, M_{max} = 21.34, H_{eff,min} = 81.65\%, H_{eff,max} = 100\%$$

$$F_{min} = 26.6, F_{max} = 52.11, M_{min} = 15.1, M_{max} = 26.13, H_{eff,min} = 75\%, H_{eff,max} = 100\%$$

$$\text{Design 1: } F_{min} = 23.18, F_{max} = 28.56, M_{min} = 11.61, M_{max} = 14.3, H_{eff,min} = 81.11\%, H_{eff,max} = 95.2\%$$

$$\text{Design 2: } F_{min} = 23.22, F_{max} = 28.37, M_{min} = 11.65, M_{max} = 14.23, H_{eff,min} = 81.65\%, H_{eff,max} = 94.73\%$$

$$F_{min} = 44.7, F_{max} = 58.8, M_{min} = 22.4, M_{max} = 29.5, H_{eff,min} = 81.78\%, H_{eff,max} = 96.65\%$$

$$F_{min} = 46.46, F_{max} = 56.73, M_{min} = 23.3, M_{max} = 28.45, H_{eff,min} = 81.64\%, H_{eff,max} = 94.77\%$$

Table 3.1: Comparison between the different number of propellers.

MAV Design	$F_{min}[N]$	$F_{max}[N]$	$F_{mean}[N]$	$M_{min}[Nm]$	$M_{max}[Nm]$	$M_{mean}[Nm]$	$H_{eff,mean}[\%]$
Tri-copter	17.17	21.21	17.95	8.61	10.64	9	85.46
Quad-copter	23.22	28.37	26.87	11.65	14.23	13.47	87.1
Penta-copter	28.95	35.46	29.4	14.52	17.78	14.74	85.35
Hexa-copter	34.74	42.55	39.52	17.42	21.34	19.82	88.9
Hepta-copter	39.96	49.44	47.2	20.04	24.8	23.66	91.1
Octa-copter	44.7	58.8	53.95	22.4	29.48	27.06	91.42

## Chapter 4

# Simulation Results

Evaluate results in simulation.

### 4.1 Hexa-copter

### 4.2 Hepta-copter

### 4.3 Octa-copter





## Chapter 5

# Conclusion

5.1 Summary/Achieved

5.2 Improvements

5.3 Further Developement



# Bibliography

- [1] M. Silvagni, A. Tonoli, E. Zenerino, and M. Chiaberge, “Multipurpose UAV for search and rescue operations in mountain avalanche events,” *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 18–33, Jan. 2017.
- [2] DJI Mavic Pro & Mavic Pro Platinum – Every Creative Moment – DJI. <https://www.dji.com/mavic>. Accessed: 2018-09-03.
- [3] Aura. <https://aura-drone.com/us/>. Accessed: 2010-09-30.
- [4] D. Brescianini and R. D’Andrea, “Design, modeling and control of an omnidirectional aerial vehicle,” in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, May 2016, pp. 3261–3266.
- [5] M. Kamel, S. Verling, O. Elkhatib, C. Sprecher, P. Wulkop, Z. Taylor, R. Siegwart, and I. Gilitschenski, “Voliro: An Omnidirectional Hexacopter With Tilttable Rotors,” *arXiv:1801.04581 [cs]*, Jan. 2018, arXiv: 1801.04581.
- [6] A. Nikou, G. C. Gavridis, and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, “Mechanical design, modelling and control of a novel aerial manipulator,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, May 2015, pp. 4698–4703.
- [7] S. Rajappa, M. Ryll, H. H. Bühlhoff, and A. Franchi, “Modeling, control and design optimization for a fully-actuated hexarotor aerial vehicle with tilted propellers,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, May 2015, pp. 4006–4013.
- [8] “Gazebo,” <http://wiki.ros.org/ROS/Tutorials>, (Online: accessed September 3, 2018).
- [9] “ROS/Tutorials - ROS Wiki,” <http://wiki.ros.org/ROS/Tutorials>, (Online: accessed August 12, 2018).
- [10] M. Ryll, H. H. Bühlhoff, and P. R. Giordano, “Modeling and control of a quadrotor UAV with tilting propellers,” in *2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, May 2012, pp. 4606–4613.



## Appendix A

# UML: Activity Diagram

