Preparation of Papers for IEEE Sponsored Conferences & Symposia*

Albert Author[1] and Bernard D. Researcher[2]

***Abstract*— This electronic document is a Olive template. The various components of your paper [title, text, heads, etc.] are already defined on the style sheet, as illustrated by the portions given in this document.**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motion Planning

Kinematic redundancy [40], [41] enables a manipulator to follow a predefined task space trajectory using the endeffector (EE), while simultaneously, optimising for an additional task with the remaining movement capacity without impacting the trajectory adherence. This is possible because the robot's degrees of freedom (DOF) go beyond what is required to perform the primary task. Consequently, the robot can adopt different joint configurations optimised according to the secondary task while performing the primary task. Common secondary tasks [42] include avoiding singularities, optimising the manipulability measure, minimising joint torques and avoiding obstacles in the operating space.

The task of finding the joint trajectories of a manipulator is called motion planning [1]. It consists of finding a sequence of joint configurations for a robot so that the robot can move along this path from its initial configuration to the goal configuration without colliding with itself, static obstacles or other agents in the environment. In addition to collision avoidance, motion planning for manipulators can optionally take into account various constraints, such as position, velocity, acceleration or jerk constraints for the joint angle or end effector, precision of the end effector with respect to position and orientation, stability of the manipulator, avoidance of singularities, or any number of other criteria.

There are numerous methods for planning manipulator movements [32], [33], they can rougly be seperated into global and local approaches. Global, sampling-based, methods such as PRM [34], RRT* [35], [37], RRT-Connect [39], Informerd RRT* [38], BIT* [36] and others offer a globally optimal solution based on a global search in configuration space. However, the generated trajectories are not always smooth or optimal, and the performance of the methods may be insufficient for real-time operation.

~~Recently, a number of learning-based methods using data-driven techniques have been proposed to improve or accelerate the functionality of sampling-based methods.~~

~~Trajectory optimisation methods such as CHOMP, STOMP and TrajOpt, on the other hand, use optimization to improve an initial seed trajectory. Consequently, the optimality of the solution is highly dependent on this initial trajectory. Nevertheless, these methods are capable of generating smooth trajectories, and although they can be too computationally intensive for high DOF dynamic real-time environments, they are generally effective in finding constrained motion plans.~~

Local motion planning approaches employ optimization techniques, two common ones are inverse kinematics [10], [19], that is based on finding a least squares solution of the manipulator joint velocities, and quadratic programming (QP) [2], [3], [4]. Both methods are fast, suitable for real-time applications in dynamic environments and provide smooth solutions. However, since they do not plan further than one step ahead, they tend to get stuck in local minima. Therefore, they are often combined with a higher-level planner, for global static environment based ~~motion~~ path planning, while local optimisation takes dynamic environment changes into account. In the following text we will focus on inverse kinematics based approaches.

B. Kinematic Obstacle Avoidance

~~Different control schemes have been proposed. Acceleration-based control excels in precise handling of motion changes, velocity-based control offers consistent and smooth movement, while force and torque-based control provides direct control over joint forces for robust physical interactions. (CITATIONS in COMMENT BELLOW)~~

Various researchers have adopted different approaches to kinematic avoidance, as detailed in [11], [20].

Colbaugh and Glass (1989) [12], [13] tackled this problem in a two-step process. Initially, they calculated the robot's end-effector trajectory. Subsequently, they used optimization to enhance the robot's dynamic response during trajectory execution and for tasks like obstacle avoidance.

Sciavicco and Siciliano [15], [16], as well as Egeland [17], independently introduced the concept of task-space augmentation, later revisited by Searji [18]. This method involves extending the primary task Jacobian with the secondary task Jacobian into a square matrix, yielding a singular solution.

Maciejewski and Klein (1985) [10], and Nakamura and Hanafusa (1987) [19], presented the concept of task prioritization and a null space for avoidance. In this framework, the secondary task is restricted to velocities that do not directly affect the primary task's movement. Their method calculates avoidance joint velocities based on the minimum distance between a point on the manipulator and an avoidance point,

*This work was not supported by any organization

[1]Albert Author is with Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Twente, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands albert.author@papercept.net

[2]Bernard D. Researcheris with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435, USA b.d.researcher@ieee.org

object, or obstacle. Žlajpah [22] improved the concept by proposing a reduced operational space formulation, that reshapes the Jacobain of the avoidance task from three cartesian axis to only the direction of obstacle avoidance. Petrič [23] suggested a way to smoothly transition between avoidance and trajectory following tasks.

C. *Artificial Potential Field*

These approaches typically do not focus on the environmental context, often representing it as geometric primitives and then calculating the distance between these primitives and the lines describing the manipulator.

Khatib [14] proposes the concept of an Artificial Potential Field. This field consists of a repulsive component that deflects the end effector away from obstacles, depicted as geometric primitives, and an attractive component that draws the manipulator towards its target. In the following years many different modifications and improvement of the original APF idea have been proposed, often focused on removal of local minimas in the potential field. Khim and Khosla [21] suggested the use of harmonic functions to solve the problem of local minima. Pinto et al. [24] proposes to vary the field based on the distance of robot from obstacles to fill the local minima. Many researchers tried using APF as a heuristic to better guide sampling based approaches [26], [27], [28].

Many of the recent works focus on use of a variation of artificial potential field to plan motion of the manipulator. Xia et al. [30] uses a variation of APF for manipulator motion [30]. Chen et al. proposes an application using APF in joint space and a variable kinematic optimization step [31]. Long [25] suggests creating motion plan of the manipulator using APF, he extends it using RRT to calculate virtual attractive point for the robot to move towards in case of local minima. Zhu et al. proposes use of APF in combination with MPC, to plan in environment with dynamic obstacles [29].

-fix citation styles (sometimes et al, sometimes not, sometimes names, sometimes years ... not same format)

D. *Environment representation*

To be able to generate collision free trajectory we need to have a representation of the static environment. One common approach is to represent environment with geomertic primitives such as bounding boxes or spheres. Another way is to divide the occupied space into hierarhical trees, such as octatree, to make calculations more efficient. Such representations are memory effective and offer simple and computationally undemanding distance calculation and collision detection. These representations are widely used in computer simulations and games, however they can be suboptimal for real environment, where sensor measurements arent always accurate and contain only part of the surrounding space. This can lead to approximation errors, which are additionally probelmatic when we are dealing with irregularly shaped objects.

Point-cloud representation captures the environment by directly using a collection of points obtained from sensors like LiDAR, radar of RGBD camera, providing a more precise depiction of space than bounding boxes or spheres. This method can more accurately represent the complex and irregular shapes of real-world objects, although it typically requires more memory and computational power to process, which can make it chllenging for real-time representation. Point cloud data is often further converted into voxel grids.

Voxel grid representation divides the space into a regular grid of volumetric elements, or voxels, which can be used to create a more manageable approximation of the environment. While this approach offers a balance between detail and computational efficiency, it can still introduce discretization errors, particularly when modeling objects with smooth surfaces or intricate details. The fidelity of the representation is dependent on the size of the voxels: smaller voxels can capture more detail but require more memory and computation, while larger voxels result in coarser approximations but are more memory-efficient, adaptive voxel grids have been explored, where the voxel size can vary throughout the space to provide higher resolution in regions of interest while conserving resources in less critical areas. Voxel grids can incorporate probabilistic information, such as in occupancy grid maps, where each voxel holds a probability indicating the chance of an obstacle's presence. The occupancy probability of a voxel can be updated dynamically using sensor measurements and Bayesian updating methods. As new sensor data is collected, the probabilities are revised to reflect the increased or decreased likelihood of the presence of an obstacle in the voxel space. Additionally, techniques such as ESDF (Euclidian Signed Distance Field) and TSDF (Truncated Signed Distance Field) can be utilized in conjunction with voxel grids to encode signed distance information, that describes what is the distance between the selected voxel field and the nearest occupied field.

There has been a number of proposed algorithms for calculating ESDF. One common method is the Brushfire method, that spreads from obstacles until it calculates the distance for every field on a grid. distance transforms Jump Flooding Algorithm (JFA) is a similar method, that can be implemented on a GPU for faster parallel distance calculation.

-Wavefront
-D* Klančar
-Euclidian distnace algorithms
-distance transforms
-voronoi diagrams
-voxblox, FIESTA
-ray casting, bullet casting ...

II. USING THE TEMPLATE

Use this sample document as your LaTeX source file to create your document. Save this file as **root.tex**. You have to make sure to use the cls file that came with this distribution. If you use a different style file, you cannot expect to get required margins. Note also that when you are creating your out PDF file, the source file is only part of the equation. *Your TEX → PDF filter determines the output file size. Even if you make all the specifications to output a letter file in the source - if your filter is set to produce A4, you will only get A4 output.*

It is impossible to account for all possible situation, one would encounter using TEX. If you are using multiple TEX files you must make sure that the “MAIN“ source file is called root.tex - this is particularly important if your conference is using PaperPlaza’s built in TEX to PDF conversion tool.

A. *Headings, etc*

Text heads organize the topics on a relational, hierarchical basis. For example, the paper title is the primary text head because all subsequent material relates and elaborates on this one topic. If there are two or more sub-topics, the next level head (uppercase Roman numerals) should be used and, conversely, if there are not at least two sub-topics, then no subheads should be introduced. Styles named Heading 1 , Heading 2 , Heading 3 , and Heading 4 are prescribed.

B. *Figures and Tables*

Positioning Figures and Tables: Place figures and tables at the top and bottom of columns. Avoid placing them in the middle of columns. Large figures and tables may span across both columns. Figure captions should be below the figures; table heads should appear above the tables. Insert figures and tables after they are cited in the text. Use the abbreviation Fig. 1 , even at the beginning of a sentence.

TABLE I

AN EXAMPLE OF A TABLE

One	Two
Three	Four

We suggest that you use a text box to insert a graphic (which is ideally a 300 dpi TIFF or EPS file, with all fonts embedded) because, in an document, this method is somewhat more stable than directly inserting a picture.

Fig. 1. Inductance of oscillation winding on amorphous magnetic core versus DC bias magnetic field

Figure Labels: Use 8 point Times New Roman for Figure labels. Use words rather than symbols or abbreviations when writing Figure axis labels to avoid confusing the reader. As an example, write the quantity Magnetization , or Magnetization, M , not just M . If including units in the label, present them within parentheses. Do not label axes only with units. In the example, write Magnetization (A/m) or Magnetization A[m(1)] , not just A/m . Do not label axes with a ratio of quantities and units. For example, write Temperature (K) , not Temperature/K.

III. CONCLUSIONS

A conclusion section is not required. Although a conclusion may review the main points of the paper, do not replicate the abstract as the conclusion. A conclusion might elaborate on the importance of the work or suggest applications and extensions.

APPENDIX

Appendixes should appear before the acknowledgment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The preferred spelling of the word acknowledgment in America is without an e after the g . Avoid the stilted expression, One of us (R. B. G.) thanks . . . Instead, try R. B. G. thanks . Put sponsor acknowledgments in the unnumbered footnote on the first page.

References are important to the reader; therefore, each citation must be complete and correct. If at all possible, references should be commonly available publications.

REFERENCES

[1] IDEAS Lab, ”Motion and Path Planning,” presented at Purdue University, 2023. [Online]. Available: `https://ideas.cs.purdue.edu/research/robotics/planning/`. Accessed on: Jan. 9, 2024.

[2] E. A. Basso and K. Y. Pettersen, “Task-Priority Control of Redundant Robotic Systems using Control Lyapunov and Control Barrier Function based Quadratic Programs,” in IFAC-PapersOnLine, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 9037–9044, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ifacol.2020.12.2024.

[3] H. Toshani and M. Farrokhi, “Real-time inverse kinematics of redundant manipulators using neural networks and quadratic programming: A Lyapunov-based approach,” Robotics and Autonomous Systems, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 766–781, Jun. 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.robot.2014.02.005.

[4] Y. Zhang, S. S. Ge, and T. H. Lee, “A Unified Quadratic-Programming-Based Dynamical System Approach to Joint Torque Optimization of Physically Constrained Redundant Manipulators,” IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. B, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 2126–2132, Oct. 2004. doi: 10.1109/TSMCB.2004.830347.

[5] J. Nakanishi, R. Cory, M. Mistry, J. Peters, and S. Schaal, “Comparative experiments on task space control with redundancy resolution,” in Proc. 2005 IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. on Intelligent Robots and Systems, Edmonton, Alta., Canada, 2005, pp. 3901–3908. doi: 10.1109/IROS.2005.1545203.

[6] M. H. Raibert and J. J. Craig, “Hybrid Position/Force Control of Manipulators,” Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control, vol. 103, no. 2, pp. 126–133, Jun. 1981. doi: 10.1115/1.3139652.

[7] T. Yoshikawa, “Dynamic hybrid position/force control of robot manipulators–Description of hand constraints and calculation of joint driving force,” IEEE J. Robot. Automat., vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 386–392, Oct. 1987. doi: 10.1109/JRA.1987.1087120.

[8] O. Khatib, “A unified approach for motion and force control of robot manipulators: The operational space formulation,” IEEE J. Robot. Automat., vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 43–53, Feb. 1987. doi: 10.1109/JRA.1987.1087068.

[9] N. Hogan, “Impedance Control: An Approach to Manipulation,” in Proc. 1984 American Control Conf., San Diego, CA, USA, Jul. 1984, pp. 304–313. doi: 10.23919/ACC.1984.4788393.

[10] A. A. Maciejewski and C. A. Klein, “Obstacle Avoidance for Kinematically Redundant Manipulators in Dynamically Varying Environments,” The International Journal of Robotics Research, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 109–117, Sep. 1985. doi: 10.1177/027836498500400308.

[11] L. Lajpah and T. Petri, "Obstacle Avoidance for Redundant Manipulators as Control Problem," in Serial and Parallel Robot Manipulators - Kinematics, Dynamics, Control and Optimization, S. Kucuk, Ed. InTech, 2012. doi: 10.5772/32651.

[12] R. Colbaugh and K. Glass, "Cartesian control of redundant robots," J. Robotic Syst., vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 427–459, Aug. 1989. doi: 10.1002/rob.4620060409.

[13] K. Glass, R. Colbaugh, D. Lim, and H. Seraji, "Real-time collision avoidance for redundant manipulators," IEEE Trans. Robot. Automat., vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 448–457, Jun. 1995. doi: 10.1109/70.388789.

[14] O. Khatib, "Real-time obstacle avoidance for manipulators and mobile robots," in 1985 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation Proceedings, Mar. 1985, pp. 500–505. doi: 10.1109/ROBOT.1985.1087247.

[15] L. Sciavicco and B. Siciliano, "A solution algorithm to the inverse kinematic problem for redundant manipulators," IEEE J. Robot. Automat., vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 403–410, Aug. 1988. doi: 10.1109/56.804.

[16] L. Sciavicco and B. Siciliano, "Solving the Inverse Kinematic Problem for Robotic Manipulators," in RoManSy 6, A. Morecki, G. Bianchi, and K. Kedzior, Eds., Boston, MA: Springer US, 1987, pp. 107–114. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4684-6915-8_9.

[17] O. Egeland, "Task-space tracking with redundant manipulators," IEEE J. Robot. Automat., vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 471–475, Oct. 1987. doi: 10.1109/JRA.1987.1087118.

[18] H. Seraji, "Configuration control of redundant manipulators: theory and implementation," IEEE Trans. Robot. Automat., vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 472–490, Aug. 1989. doi: 10.1109/70.88062.

[19] Y. Nakamura, H. Hanafusa, and T. Yoshikawa, "Task-Priority Based Redundancy Control of Robot Manipulators," The International Journal of Robotics Research, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 3–15, Jun. 1987. doi: 10.1177/027836498700600201.

[20] B. Siciliano and O. Khatib, Eds., Springer Handbook of Robotics. in Springer Handbooks. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-32552-1.

[21] J.-O. Kim and P. Khosla, "Real-Time Obstacle Avoidance Using Harmonic Potential Functions," 1992. doi: 10.1109/70.143352.

[22] L. Zlajpah and B. Nemec, "Kinematic control algorithms for on-line obstacle avoidance for redundant manipulators," in Proc. IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, Lausanne, Switzerland, 2002, pp. 1898–1903. doi: 10.1109/IRDS.2002.1044033.

[23] T. Petrič and L. Žlajpah, "Smooth continuous transition between tasks on a kinematic control level: Obstacle avoidance as a control problem," Robotics and Autonomous Systems, vol. 61, no. 9, Art. no. 9, Sep. 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.robot.2013.04.019.

[24] M. F. Pinto, T. R. F. Mendonça, L. R. Olivi, E. B. Costa, and A. L. M. Marcato, "Modified approach using variable charges to solve inherent limitations of potential fields method," in Proc. 2014 11th IEEE/IAS International Conference on Industry Applications, Dec. 2014, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1109/INDUSCON.2014.7059414.

[25] Z. Long, "Virtual target point-based obstacle-avoidance method for manipulator systems in a cluttered environment," Engineering Optimization, vol. 52, no. 11, Art. no. 11, Nov. 2020. doi: 10.1080/0305215X.2019.1681986.

[26] A. H. Qureshi and Y. Ayaz, "Potential Functions based Sampling Heuristic For Optimal Path Planning," Auton Robot, vol. 40, no. 6, Art. no. 6, Aug. 2016. doi: 10.1007/s10514-015-9518-0.

[27] A. H. Qureshi et al., "Adaptive Potential guided directional-RRT*," in Proc. 2013 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO), Shenzhen, China, Dec. 2013, pp. 1887–1892. doi: 10.1109/ROBIO.2013.6739744.

[28] J. Yi, Q. Yuan, R. Sun, and H. Bai, "Path planning of a manipulator based on an improved P_RRT* algorithm," Complex Intell. Syst., vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 2227–2245, Jun. 2022. doi: 10.1007/s40747-021-00628-y.

[29] T. Zhu, J. Mao, L. Han, C. Zhang, and J. Yang, "Real-Time Dynamic Obstacle Avoidance for Robot Manipulators Based on Cascaded Nonlinear MPC With Artificial Potential Field," IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron., pp. 1–11, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TIE.2023.3306405.

[30] X. Xia et al., "Path Planning for Obstacle Avoidance of Robot Arm Based on Improved Potential Field Method," Sensors, vol. 23, no. 7, Art. no. 7, Apr. 2023. doi: 10.3390/s23073754.

[31] Y. Chen, L. Chen, J. Ding, and Y. Liu, "Research on Real-Time Obstacle Avoidance Motion Planning of Industrial Robotic Arm Based on Artificial Potential Field Method in Joint Space," Applied Sciences, vol. 13, no. 12, p. 6973, Jan. 2023. doi: 10.3390/app13126973.

[32] S. M. LaValle, Planning Algorithms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[33] M. G. Tamizi, M. Yaghoubi, and H. Najjaran, “A review of recent trend in motion planning of industrial robots,” Int J Intell Robot Appl, vol. 7, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Jun. 2023. doi: 10.1007/s41315-023-00274-2.

[34] P. Švestka and M. H. Overmars, “Motion planning for carlike robots using a probabilistic learning approach,” The International Journal of Robotics Research, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 119–143, 1997.

[35] S. LaValle, “Rapidly-exploring random trees: A new tool for path planning,” Research Report 9811, 1998.

[36] J. D. Gammell, S. S. Srinivasa, and T. D. Barfoot, “Batch Informed Trees (BIT*): Sampling-based Optimal Planning via the Heuristically Guided Search of Implicit Random Geometric Graphs,” in Proc. of the 2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), May 2015, pp. 3067–3074. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2015.7139620.

[37] S. Karaman and E. Frazzoli, ”Incremental sampling-based algorithms for optimal motion planning,” in Proc. Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS), 2010.

[38] J. D. Gammell, S. S. Srinivasa, and T. D. Barfoot, “Informed RRT*: Optimal sampling-based path planning focused via direct sampling of an admissible ellipsoidal heuristic,” in Proc. of the 2014 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, Chicago, IL, USA, Sep. 2014, pp. 2997–3004. doi: 10.1109/IROS.2014.6942976.

[39] J. J. Kuffner and S. M. LaValle, “RRT-connect: An efficient approach to single-query path planning,” in Proceedings of the 2000 ICRA. Millennium Conference. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation. Symposia Proceedings (Cat. No.00CH37065), Apr. 2000, pp. 995–1001 vol.2. doi: 10.1109/ROBOT.2000.844730.

[40] B. Siciliano, “Kinematic control of redundant robot manipulators: A tutorial,” J. Intell. Robot. Syst., vol. 3, no. 3, Art. no. 3, 1990, doi: 10.1007/BF00126069.

[41] B. Siciliano and O. Khatib, Eds., Springer Handbook of Robotics, in Springer Handbooks. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-32552-1.

[42] B. Siciliano, L. Sciavicco, L. Villani, and G. Oriolo, Robot. Model. Plan. Control, 2010, pp. 161–189. [Online]. Available: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-84628-642-1_4