# Basic result on type II DM self-motions of planar Stewart Gough platforms

Georg Nawratil



Institute of Discrete Mathematics and Geometry Research was supported by FWF (1408-N13)





1st Workshop on Mechanisms, Transmissions and Applications, Timisoara October 6-8 2011, Romania

### **Table of contents**

#### [1] Introduction

[a] Stewart Gough Platform (SGP)

- [c] Architecturally singular SGPs
- [2] Preliminary considerations
  - [a] Redundant planar SGPs

[b] Self-motions

[d] Review

- [b] Assumptions and basic idea
- $[c] \ {\rm Darboux} \ \& \ {\rm Mannheim} \ {\rm constraint} \quad [d] \ {\rm Types} \ {\rm of} \ {\rm self-motions}$
- [3] Type II DM self-motions
  - [a] Computation
- [b] The special cases  $(\star)$  and  $(\circ)$

[c] Basic result

[d] Geometric interpretation of  $(\star)$  and  $(\circ)$ 

### [4] **References**

### [1a] Stewart Gough Platform (SGP)

The geometry of a planar SGP is given by the six base anchor points  $M_i$  with  $\mathbf{M}_i := (A_i, B_i, 0)^T$  in the fixed space  $\Sigma_0$ , and by the six platform points  $m_i$  with  $\mathbf{m}_i := (a_i, b_i, 0)^T$  in the moving space  $\Sigma$ .

 $M_i$  and  $m_i$  are connected with a SPS leg.

#### Theorem 1

A SGP is singular (infinitesimal flexible, shaky) if and only if the carrier lines of the six SPS legs belong to a linear line complex.



### [1b] Self-motions and the Borel Bricard problem

If all P-joints are locked, a SGP is in general rigid. But, in some special cases the manipulator can perform an n-parametric motion (n > 0), which is called self-motion.

Note that in each pose of the self-motion, the SGP has to be singular. Moreover, all self-motions of SGPs are solutions to the famous Borel Bricard problem [1,3,4,12].

**Borel Bricard problem** (still unsolved) Determine and study all displacements of a rigid body in which distinct points of the body move on spherical paths.





## [1c] Architecturally singular SGPs

Manipulators which are singular in every possible configuration, are called architecturally singular.

Architecturally singular SGPs are well studied:

- ★ For the planar case see [6,A,B,C],
- $\star$  For the non-planar case see [D,E].

It is well known, that architecturally singular SGPs possess self-motions in each pose.

Therefore we are only interested in selfmotions of non-architecturally singular SGPs.





## [1d] Review on SGPs with self-motions

- Husty and Zsombor-Murray [F]: SGP with Schönflies self-motion
- Zsombor-Murray et al. [G]: SGP with line-symmetric self-motion
- Husty and Karger [H] proved that the list of Schönflies Borel Bricard motions given by Borel [1] is complete
- Karger and Husty [I]: Self-motions of the original SGP
- Karger [7,8] presented a method for designing planar SGPs with self-motions of the type  $e_0 = 0$ , where  $e_0$  denotes an Euler parameter
- Nawratil [J] presented a complete list of TSSM self-motions (6-3 SGPs)



## [2a] **Redundant planar SGPs**

According to Husty [K], the "sphere constraint" that  $m_i$  is located on a sphere with center  $M_i$  can be expressed by a homogeneous quadratic equation  $\Lambda_i$  in the Study parameters  $(e_0 : e_1 : e_2 : e_3 : f_0 : f_1 : f_2 : f_3)$ .

Therefore the direct kinematic problem corresponds to the solution of the system  $\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_6, \Psi$  where  $\Psi$  denotes the equation of the Study quadric.

If a planar SGP is not architecturally singular, then at least a 1-parametric set of legs  $\lambda_1 \Lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_6 \Lambda_6$  can be added without changing the direct kinematics [5,9].

As the solvability condition of the underlying linear system of equations (Eq. (30) of [9]) is equivalent with the criterion given in Eq. (12) of [2], also the singularity surface of the SGP does not change by adding legs of this 1-parametric set.





## [2a] Redundant planar SGPs

It was shown [5,9] that in general the base anchor points as well as the corresponding platform anchor points are located on planar cubic curves C resp. c.  $U_1, U_2, U_3$  are the ideal points of C.  $u_4, u_5, u_6$  are the ideal points of c.





# [2b] Assumptions and basic idea

#### **Assumption 1**

We assume, that there exist such cubic curves c and C in the Euclidean domain of the platform and the base, respectively.

As the correspondence between c and C has not to be a bijection, a point  $\in P^3_{\mathbb{C}}$  of c resp. C is in general mapped to an non-empty set of points  $\in P^3_{\mathbb{C}}$  of C resp. c. We denote this set by the term *corresponding location* and indicate this fact by the usage of brackets  $\{ \}$ .

#### **Assumption 2**

For guaranteeing a general case, we assume that each of the corresponding locations  $\{u_1\}, \{u_2\}, \{u_3\}, \{U_4\}, \{U_5\}, \{U_6\}$  consists of a single point. Moreover, we assume that no four collinear platform points  $u_i$  or base points  $U_i$  for i = 1, ..., 6 exist.

**Basic idea:** Attach the special "legs"  $\overline{u_i U_i}$  with  $i = 1, \ldots, 6$  to SGP  $m_1, \ldots, M_6$ .



## [2c] **Darboux constraint**

The attachment of the "legs"  $\overline{u_i U_i}$  with i = 1, 2, 3 corresponds with the so-called Darboux constraint, that the platform anchor point  $u_i$  moves in a plane of the fixed system orthogonal to the direction of the ideal point  $U_i$ .

The Darboux constraint can be written as a homogeneous quadratic equation  $\Omega_i$  in the Study parameters (for details see [10]).

Note that  $\Omega_i$  depends only linearly on  $f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3$ .

**Remark:** Due to Assumption 2 not both points  $u_i$  and  $U_i$  can be ideal points.  $\diamond$ 



1st Workshop on Mechanisms, Transmissions and Applications, Timisoara October 6-8 2011, Romania

## [2c] Mannheim constraint

The attachment of the "leg"  $\overline{u_j U_j}$  with j = 4, 5, 6 corresponds with the so-called Mannheim constraint, that a plane of the moving system orthogonal to  $u_j$  slides through the point  $U_j$ .

The Mannheim constraint can be written as a homogeneous quadratic equation  $\Pi_j$  in the Study parameters (for details see [10]).

Note that  $\Pi_j$  depends only linearly on  $f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3$ .

**Remark:** Due to Assumption 2 not both points  $u_j$  and  $U_j$  can be ideal points.  $\diamond$ 



1st Workshop on Mechanisms, Transmissions and Applications, Timisoara October 6-8 2011, Romania

# [2d] Types of self-motions

#### **Theorem 2** (Proof is given in [10])

Given is a planar SGP  $m_1, \ldots, M_6$  which is not architecturally singular and which fulfills Assumption 1 and 2. Then the resulting manipulator  $u_1, \ldots, U_6$  is redundant and therefore architecturally singular.

#### **Definition** 1

Assume  $\mathcal{M}$  is a 1-parametric self-motion of a non-architecturally singular SGP  $m_1, \ldots, M_6$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}$  is of type n DM (Darboux Mannheim) if the corresponding architecturally singular manipulator  $u_1, \ldots, U_6$  has an n-parametric self-motion  $\mathcal{U}$  (which includes  $\mathcal{M}$ ).

**Theorem 3** (Proof is given in [10]) All 1-parametric self-motions of non-architecturally singular planar SGPs fulfilling Assumption 1 and 2 are type I or type II DM self-motions.



# [3a] **Computation**

W.I.o.g. we can assume that the variety of a 2-parametric DM self-motion is spanned by  $\Psi, \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3, \Pi_4, \Pi_5$  (otherwise we can consider the inverse motion).

**Lemma 1** (Proof is given in [10]) W.I.o.g. we can choose coordinate systems in  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Sigma$  with  $X_2(X_2 - X_3)x_5 \neq 0$ ,  $a_1 = b_1 = y_4 = A_4 = B_4 = Y_1 = h_4 = g_5 = 0$ ,  $X_1 = Y_2 = Y_3 = x_4 = y_5 = 1$ , where  $(0: X_i: Y_i: 0)$  and  $(0: x_i: y_i: 0)$  are the projective coordinates of the ideal points  $U_i$  and  $u_i$ , respectively.

We solve  $\Psi, \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Pi_4$  for  $f_0, \ldots, f_3$  and plug the obtained expressions in the remaining two equations which yield  $\Omega[40]$  (degree 2) and  $\Pi[96]$  (degree 4).

Finally, we compute the resultant of  $\Omega[40]$  and  $\Pi[96]$  with respect to one of the Euler parameters. For  $e_0$  this yields  $\Gamma[117\,652]$  (degree 8).



# [3a] **Computation**

In the following, we list the coefficients of  $e_1^i e_2^j e_3^k$  of  $\Gamma$ , which are denoted by  $\Gamma_{ijk}$ :

$\Gamma_{080} = F_1[8]F_2[18]^2$	,	$\Gamma_{800} = (b_2 - b_3)^2 (L_1 + b_3)^2 (L_2 + b_3)^2 (L_1 + b_3)^2 (L_2 + b_3)^2 (L_1 + b_3)^2 (L_2 + b_3)^2 (L_2 + b_3)^2 (L_1 + b_3)^2 (L_2 + b_3)^2 (L_1 + b_3)^2 (L_2 + b_3)^2 (L_2$	$(-g_4)^2 F_3[8],$
$\Gamma_{170} = F_2[18]F_4[283],$		$\Gamma_{710} = (b_2 - b_3)(L_1 - g_4)F_5[170],$	
$\Gamma_{620}[2054],$	$\Gamma_{602}[1646],$	$\Gamma_{260}[6126],$	$\Gamma_{062}[4916],$
$\Gamma_{026}[5950],$	$\Gamma_{116}[3066],$	$\Gamma_{530}[4538],$	$\Gamma_{512}[4512],$
$\Gamma_{152}[6514],$	$\Gamma_{440}[7134],$	$\Gamma_{422}[6314],$	$\Gamma_{242}[7622],$
$\Gamma_{044}[6356],$	$\Gamma_{314}[6934],$	$\Gamma_{224}[7096],$	$\Gamma_{134}[6656],$
$\Gamma_{206}[5950],$	$\Gamma_{350}[7166],$	$\Gamma_{404}[5766],$	$\Gamma_{332}[6982].$

Based on these 24 equations  $\Gamma_{ijk} = 0$  (in 14 unknowns), we were able to proof the following basic result on type II DM self-motions.



## [3b] The special cases $(\star)$ and $(\circ)$

We denote the coefficient  $e_0^i e_1^j e_2^k e_3^l$  of  $\Omega[40]$  by  $\Omega_{ijkl}$ .

By computing  $\Omega_{2000} + \Omega_{0002}$ ,  $\Omega_{2000} - \Omega_{0002}$  and  $\Omega_{1001}$  it can immediately be seen that  $\Omega$  does not depend on  $e_0$  and  $e_3$  iff

$$L_1(\overline{X}_2 - \overline{X}_3) - L_2 + L_3 = \overline{X}_2 a_2 - \overline{X}_3 a_3 + b_2 - b_3 = \overline{X}_2 b_2 - \overline{X}_3 b_3 - a_2 + a_3 = 0 \quad (\star)$$

By computing  $\Omega_{0200} + \Omega_{0020}$ ,  $\Omega_{0200} - \Omega_{0020}$  and  $\Omega_{0110}$  it can immediately be seen that  $\Omega$  does not depend on  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  iff

$$L_1(\overline{X}_2 - \overline{X}_3) - L_2 + L_3 = \overline{X}_2 a_2 - \overline{X}_3 a_3 - b_2 + b_3 = \overline{X}_2 b_2 - \overline{X}_3 b_3 + a_2 - a_3 = 0 \quad (\circ)$$

**Remark:** The conditions given in  $(\star)$  and  $(\circ)$  are equivalent with the conditions given in Eqs. (1-3) of the presented paper.

1st Workshop on Mechanisms, Transmissions and Applications, Timisoara October 6-8 2011, Romania



# [3c] **Basic result**

**Theorem 4** (Proof is given in the presented paper and its corresponding technical report [11]) If neither the equations ( $\star$ ) nor the equations ( $\circ$ ) are fulfilled, then the corresponding manipulator  $u_1, \ldots, U_6$  of a planar SG platform (fulfilling Assumptions 1, 2 and Lemma 1) with a type II DM self-motion, has to have further 3 collinear anchor points in the base or in the platform beside the points  $U_1, U_2, U_3$  and  $u_4, u_5, u_6$ .

Due to Lemma 2 of [6] and Theorem 2 we can replace the word "or" in Theorem 4 by the word "and"; i.e.

If neither the equations ( $\star$ ) nor the equations ( $\circ$ ) are fulfilled, then the corresponding manipulator  $u_1, \ldots, U_6$  of a planar SG platform (fulfilling Assumptions 1, 2 and Lemma 1) with a type II DM self-motion, has to have 3 collinear platform points  $u_i, u_j, u_k$  and 3 collinear base points  $U_l, U_m, U_n$  beside the points  $U_1, U_2, U_3$  and  $u_4, u_5, u_6$  where (i, j, k, l, m, n) consists of all indices from 1 to 6.



### [3d] Geometric interpretation of ( $\star$ )

(1)  $L_1(\overline{X}_2 - \overline{X}_3) - L_2 + L_3 = 0$  expresses that the three lines  $t_i \in \Sigma_0$  (i = 1, 2, 3) with homogeneous line coordinates  $[L_i : \overline{X}_i : \overline{Y}_i]$ have a common point T ( $\Rightarrow$  the three Darboux planes belong to a pencil of planes).

(II)  $\overline{X}_2 b_2 - \overline{X}_3 b_3 - a_2 + a_3 = 0$  expresses that the three lines  $s_i := [u_i, \overline{U}_i]$  (i = 1, 2, 3)have a common point S.

(III)  $\overline{X}_2 a_2 - \overline{X}_3 a_3 + b_2 - b_3 = 0$  expresses that the three lines  $s_i^{\perp} := [u_i, \overline{U}_i^{\perp}]$  (i = 1, 2, 3)have a common point  $S^{\perp}$ .



# [3d] Geometric interpretation of $(\star)$ and $(\circ)$

Note that the items (II) and (III) only hold if the coordinate systems are chosen according to Lemma 1 and if these two coordinate systems coincide.

Moreover, the geometric interpretation of ( $\circ$ ) is equivalent with the one given for ( $\star$ ), if one rotates the platform about the x-axis with angle  $\pi$ .

The geometric interpretation of  $(\star)$  and  $(\circ)$  is important because it was recently proved in [L] that  $(\star)$  resp.  $(\circ)$  are even necessary for a type II DM self-motion:

**Theorem 5** (Proof is given in [L]) The corresponding manipulator  $u_1, \ldots, U_6$  of a planar SG platform (fulfilling Assumptions 1, 2 and Lemma 1) with a type II DM self-motion has to fulfill the three conditions of either ( $\star$ ) or ( $\circ$ ).



## [3d] Line-symmetric Bricard octahedra

Due to [10] every line-symmetric Bricard octahedron  $\mathcal{O}$  possess a type II DM self-motion. We denote the vertices of  $\mathcal{O}$  by  $1_a, 1_b, 2_a, 2_b, 3_a, 3_b$ , where  $i_a$  and  $i_b$  are symmetric with respect to the line I for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Due to item (I) the following three planes have a common line  $T_{ijk}$ :

 $\star$  plane orthogonal to  $[1_i, 2_j]$  though  $3_{k'}$ 

 $\star$  plane orthogonal to  $[2_j, 3_k]$  though  $1_{i'}$ 

 $\star$  plane orthogonal to  $[3_k, 1_i]$  though  $2_{j'}$ 

with 
$$i \neq i'$$
,  $j \neq j'$ ,  $k \neq k' \land i', j', k' \in \{a, b\}$ .

#### **New property:** $\mathcal{O}$ possesses the 8 lines $\mathsf{T}_{ijk}$ .





## [4] **References**

For [1-12] see the presented paper. The remaining references [A-L] are as follows:

[A] Nawratil G (2008) On the degenerated cases of architecturally singular planar parallel manipulators. J Geom Graphics 12(2):141–149

[B] Röschel O, Mick S (1998) Characterisation of architecturally shaky platforms. In: Lenarcic J, Husty ML (eds) Advances in Robot Kinematics: Analysis and Control, Kluwer, pp 465–474

[C] Wohlhart K (2010) From higher degrees of shakiness to mobility. Mech Mach Theory 45(3):467–476

[D] Karger A (2008) Architecturally singular non-planar parallel manipulators. Mech Mach Theory 43(3):335–346

[E] Nawratil G (2009) A new approach to the classification of architecturally singular parallel manipulators. In: Kecskemethy A, Müller A (eds) Computational Kinematics, Springer, pp 349–358

[F] Husty ML, Zsombor-Murray P (1994) A Special Type of Singular Stewart Gough platform. In: Lenarcic J, Ravani B (eds) Advances in Robot Kinematics and Computational Geometry, Kluwer, pp 439–449



# [4] **References**

[G] Zsombor-Murray P, Husty M, Hartmann D (1995) Singular Stewart-Gough Platforms with Spherocylindrical and Spheroconical Hip Joint Trajectories. In: Proceedings of 9th IFToMM World Congress on the Theory of Machines and Mechanisms, Milano, Italy (1995) pp 1886–1890
[H] Husty ML, Karger A (2002) Self motions of Stewart-Gough platforms: an overview. In: Proceedings of the workshop on fundamental issues and future research directions for parallel mechanisms and manipulators Quebec City, Canada (2002) pp 131–141

[I] Karger A, Husty M (1998) Classification of all self-motions of the original Stewart-Gough platform. Comput Aided Des 30(3):205–215

[J] Nawratil G (2011) Self-motions of parallel manipulators associated with flexible octahedra. In: Hofbaur M, Husty M (eds) Proceedings of the Austrian Robotics Workshop, Hall in Tyrol, Austria (2011) pp 232–248

[K] Husty ML (1996) An algorithm for solving the direct kinematics of general Stewart-Gough platforms. Mech Mach Theory 31(4):365–380

[L] Nawratil G (2011) Necessary conditions for type II DM self-motions of planar Stewart Gough platforms. Technical Report No. 219, Geometry Preprint Series, TU Vienna

