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Abstract—Algorithms for dextrous robot grasping always have to cope with the challenge of achieving high object specialisation for a wide range of grasping contexts. In this paper, we present a tactile-driven approach that dynamically uses the robot’s grasping experience to address this issue. During the grasp movement, the current contact information is used to dynamically adapt the grasping control by targeting the best matching posture from the experience base. Thus, the robot recalls and actuates a grasp it already successfully performed in a similar tactile context. To efficiently represent the experience, we introduce the Grasp Manifold assuming that grasp postures form a smooth manifold in hand posture space. We present a simple way of providing approximations of Grasp Manifolds using Self-Organising Maps (SOMs). The algorithm is evaluated on three different geometry primitives – box, cylinder and sphere – in a physics-based computer simulation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Dextrous robot grasping is a complex task and poses some very intricate problems. One of the main difficulties is to find grasping strategies and algorithms which generalise to new situations and thus are sufficiently robust against variations of object position, orientation, or even shape.

In general, there are two apposing basic approaches to address this issue. The first uses object geometry information to plan the grasp beforehand by computing a geometry-specific (optimal) hand posture. The second closes the fingers around the object solely based on tactile feedback until stable object contact is detected. In the case of ”geometry-based” grasping, the algorithm itself inheres the knowledge of how to grasp specific objects, but is not able to match this knowledge dynamically to the presented object. On the other side, ”contact-based” grasping reacts on tactile events and adapts the grasping motion to the actual situation, but is not able to take advantage of any grasping experience or object knowledge.

For both strategies, several examples exist. Borst et al. [1] compute a set of optimised contact points based on a detailed geometric object model and calculate a hand posture that generates the recommended contacts solving a constrained optimisation problem. Later, they relax the need of optimal contact points showing that an average quality grasp performs sufficiently well in most tasks [2]. Miller et al. [9] weaken the requirement of a precise geometry information using shape primitives which roughly approximate the object’s geometry. Based on these primitives, multiple grasp starting positions and approach vectors are evaluated in simulation using GraspIt! [8], and the best one is chosen for execution. Pelossof et al. [11] combine this approach with SVM regression to map parametric descriptions of superquadric objects to potential initial hand postures and an associated grasp quality. In real world scenarios grasping every-day objects, this kind of approach has the drawback that (even a coarse) geometrical object model is usually not available. Thus, the precise grasping knowledge cannot be optimally exploited due to the lack of object knowledge.

The contact-based grasping uses no object information and is thus better qualified in unknown grasping situations. Such a control has been presented by Natale and Torres-Jara [10] who built a tactile-driven system to explore and grasp objects without prior object knowledge. They conclude that tactile exploration is more powerful in every-day tasks than precise a priori computation. Platt et al. [12], [13] treat grasping as an active sensory-driven problem without explicit object knowledge. Multiple control laws are applied whereas subordinate laws operate in the nullspace of superordinate ones and hence do not interfere with higher level goals. In previous works, we proposed an algorithm based on pairs of an initial pre-grasp and a final grasp posture which are selected from a set of common grasps according to human gestures [18], [16]. The grasp is accomplished by a tactile-driven transition from the initial pre-grasp to the final grasp posture, stopping when stable fingertip contacts are detected. Solely based on tactile feedback and without any assumptions on the object shape, all contact-based approaches cannot exploit object-specific knowledge to perform expedient task-dependent finger coordination.

In the present paper, we propose a new approach to dextrous robot grasping that combines the advantages of geometry-based and contact-based grasping. Using tactile information to infer implicit object knowledge, the algorithm dynamically includes previously acquired grasping knowledge to adapt the grasping motion to the actual situation. The grasping experience is formed by a database of hand postures which previously led to successful grasps. According to observed finger contacts, the most suitable hand posture is selected from the database to guide the grasping process. To improve computational performance and generalisation we propose a compact representation of the database as a low-dimensional manifold in the space of all possible hand postures. More concretely, we employ object-specific Self-Organising Maps (SOMs) to approximate this manifold by a few number of discrete postures.

The implementation, acquisition of training data, and evaluation have been realised in a physics-based computer simulation using the proprietary toolkit VORTEX [3] and...
a model of our 24-DOF SHADOW DEXTROUS HAND [19] shown in Fig. 1. While the kinematics of the hand model exactly corresponds to the real hand, the geometric shape is only coarsely approximated which has proven to be sufficient to obtain results applicable to the real hand.

The paper is organised as follows: In Section II the proposed grasping algorithm is presented in detail assuming an arbitrary representation of the experience database. In Section III we recall the SOM algorithm and discuss advantages and disadvantages of this compact representation. The evaluation of the algorithm for three basic object shapes is described in Section IV and finally we discuss the results in Section V.

II. EXPERIENCE-BASED GRASPING

The main idea of the proposed grasping algorithm is to augment a tactile-driven grasping heuristics with an experience base of grasp postures which can be used to guide the grasping process to promising hand postures. We represent this experience as a database of hand postures \( \vec{\Theta} \) which previously led to successful grasps of one or more objects in a variety of grasping contexts, i.e. different positions and orientations of the object relative to the hand. Let \( I \) be the number of fingers, \( N_i \) the most distal joint in finger \( i \), then \( \vec{\Theta} \) denotes the vector \( \{ \Theta_{1,1}, \ldots, \Theta_{1,N_1}, \ldots, \Theta_{I,N_I} \}^T \) comprising all finger joint angles. Notice, that a grasp posture directly corresponds to a specific object and grasping context. Used in another context, the same hand posture might not lead to a successful grasp.

Comprising a set of successful grasp postures, the experience base implicitly provides knowledge of how to grasp the associated object. As counterpart, the tactile information observed during the grasping process provides implicit knowledge of the actual object shape, position and orientation. A dynamic matching of this context-specific knowledge to the grasping knowledge stored in the experience base yields information about how to grasp the current object in the current situation. We only utilise joint angles for this matching process whose finger segments provide reliable context information. To this end, we employ a Partial Contact Posture (PCP) \( \vec{\Theta}_{pcp} \) specifying only joints between the palm and finger segments having object contact. If \( S_{i,j} \) denotes the finger segment directly attached to and moved by joint \( j \) of finger \( i \), the PCP can be defined more formally as:

\[
\vec{\Theta}_{pcp} = \{ \Theta_{pcp}^{1}, \ldots, \Theta_{pcp}^{N_1}, \ldots, \Theta_{pcp}^{I,N_I} \}^T \quad \text{where:}
\]

\[
\Theta_{pcp}^{i,j} = \begin{cases} 
\Theta_{i,j} & \text{if a segment } S_{i,j(k \geq j)} \text{ has contacts} \\
\text{not specified otherwise.} & \end{cases}
\]

Based on this PCP we define a modified Euclidean norm \( d_{pcp} \) to match a current hand posture \( \vec{\Theta}_{pcp} \) to a posture \( \vec{\Theta}_{pcp}^{*} \) in the experience base, only taking reliable joints into account:

\[
d_{pcp}(\vec{\Theta}_{pcp}^{*}, \vec{\Theta}_{pcp}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} s_{i,j} \cdot (\Theta_{i,j}^{pcp} - \Theta_{i,j}^{pcp*})^2} \quad (1)
\]

The \( s_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \) only select specified dimensions of \( \vec{\Theta}_{pcp}^{*} \) for comparison. As the PCP requires contact information, a precondition for the experience-based control is the existence of at least one contact. Furthermore, as the experience base is a discrete set of hand postures which additionally is affected by noise, a subsequent generic finger closing heuristic similar to our originally used algorithm [16] is necessary to finalise the grasp and establish stable object contacts.

Subsumed, there are four different control phases: 1) Actuating an initial hand posture, 2) Establishing first contact in an already experience-influenced process, 3) Performing experience-based grasp control and 4) Applying a generic finger closing heuristic. The whole grasp control is embedded in an action-perception-loop which allows a dynamic adaptation to the current grasping context. Single loop iterations will be referred to as control cycles. A complete overview over the control algorithm is given in Fig. 2 A-C.

A. Initial hand posture (Pregrasp) (Fig. 2A)

While our previous, purely contact-based grasping algorithm is based on a static transition from an initial to a final hand posture [16], the experience-based approach dynamically selects the currently best fitting hand postures from the experience base to finally reach a grasp posture optimally suited for the actual situation. Nevertheless, the grasping result depends on the initial hand posture which actually pre-determines the first contact occurrence and thus primes the remaining grasping process. Hence, the pre-grasp posture should be selected context-dependent, e.g. incorporating task knowledge or vision results. From experiments, we know that the new algorithm is relatively robust w.r.t. the initial hand posture and we used the posture shown in Fig. 1 for all evaluation experiments.

B. Establishment of first contact (Fig. 2B)

Prior to the first contact, the best-match search based on Eq.1 cannot be applied because no meaningful PCP is available. Nevertheless, the experience base contains valuable information about typical grasp postures. Hence, within this initial phase we actuate the database posture \( \vec{\Theta}^* \) which best resembles the current posture considering all joint angles. If no contact can be evoked in this manner, the generic finger closing heuristic closes the fingers further until another best-match posture \( \vec{\Theta}^* \) is found and the process can start over. This cycle is repeated until the first contact arises.
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C. Experience-based control (Fig. 2C)

Initiated by the first contact, the experience-based grasp control considers the current tactile information to determine the best matching posture $\hat{\Theta}^*$ from the experience base:

$$\hat{\Theta}^* = \arg \min_{\hat{\Theta}^{pcp}} d_p(\hat{\Theta}^{xp}, \hat{\Theta}^{pcp})$$

which is used as target posture for further motion generation. To obtain a stable grasp which additionally allows flexible manipulation of the grasped object, we aim at stable fingertip contact for all fingers. On the one hand, this ensures that all DOFs can be exploited for manipulation and on the other hand guarantees the highest spatial resolution for tactile sensing. According to Fig. 2C, each finger is controlled separately depending on its particular contact state:

1) The finger has no contact(s).

In this case the finger joints are actuated towards the sub-target posture $\Theta_{i,j}^{*}$ corresponding to this finger. If the resulting motion leads to a contact, the PCP changes, a new best-match posture can be computed, and control proceeds in state 2) or 3). If the targeted finger posture is reached without evoking any contacts, the generic finger closing heuristic is applied to further close the finger.

2) The finger has only non-fingertip contact(s).

As the former grasp motion did not lead to fingertip contacts, all joints more distant than the contact segment(s) will be subsequently closed further applying the generic finger closing heuristic again. More proximal joints (corresponding to the specified dimensions of the PCP) maintain their current positions to prevent pushing the object away. In this state, the finger control is no longer affected by updates of $\dot{\Theta}^*$ as long as at least one finger contact remains. This prevents backward movements potentially resulting from new target postures and thus ensures a coherent grasping advance.

3) The finger has fingertip contact(s)

The grasping objective is accomplished with respect to this finger and motion is halted until the fingertip contact is lost, e.g. due to object motion.

If the contact situation changes due to finger motions, the PCP is newly determined and a new best-match posture is selected from the experience database as indicated by the bottom-up arrow in Fig. 2C. Hence during grasping progress, the targeted grasp posture is always dynamically adapted to the actual context inferred implicitly from tactile data.

D. Generic finger closing heuristic (Fig. 2, dashed ellipses)

If the grasping experience does not cover the current grasping situation, the described control scheme possibly leads to no fingertip contacts at all – even if the targeted posture $\hat{\Theta}^*$ is reached. For example, if the current object is smaller than all previously grasped objects or is shifted in an unusual way. In this case, we apply a modification of our original closing heuristic (cf. [16]) without taking the experience base into account. The aim is to continue the finger closing motion until contacts are observed. The main issue to be handled in this phase is the degree of finger flexion determined by the relative closing speeds of the proximal w.r.t. the distal finger joints, denoted by the ratio $\lambda$. A value $\lambda > 1$ corresponds to a marginal, a value $\lambda \approx 1$ to a distinct flexion. Throughout this paper, we use the empirically determined value $\lambda = 5$, an adaption of $\lambda$ according to e.g. vision results is possible but beyond the scope of this paper. The finger joints continue closing at joint-specific speeds $\dot{\Theta}_{i,j}$ according to the following equations:

$$\dot{\Theta}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if a segment } S_{i,(k \geq j)} \text{ has contacts} \\ \gamma_{i,j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\gamma_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \lambda \cdot \gamma & \text{if } (i, j); \text{ proximal joint} \\ \gamma & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
Adaptation of the nodes is realised in an iterative procedure similar to vector quantisation methods. Given a training set \{\bar{\Theta}_i\} of grasp postures the learning rule takes the form:

$$\forall \bar{\Theta}_i : \forall \bar{a}_j : \Delta \tilde{w}_{\bar{a}_j} (t) = \varepsilon (t) \cdot h_{\bar{\bar{a}}, \bar{a}} (\bar{\bar{a}}_i) \cdot \left( \bar{\Theta}_i - \tilde{w}_{\bar{a}_j} \right) \quad (6)$$

where \( t = 1..T \) is the training epoch (cycle over all data points), \( \varepsilon (t) \in [0,1] \) is a slowly decreasing learning rate and \( h_{\bar{\bar{a}}, \bar{a}} (\bar{\bar{a}}_i) \) is a gaussian neighbourhood function diminishing the learning rate depending on the distance of node \( \bar{a}_j \) to the best-match node \( \bar{a}^*(\bar{\Theta}_i) \) in the lattice \( \bar{\bar{a}}_i \):

$$h_{\bar{\bar{a}}, \bar{a}} = \exp \left( -\frac{\| \bar{a} - \bar{a}^* \|^2}{2\sigma(t)^2} \right). \quad (7)$$

Due to this neighbourhood adaption, the SOM can learn a smooth Grasp Manifold which preserves the topology of the original hand posture space. The best-match search performed by Eq. 2 within the whole posture base is now replaced by a projection onto the Grasp Manifold \( \mathcal{GM}_{dc} \) by applying Eq. 5. Projections of a PCP can be realised by adjusting the Euclidean distance computation in Eq. 5 according to Eq. 1.

In the presented work, we use object-specific 25x25 SOMs trained on grasp postures for one specific object shape. Hence, a particular SOM is only adequate to grasp objects of the matching type, requiring a prior classification of the object. This has the advantage, that the extension of the system by new objects does not change the behaviour for already learned objects. Nevertheless, we have shown that representing all grasp postures corresponding to various object shapes within a single SOM is possible as well [17], Fig. 3 depicts a two-dimensional SOM-based Grasp Manifold trained on 4220 cylinder grasp postures. Each hand picture represents the reference vector \( \bar{w}_{\bar{a}} \) of a particular SOM node. The visualisation of the SOM shows that similar hand postures are grouped together which supports our initial assumption of a smooth low-dimensional Grasp Manifold.

III. THE GRASP MANIFOLD

Grasping experience was introduced in the previous sections as a set of grasp postures. To appropriately cover all possible grasping situations, the database must comprise a multitude of corresponding postures, which increases both the computational costs and required storage capacity. To obtain a more compact representation of the grasping knowledge, we assume that all valid grasp postures for at least one object form a low-dimensional smooth manifold \( \mathcal{GM} \) embedded in hand posture space and denote it as Grasp Manifold. We further assume that – based on a discrete training set – we can find a discrete approximation \( \mathcal{GM}_{dc} \) to \( \mathcal{GM} \).

One powerful and adaptive realisation of such an approximation is the Self-Organising Map (SOM), [15]. In terms of the Grasp Manifold, it consists of a \( m \)-dimensional lattice \( A \) of nodes labelled with a spatial lattice index \( \bar{a} \in A \) and having attached a reference vector \( \bar{w}_{\bar{a}} \) in hand posture space. A projection of a hand posture \( \bar{\Theta} \) onto the SOM is determined as the reference vector of the “best-match node”

$$\bar{w}_{\bar{a}^*} (\bar{\Theta}) = \arg \min_{\bar{w}_a} \| \bar{w}_{\bar{a}} - \bar{\Theta} \| . \quad (5)$$

To verify the generalisation ability of the discrete Grasp Manifolds w.r.t. position and orientation of the object, the evaluation of the grasp stability is conducted starting from various initial positions. These are selected from a regular grid spaced at 0.5 cm for cylinder and box, adding to a total of 15 × 13 × 7 = 1365 positions, and spaced at 0.2 cm for the sphere resulting in 36 × 31 × 16 = 17,856 positions. The grid dimensions can be read from the axis labels in Fig. 4 and are illustrated in Fig. 5. At each position the objects are also presented at 2 × 4 × 6 = 48 different orientations (x: 0°, 45°; y: ±5°, ±15°; z: −45° − +5° spaced at 10°), where rotations about the x-axis are ignored for the cylinder and entirely for the sphere due to their symmetry. Initial configurations already causing collisions are ignored completely, which results in a total of 43,802 box grasps, 17,069 cylinder grasps and 16,431 sphere grasps.

To visualise the grasping results within this high-dimensional test space as concisely as possible, Fig. 4 displays the relative amount of force closure grasps (characterised by a grasp stability value α > 0) averaged over all orientations and within nine subregions of the x-y-plane. The distance of the object centre to the palm (along z-axis) is shown most detailed within the sub figures, because it strongest affects the grasping result. Altogether, 79.53% of all grasps are force closure (box: 93.93%, cylinder: 83.41%, sphere: 37.12%), i.e. are stable w.r.t. any (small magnitude) disturbance wrench. Compared to an evaluation excluding the experience base, a performance gain of +13.33% of all grasps has been achieved (box: +16.43%, cylinder: +4.49%, sphere: +14.27%). The most distinct performance differences can be observed in the non-centre regions in which the experience-based algorithm proves to be more robust concerning the object position or the pregrasp respectively.

Due to their similar object geometry, the evaluation outcome of the box and cylinder grasps are very similar in most object position regions whereas the number of force closure
grasps for the cylinder stays consequently slightly below that for the box. Particular differences are on the one hand the lack of $z = 4$ values of the cylinder graphs in the middle and bottom positions caused by initial intersections at a distance $z = 4$ which are completely ignored for evaluation. On the other hand, a significantly faster decrease of the number of cylinder force closure grasps with increasing object/palm distance can be detected which is caused by a combination of an unstable contact simulation and the occurrence of a net object force pushing it out of the grasp in the case of large object/hand distances (see Fig. 6). Additionally, the object can slide out of reach in the case of a misplaced first contact as the object movements are not constrained (e.g. by a table). The sphere can be grasped only in a very restricted position subspace. On the left side, the most crucial reason for the loss of performance is that the required hand postures can not be actuated appropriately (especially due to the restricted movability of the thumb) neither in the experience acquisition phase nor in the grasp execution itself. In the case of the right side regions, one drawback of the algorithm becomes apparent: as the algorithm cannot “see” the object before first contact and it is not (yet) able to restart a grasp with another initial hand posture, the actuation of the situation-appropriate posture out of a disadvantageous posture can push the object apart and out of range. Similar to the box and the cylinder, the rate of force closure grasps decreases with increasing hand-object distance – again caused by a net contact force pushing the sphere away from the hand (Fig. 6).

V. CONCLUSION

We presented a new approach to dextrous robot grasping that dynamically combines grasping experience with current tactile object information. Searching for the grasp posture which best matches the current Partial Contact Posture the algorithm dynamically bridges the gap between general grasping knowledge and actual object perception. As an alternative experience representation, we introduced the Grasp Manifold being a smooth manifold in hand posture space. With the Self-Organising Map, we provided one powerful example of a Grasp Manifold approximation.

The presented approach using such Grasp Manifolds as experience base can provide force closure grasps for a great variety of grasp contexts. The generalisation ability has been shown in the evaluation where three SOMs with a total of 1875 nodes could generate force closure grasps in 79.53% of 77302 different object positions and orientations. As the algorithm does not plan the movement beforehand but dynamically adapts the grasping control according to the current grasp context, object displacements are handled without additional efforts. A certain robustness concerning the object shape is implicitly provided by the finalising generic finger closing heuristic which is independent of the experience base.

Future work will address an extension to more objects and more complex object shapes as well as a realisation of the presented grasp strategy with our real ShadowHand which does not meet the precision and sensitivity requirements of the presented control algorithm yet. Furthermore, an incremental online training which is inherently supported by the SOM will be evaluated regarding to the benefits of developmental learning. Finally, the performance of continuous manifold representations like the Unsupervised Kernel Regression [5][6][7] will be evaluated concerning the effect of the continuity and the ability to represent whole movement trajectories instead of final grasp postures only.
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