

# Scale-Dependent Grasp

Makoto Kaneko, *Member, IEEE*, Tatsuya Shirai, and Toshio Tsuji, *Member, IEEE*

*Abstract*— This paper discusses the scale-dependent grasp. Suppose that human approaches an object initially placed on a table and finally achieves an enveloping grasp. Under such initial and final conditions, he (or she) unconsciously changes the grasp strategy according to the size of objects, even though they have similar geometry. We call the grasp planning the scale-dependent grasp. We find that grasp patterns are also changed according to the surface friction and the geometry of cross section in addition to the scale of object. Focusing on column objects, we first classify the grasp patterns and extract the essential motions so that we can construct grasp strategies applicable to multi-fingered robot hands. The grasp strategies constructed for robot hands are verified by experiments. We also consider how a robot hand can recognize the failure mode and how it can switch from one to another.

*Keywords*— Scale-Dependent Grasp, Grasping strategy, Multi-fingered robot hand.

## I. INTRODUCTION

There have been a number of works concerning multi-fingered robot hands. Most of them address a finger tip grasp, where it is assumed that a part of inner link never makes contact with object [1], [2], [3]. Enveloping grasp (or power grasp) provides another grasping style, where multiple contacts between one finger and an object are allowed. Such an enveloping grasp can support a large load in nature and is highly stable due to a large number of distributed contact points on the grasped object. We focus on the enveloping grasp in this work. While there are still many works discussing the enveloping grasp, most of them deal with the grasping phase only, such as contact force analysis, robustness of grasp, contact position sensing, and so forth. On the other hand, we are interesting to consider the whole grasping procedure starting from an approach phase. Through experiments for getting the hint of this problem, we found out an interesting human behavior. Suppose that human eventually achieves an enveloping grasp for an object placed on a table as shown in Fig.1. Actually, such a situation is often observed in practical environment, for example, in grasping a table knife, an ice pick, a hammer, a wrench, and so on. In many cases, the tool handle can be modeled as a cylindrical shape. For a cylindrical object having a sufficiently large diameter, human wraps it directly without any regrasping process since the table makes no interference with the finger links at all. As the diameter decreases, human is obliged to utilize a different strategy so that he (or she) may avoid interference caused by the table. By experiments, we show that human chooses a grasp planning according to the size of object, even though they are geometrically similar. We call the grasp planning the




Fig. 1. Enveloping grasp for an object placed on a table.

scale-dependent grasp planning. We would note that the scale-dependent grasp does not mean the final grasp style but means the change of grasp patterns observed between the initial and the final states according to the size of objects.

In this paper, we first observe the human behavior for grasping column objects with different size, shape of cross section and contact friction. Then, we extract the essential motions (or functions) from human behaviors so that we can apply them to a multi-fingered robot hand. It should be noted that we do not intend to transfer the exactly same human motions to a robot hand just like a master-slave system. The approach by a master-slave operation may succeed in grasping the object if the robot hand has the same degrees of freedom, configuration, number of fingers, and surface material as those of human. The developed robot hands [4], [5], [6], however, have their own mechanical configurations and some are too far from that of human hand. Under such a situation, the approach by a master-slave operation may easily fail in grasping an object. This is the reason why we intend to transfer the basic functions instead of the exact motions. In such sense, it is important to extract the basic functions from human grasping patterns. Through human observation, we learn that an enveloping grasp can be achieved by three essential tasks; detaching motion from a table, lifting up motion toward the palm and firmly grasping. For robot application, we prepare grasping strategies composed of the above three tasks which are changed according to the size, the shape of cross section and the contact friction of object. A question is how a robot chooses an appropriate one among a number of strategies. As for both shape and size of objects, vision sensor is greatly helpful for making decision on choosing an appropriate strategy suitable for them. However, contact friction is not known until a finger tip makes contact with the object. Under such a situation, it should be a natural way that the robot starts to approach an object with the simpler strategy. If it fails in grasping, then it switches to the other one depending on the sensor information avail-

Hiroshima University, Japan. E-mail: kaneko@huis.hiroshima-u.ac.jp.

Hiroshima University, Japan. E-mail: shirai@hfl.hiroshima-u.ac.jp.

Hiroshima University, Japan. E-mail: tsuji@hfl.hiroshima-u.ac.jp.

able. The way for switching is also an important issue in this work.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we briefly review conventional works. In section III, we observe the human grasping and show that human changes his (or her) grasping strategy depending upon the size, friction, and geometry of objects. In order to obtain the orientation for constructing grasp strategies suitable for a multi-fingered robot hand, we extract the essential functions from human observation. In section IV, we discuss the grasping strategies applicable for a general multi-fingered robot hand. We also include the discussion on how to choose an appropriate one among many strategies and how to switch from one to another when the robot hand fails in grasping an object. In section V, we try to relax some assumptions, so that we can apply the results to more general cases. In section VI, we conclude our work.

## II. RELATED WORK

**Human grasping based approach:** In robotic hands, there have been a number of papers learnt by human behaviors[7]–[10]. Cutkosky[7] has analyzed manufacturing grips and correlation with the design of robotic hands by examining grasps used by humans working with tools and metal parts. Bekey et al.[8] have presented the automatic grasp planner which generates an order set of grasp according to task description, heuristics, and geometry of an object. Kang and Ikeuchi[9] have proposed the *contact web* and the *grasp cohesive index* for automatic classification of human grasping. However, the grasping taxonomy proposed in these works[8], [9] have focused on either the final grasp mode or finding an appropriate grasp posture, while our work focuses on the grasping procedure for size of objects.

**Approach phase:** Jeannerod[11] has shown that during the approaching phase of grasping, human hand preshapes in order to prepare the shape matching with the object to be grasped. Bard and Troccaz[12] introduced such a pre-shaping motion into a robotic hand and proposed a system for pre-shaping a planar two-fingered hand by utilizing low-level visual data. Kaneko and Honkawa[13] have proposed a method for detecting a local contact point between a robot hand and an object by utilizing the *self-posture changing motion* where a finger link system with compliant joints can change its posture while making contact with an object.

**Enveloping grasp (or power grasp):** Salisbury et al.[14], [15] have proposed the Whole-Arm Manipulation (WAM) capable of treating a big and heavy object by using one arm allowing multiple contacts with an object. Mirza and Orin[16] have applied a linear programming approach to solve the force distribution problem in power grasps, and showed that the maximum weight of object which a robot hand can grasp increases significantly when the completely enveloping type of power grasp is utilized. Hirose et al.[17] have proposed the *soft gripper* which can always produce constant torque in each joint simultaneously by using only




Fig. 2. Column objects used in the experiments.

two actuators. Bicchi[18] has showed that internal forces in power grasps can be decomposed into active and passive. Omata and Nagata[19] have analyzed the indeterminate grasp force by considering that sliding directions are constrained in power grasps. Zhang et al.[20] have evaluated the robustness of power grasp by utilizing the virtual work rated for all directions of virtual displacements.

**Enveloping style manipulation:** Trinkle, Abel and Paul[21] have analyzed planning techniques for enveloping without friction. Trinkle and Paul[22], [23] have proposed the *Initial Grasp Liftability Chart* (IGLIC) to analyze liftable condition for a frictionless object by using several pushers. Trinkle et al.[24] have discussed the quasi-static, "whole-arm," dexterous manipulation of enveloped slippery workpieces. They have considered grasp planning only under the assumption of low friction, while contact friction generally plays an important role to determine the grasp planning. Under constant torque control, Kaneko, Higashimori and Tsuji[25] have discussed the transition stability ensuring that the object moves stably from a table to the palm. They have proposed the *force-flow diagram* showing the accelerated direction at the point where the object is grasped. Kleinmann et al.[26] have showed a couple of approaches for finally achieving the power grasp from the finger tip grasp.


There have been a number of papers discussing finger tip based manipulation, where we can expect dexterous manipulation by using many degrees of freedom existing in the system. For example, Sarkar, Yun and Kumar[27], Cherif and Gupta[28], Kao and Cutkosky[29], Cole, Hsu and Sastry[30] discussed the rolling based manipulation and the sliding based manipulation. Also, there have been a couple of research groups where they focused on non-prehensile manipulation. For example, pushing manipulation[31], graspless manipulation[32], orientation of planar polygonal parts[33] and toppling manipulation[34].

While there have been many works concerning the grasp, there is no work discussing the grasping strategy based on the *scale-effect* of objects.

## III. OBSERVATION OF HUMAN GRASPING

### A. Grasp pattern classification

In order to observe human behaviors, we asked a subject to achieve enveloping grasp for an object placed on a table as

Fig. 3. Explanation of  $L_o$  and  $L_h$ .

shown in Fig.1. For column objects, we observe how human changes his (or her) grasping strategy according to the size, the shape of cross section and the contact friction of object. Fig.2 shows the objects used in our experiments, where the white and the black surfaces denote that they are covered by a drawing paper and a rubber, respectively, so that we can purposely change the contact friction. Now, suppose two subjects, where they have a big hand and a small hand, respectively. Also, suppose that each subject approaches and grasps the same object. In such a case, the subject with a big hand should feel the object relatively smaller than the subject with a small hand feels. To avoid such scale effect depending on the size of object, we introduce the normalized object size  $d$  defined by  $d = L_o/L_h$ , where  $L_h$  and  $L_o$  denote the length from the tip of thumb to the tip of index finger, and the length of the circumference of object, respectively, as shown in Fig.3. For experiments, we prepared six kinds of objects whose sizes are  $2.80 \geq d \geq 0.26$ .

Fig.4 shows the experimental results for column objects, where "No." denotes the number of subjects taking the particular grasp pattern, and the cross section of object is illustrated in the bottom of each figure. Each grasp pattern is explained in the following.

**Pattern-1 (Direct grasp):** Without any re-grasping motion, human directly grasps the object (Fig.5(a)).

**Pattern-2 (Sliding based grasp):** This pattern utilizes the sliding motion between the finger link and the object. Finger tips push the part between the bottom of object and the table, such that the object can be lifted up (Fig.5(b)). This is what we call the wedge-effect where an object receives quite a big lifting force produced by finger tips inserted into narrow gap between the table and the object.

**Pattern-3 (Rolling based grasp):** The object is rolled up over the surface of thumb (or index finger). After the object is lifted up from the table, each finger link is closed to achieve an enveloping grasp (Fig.5(c)).

**Pattern-4 (Regrasping based grasp):** The object is first picked up by thumb and index (or middle) finger tips. The remaining fingers hook the object and then squeeze it till the finger tip grasping is broken. Finally, the object comes in contact with the palm (Fig.5(d)).

For a large object ( $2.8 \geq d > 1.0$ ), human directly grasps it (pattern-1), irrespective of the shape of cross section




Fig. 4. Grasp pattern classification map.

and the contact friction. As the size of object decreases ( $1.0 \geq d \geq 0.5$ ), pattern-2 through 4 appear according to the personal choice as well as the conditions set for the experiment. For this size of object, some subjects take the *sliding based grasp* (pattern-2), when the surface friction is small. On the other hand, for the object with significant friction, *sliding based grasp* (pattern-2) disappears and, instead, both *rolling based grasp* (pattern-3) and *regrasping based grasp* (pattern-4) become dominant. The change of grasp patterns is naturally understandable, because it is hard to achieve a sliding motion under a significant friction while both rolling and regrasping motions can be realized irrespective of the contact friction. Pattern-4 especially becomes dominant for a small object ( $0.5 > d \geq 0.26$ ). For such a small object, human tries to avoid interference between the finger tip and the table. As a result, human first picks up the object and achieves the target grasp through regrasping process from the finger tip to the enveloping grasps.




Fig. 5. Grasp patterns.




Fig. 6. Initial adjustment motion

An interesting behavior is observed at the initial phase in grasping triangular objects. Almost 70% of subjects first rotate the object around an edge so that a couple of fingers can be inserted in the gap between the object and the table as shown in Fig.6(b), where (a) explains the basic motion at the initial phase and (b) shows percentage of subjects utilizing the rotating motion. For grasping a triangular object, such a rotating motion is indispensable for detaching the object from the table. We call this motion *initial adjustment motion*. We note that the *initial adjustment motion* dominantly appears only for triangular objects.

### B. Interpretation of grasping motions

Human grasping provides a good hint for constructing grasping strategies of a robot hand. However, as mentioned in Introduction, transferring the exact grasping motion to a robot hand may often fail in grasping an object, since




Fig. 7. The relation between the robot hand and the object.

each robot hand has its own mechanical configuration and structure. In this section, we provide an interpretation for human grasping, so that we can construct grasping strategies easily applicable to multi-fingered robot hands. While it is hard to decompose the human behaviors in grasping phase into individual motions, except the direct grasp, we can roughly separate the grasping procedure into the following three tasks.

- |   |
|---|
| <p><b>Task 1 :</b> Detaching the object from a table and putting it into the robot hand.</p> <p><b>Task 2 :</b> Lifting up the object within the hand.</p> <p><b>Task 3 :</b> Grasping the object firmly.</p> |
|---|

Detaching the object from a table is the starting motion for further steps. For example, detaching can be achieved by utilizing the wedge-effect or picking up motion or rolling motion. Lifting up can be achieved by sliding motion or rolling motion.

## IV. APPLICATION TO ROBOT HANDS

For our convenience, we first define several parameters for robot hands as shown in Fig.7. We utilize the normalized length  $d_{robot}$  defined by  $d_{robot} = L_o/L_r$ , where  $L_o$  and  $L_r$  denote the circumference of the object and the length between finger tips, respectively.  $L_r$  corresponds to the parameter  $L_h$  for human hand. The parameter  $H_{object}$  is the height of object, and the corresponding diameter for finger tip is defined by  $D_{finger}$ .  $O_{object}$ ,  $n_{ij}$ ,  $a_{ij}$  and  $b$  are the geometrical center of object, a unit normal vector perpendicular to the surface of link  $j$  of  $i$ -th finger, and the length between the surface of link  $j$  of  $i$ -th finger and  $O_{object}$ , respectively.  $G_{tips}$  is defined by the distance between finger tips as shown in Fig.7(b), where we set  $G_{tips} = 0$  when each finger link has an intersection.

We put several assumptions for simplicity :

- (A-1) Objects have column shape and their cross sections are regular polygon where all sides of cross section and angles are equal.
- (A-2) Size of the objects are smaller than the size where the robot hand can cover more than the half of the circumference, and greater than the size where the robot hand can pick up or achieve a rotating motion on a table.
- (A-3) Each finger motion is restricted to a planar motion.




Fig. 8. The map for choosing an appropriate strategy for achieving enveloping grasp.

- (A-4) Robot hand is attached to the end of an arm. The hand position is measurable.
- (A-5) Objects are placed within the reachable area of robot hand.
- (A-6) Robot hand includes a joint torque sensor, joint angular sensor and a tactile sensor in the palm.
- (A-7) Each joint of robot hand can produce enough torque to manipulate an object.

With both assumptions (A-4) and (A-6), the robot hand can obtain  $H_{object}$ , while it can be detached more easily if it has a vision sensor. The robot hand used in the experiment consists of three same finger units and each finger has three links. The length of each link is  $l_1 = 40[mm]$ ,  $l_2 = 25[mm]$ , and  $l_3 = 30[mm]$ , respectively. Rotary encoder is used as an angular sensor. The palm is equipped with ON/OFF type tactile sensor. More precise information on the robot hand will be obtained in our previous work[35]. With these assumptions and the mechanical configuration of the robot hand, we implicitly assume that the study is essentially one of 2D grasping in which object symmetry and, to some extent, hand symmetry is assumed.

Let us now discuss how to realize three tasks given in subsection III-B. The simplest way for achieving Task 1 (Detaching the object) is to pick up an object by finger tips. However, if a robot hand regrasps an object from finger tip to an enveloping grasps in the open space in the air, it will often drop the object on the table. If the object is fragile, it will be broken. To avoid such a undesirable scenario, we make the grasp planning so that a part of object can make contact with the table as much as possible until the object is firmly grasped within the hand. Therefore, executing the detaching motion by a robot hand will differ from that of human. Task 2 (Lifting up the object) is achieved either by sliding or rolling motion, depending upon the contact friction over the object's surface as human does. We execute Task 3 (Grasping the object firmly) by constant torque control which is widely used in the research of power grasp [20], [25], [38]. The constant torque control can be achieved by adjusting actuator's current based on the torque sensor output. The control has an advantage where both finger posture and contact force between the finger links and the object are determined automatically according to the command torque. While the grasping motions may differ from those of human and also vary depending upon the mechan-

TABLE I  
GROUPS OF GRASPING STRATEGIES

Group	Grasping strategy
A	Direct grasp
B <sub>1</sub>	Sliding based grasp
B <sub>2</sub>	Rolling based grasp
C <sub>1</sub>	Regrasping based grasp
C <sub>2</sub>	Regrasping based grasp with Rolling motion
D <sub>1</sub>	Without Rotating motion
D <sub>2</sub>	With Rotating motion

ical structure of robot hands, the basic tasks constructing the grasping strategy do not change irrespective of the hardware of robot hands.

Fig.8 shows a guide-line-map for choosing an appropriate strategy according to the size, the shape of cross section and the contact friction of objects. Table I shows the names corresponding each group  $A \sim D$  in Fig.8. Let  $\alpha$  and  $\theta$  be an angle of friction and an angle between the horizontal line and the normal vector  $\mathbf{n}$  at the contact point, respectively. Fig.8(a) shows the guide-line-map under the condition that the contact friction between finger links and the object is small ( $\theta > \alpha$ ), where the horizontal and the vertical axes denote the nondimensional object size  $d_{robot}$  and the shape of object, respectively. On the other hand, Fig.8(b) shows the guide-line-map under the condition where the contact friction is significant ( $\theta \leq \alpha$ ).

Before proceeding the precise discussion, we define the success condition for achieving an enveloping grasp in our work. Suppose a robot hand having  $n$  fingers and  $m_i$  links for the  $i$ -th finger.

#### [Success condition of enveloping grasp]

It is defined that a robot hand completes an enveloping grasp for an object, if the following conditions are satisfied.

$$I_a \leq I_{ae} \cap I_b \leq I_{be} \cap G_{tips} < H_{object}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$I_a = \max \{ I_{ai} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{|(H_{object}/2) - a_{ij}|}{H_{object}}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n \}, \quad (2)$$

$$I_b = \frac{2b}{H_{object}}, \quad (3)$$

$I_{ae}$  and  $I_{be}$  are thresholds for  $I_a$  and  $I_b$ , respectively.  $I_a$  is the maximum value among  $I_{a1}$  through  $I_{an}$ .  $I_{ai}$  represents the normalized distance between each link surface and the object surface, and  $I_b$  represents the normalized distance between the palm and the representative position of object.

For a cylindrical object,  $I_a = 0$  and  $I_b = 1$  if the object makes contact with all finger links and the palm. However, for a general column object, both  $I_a = 0$  and  $I_b = 1$  are




Fig. 9. Direct grasp.

not kept anymore, even if the robot hand fully envelops the object. To cope with this, we have to choose the thresholds ( $I_{ae}$ ,  $I_{be}$ ) carefully. For computing  $I_a$  and  $I_b$ , we need  $O_{object}$ . If the robot hand includes a vision sensor, it can directly obtain  $O_{object}$  from the image information. Even if this is not the case, the robot can judge the *success condition of enveloping grasp* by joint angular sensor to some extent, which is described in Appendix.

#### A. Without initial adjustment motion : Group-D<sub>1</sub>

##### ○ Group-A ( $d_{robot} > 1.0$ ) : Direct grasp

For an object satisfying this condition, constant torque control is applied to each joint after the palm makes contact with the object, as shown in Fig.9(a). After an enveloping grasp is completed, the robot arm can move the object as shown in Fig.9(b). We note that it is not necessary for the hand to realize detaching and lifting motions, since they are achieved by the arm.

Task 1 (Detaching motion) :	no need
Task 2 (Lifting motion) :	no need
Task 3 (Grasping motion) :	Constant torque command

##### ○ Group-B<sub>1</sub>

$((\pi D_{finger})/L_r \leq d_{robot} < 1.0 \cap \text{Contact friction is small})$   
: Sliding based grasp

For an object satisfying this condition, the robot hand utilizes a sliding motion between the object and fingers for detaching the object from a table. Initially each finger is opened as shown in Fig.10(a) and then approaches the table until the finger tip makes contact with it, where the table detection can be easily checked by torque sensor outputs. In the next step, each finger tip follows along the surface of table until a part of finger link makes contact with the object as shown in Fig.10(b). This phase is what we call approach phase. The approach phase is inserted for every strategy except for the *direct grasp*, while we omit the explanation of approach phase in the following discussions. Then, each finger tip pushes the bottom part of object each other, so that we can make the most use of the wedge-effect. The object will be automatically lifted up by slipping over the finger surface as shown in Fig.10(c). At the same time, each link is gradually closed to fully constrain the object. In this strategy, constant torque control is also effectively utilized for achieving Task 1 through 3. Whether the object really reaches the palm or not strongly depends on how much torque command is imparted to each





Fig. 10. Sliding based grasp.

Fig. 11. Success map for a cylindrical object ( $\mu = 0.7$ ).

joint.

Task 1 (Detaching motion) :	Constant torque command
Task 2 (Lifting motion) :	Constant torque command
Task 3 (Grasping motion) :	Constant torque command

Fig.11 shows the success classification map for a cylindrical object with  $H_{object} = 32[mm]$  and  $\mu = 0.7$ , where the horizontal and the vertical axes denote the normalized command torque  $\tau_1/(mgl_1)$ ,  $\tau_2/(mgl_2)$  for the first and the second joints under  $\tau_3/(mgl_3) = \tau_2/(mgl_2)$ , respectively, and ○ and the other three marks(×, ■, ◇) correspond to the final grasping postures as shown in the top of the graph. The judgment of success or failure is achieved by examining  $I_a$  and  $I_b$  which are also given in Fig.11. From Fig.11, we can see that a large area of torque commands is obtained for achieving an enveloping grasp under  $\mu = 0.7$ .

##### ○ Group-B<sub>2</sub>

$((\pi D_{finger})/L_r \leq d_{robot} < 1.0 \cap \text{Contact friction is large})$   
: Rolling based grasp

Fig.12 shows the success classification map for a cylindrical object ( $H_{object} = 32[mm]$ ) under  $\mu = 1.3$ . We note that the region(○) where the hand envelops an object successfully,




 Fig. 12. Success map for a cylindrical object ( $\mu = 1.3$ ).


Fig. 13. Rolling based grasp.

disappears under  $\mu = 1.3$ . This is because a sliding motion based on wedge-effect is blocked under a significant surface friction. Therefore, we need an alternative strategy for enveloping the object under a significant friction.

When the robot recognizes any failure, it switches grasping strategy from sliding to rolling based strategies after putting down the object on the table. Fig.13 shows an example of *rolling based grasp*. More precise motion planning is given in [38].

Task 1 (Detaching motion)	: Rolling motion
Task 2 (Lifting motion)	: Rolling motion
Task 3 (Grasping motion)	: Constant torque command

○ Group-C<sub>1</sub>  
 $(d_{robot} < (\pi D_{finger})/L_r \cap \text{Contact friction is small})$   
 : Regrasping based grasp

For an object whose diameter is small enough to ensure that any finger tip can not be inserted into the bottom part of object, it becomes difficult to utilize the wedge-effect. In such a case, *regrasping based grasp* may be an appropriate strategy decomposed of two basic motions where one is the motion for picking up the object by using two fingers as shown in Fig.14(a), and the other one is the re-




Fig. 14. Regrasping based grasp.

grasping motion as shown in Fig.14(b) through (e). The first motion plays an important role in allowing no interference from the table. In the following motion, the remaining finger hooks the object so that we can make a small gap between the object and the table as shown in Fig.14(b), even though two fingers picking up the object are released from the object. After these finger motions, the object is supported by one finger and the table as shown in Fig.14(c). We note that under such object's posture we can find an enough space between the object and the table for inserting the released fingers. In the next step, the left finger is swung a bit as shown in Fig.14(d) so that both the right and the left fingers may not interfere with each other during the finger closing motion. After every finger is inserted into the bottom of object as shown in Fig.14(e), constant torque control is applied for achieving an enveloping grasp as shown in Fig.14(f). While human regrasps the object in the air, the robot hand uses the surface of table effectively in order to prevent the object from falling down.

Task 1 (Detaching motion)	: Alternative finger inserting motion
Task 2 (Lifting motion)	: Constant torque command
Task 3 (Grasping motion)	: Constant torque command

○ Group-C<sub>2</sub>  
 $(d_{robot} < (\pi D_{finger})/L_r \cap \text{Contact friction is large})$   
 : Regrasping based grasp with Rolling motion

For an object satisfying this condition, the regrasping motion just same as the motion for Group-C<sub>1</sub> (*Regrasping based grasp*) can be applied for detaching the object from the table and inserting the finger into the bottom of object. However, the object can not slide over the finger link surface under a large contact friction. Thus, after detaching the object from the table, a rolling motion utilized in Group-B<sub>2</sub> (*Rolling based grasp*) is applied for carrying the




Fig. 15. Examples of objects where the upward force is expected (a) and is not expected (b) by a simple pushing motion.




Fig. 16. Initial adjustment motion (Rotating motion).

object to the palm.

Task 1 (Detaching motion) :	Alternative finger inserting motion
Task 2 (Lifting motion) :	Rolling motion
Task 3 (Grasping motion) :	Constant torque command

### B. With initial adjustment motion : Group- $D_2$

For an object whose cross section is circle as shown in Fig.15(a), an upward force can be produced by pushing the bottom of the object towards the horizontal direction. For an object whose cross section is triangle or rectangle as shown in Fig.15(b), the finger tip forces may produce a downward force or balance each other within the object. Under such a situation, the lifting force is not produced even though the contact force is increased. From grasp experiments by human, the rotating motion is obviously a key for detaching an object from the table if it has rectangular or triangular cross section. For either object, a robot hand also conveniently utilizes the rotating motion for producing a space for inserting fingers between the object and the table. For this *initial adjustment motion* we can also apply the toppling manipulation where the rotating motion is guaranteed by just one finger[34]. Fig.16 shows an example of the *initial adjustment motion*. Once a sufficient gap is produced as shown in Fig.16(c), one finger is removed away from the object's surface and inserted into the gap as shown in Fig.16(d). After the finger tip is inserted into the gap between the object and the table, we apply the same grasping mode as those taken for cylindrical objects.

### C. The Switching Algorithm among Strategies

We now discuss how to choose an appropriate one from various strategies prepared according to the size, the shape of cross section, and the contact friction of objects, and




Fig. 17. The strategy flow diagram.

how to switch from one to another when a robot hand fails in grasping an object. First of all, a robot hand needs to know the size of object, so that it can choose a strategy appropriate for the scale. An appropriate candidate is to utilize a tactile sensor installed in the palm. Suppose that each finger is fully opened initially and we make the hand come down until either the palm sensor or the finger link makes contact with an object. By this contact, the robot can detect the height of object  $H_{object}$  and  $d_{robot}$  computed by  $\pi H_{object}/L_r$ . While  $\pi H_{object}$  does not provide the circumference of object in general, it denotes the exact one for a cylindrical object. Anyway, the robot can roughly estimate the size of object by  $\pi H_{object}/L_r$ . Even for two objects having the same  $d_{robot}$ , there are some cases where two different strategies exist. In such a case, we take the idea of Easier-Strategy-Comes-First which starts from the easier strategy and switches into the other one when an easy one fails. Fig.17 shows the flow-diagram of the grasping strategies, where relatively complicated strategies are

placed in lower parts and strategies surrounded by a bold line entail the *initial adjustment motion*.

The strategy block-I consists of *direct grasp*. It is difficult that the robot hand lifts up a triangular or a rectangular object from the table by *direct grasp without rotating motion*, except for the case that the contact friction is large. In such a case, the robot hand applies the *direct grasp with rotating motion*. When the robot hand fails in grasping the object, it estimates that the object is small for achieving the *direct grasp*, then it switches the block-I to the block-II.

The strategy block-II consists of *sliding* and *rolling based grasps*. At first, the robot hand tries the *sliding based grasp* since it is simpler than the *rolling based grasp*. When the contact friction is large, the robot hand can not utilize the *sliding based grasp*. When the cross section of object has triangle or rectangle, the robot hand needs the *initial adjustment motion* before further steps. Based on the *success condition*, the robot hand recognizes the failure. In either case that the object has triangular or rectangular cross section, the *initial adjustment motion* is necessary before starting Task 1 through 3. Therefore, the robot hand needs the information concerning the shape of cross section of the object when it recognizes the failure. While the robot needs the bottom shape of object, it is not necessary for the robot to know the full shape of cross section for choosing an appropriate strategy. The bottom shape of object can be estimated by measuring width  $W_f$  and  $W_t$ , where  $W_f$  and  $W_t$  are the width at the bottom and the width at a bit higher position as shown in Fig.17, respectively. If  $W_f < W_t$ , cross sections are, for example, pentagon, hexagon, circle, and so on. When the robot fails in grasping under  $W_f < W_t$ , it judges a large contact friction of object. Based on this estimation, the robot hand chooses the *rolling based grasp*. On the other hand, if  $W_f \geq W_t$ , the shape of cross section should be triangle or rectangle. In case of  $W_f \geq W_t$ , the robot hand chooses the *sliding based grasp with rotating motion*. If both approaches in block-II do not work successfully, the robot hand switches the strategy block to either block-I or block-III.

The strategy block-III consists of *regrasping based grasp*. First, the robot hand tries *regrasping based grasp*. When the robot hand fails in grasping, it checks the status where the object is. When the object is in the robot hand, it switches the strategy to *regrasping based grasp with rolling motion* according to the reasoning that the contact friction is too large for lifting up the object by utilizing constant torque control. On the other hand, when the object is not detached from the table, the robot hand switches the strategy to *regrasping based grasp with rotating motion* according to the reasoning that the object is triangular or rectangular column. When all strategies in block-III do not work appropriately, the robot hand switches the strategy block to the block-II.

While the switching in the strategy flow diagram given in




Fig. 18. Grouping of column objects whose cross sections are convex.

Fig.17 is based on tactile information, each block becomes much simpler under a vision sensor. The video proceeding[39] contains the experiments based on this switching algorithm.

## V. DISCUSSION

As for the generality issue, we first try to relax the assumption given in section IV and consider the following cases, toward general column objects, a new robot hand, and a new task. We also discuss the torque determination in theoretical sense.

### A. Toward general column objects

For a general column objects, the most important point is to confirm whether the robot hand can detach the object from the table or not (Task 1).

Let  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  be angles between an edge of the object and the table as shown in Fig.18. We classify general column objects into three groups as shown in Fig.18, where both  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are greater than  $\pi/2$ [rad] in (a), either  $\beta_1$  or  $\beta_2$  is greater than  $\pi/2$ [rad] in (b), and both  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are less than  $\pi/2$ [rad], respectively. For an object shown in (a), we can apply the same grasping strategy as those used for a cylindrical object. The objects classified into Fig.18(b) are not included in the strategy flow diagram. Now, suppose that two fingers push the bottom part of object as shown in Fig.19(a). While the right finger does not contribute to lifting up the object, the left finger produces the wedge-effect and rotates the object around one edge of the object as shown in Fig.19(b). If the surface friction is small enough, the hand will lift up the object by sliding motion and finally complete an enveloping grasp. Thus, the object shown in Fig.18(b) can be included in the same group which can be achieved by a *sliding based grasp* if the contact friction is small. Now, let us consider an object classified into the group in Fig.18(c). Such an object needs an *initial adjustment motion* requested for either a triangular or a rectangular objects. For achieving the *initial adjustment motion*, the robot has to detect  $P_c$  where the rotating moment is produced as far as the contact friction is not zero. Since  $P_c$  does not always exist for general column objects, the robot often meets an object where  $P_c$  is not found. In such a case, the robot anyway pushes at  $P'_c$  where  $P'_c$  denotes the top of object as shown in Fig.18(c). When the robot can not rotate the object, it gives up grasping the object.

As far as the surface friction is large enough, the robot




Fig. 19. The wedge-effect at one edge of the object.

hand can not grasp the object whose shape is extremely flat, and both  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are smaller than  $\pi/2[\text{rad}]$ , while it can grasp an object if  $\beta_1 > \pi/2[\text{rad}]$  and  $\beta_2 > \pi/2[\text{rad}]$ . In other words, if the robot hand can not find any contact points which can produce upward force, it can not grasp the object firmly in the air.

### B. Toward the utilization of a new robot hand

Now, let us consider the same grasping task with a new hand. The functions do not change irrespective of the hardware of robot hands, while the motions have to be changed so that they may match with the hardware. Therefore, we can cope with this issue easily by changing the software, so that we can achieve the basic functions obtained through the human observation.

### C. Toward a new task


As for a new task, the first thing to do is to extract the basic functions (tasks) from the human grasping and then we develop software so that it can achieve these functions instead of realizing the exactly same motions as human do.

### D. Clue for determining torque command

Under multiple contacts, it is generally difficult to find a set of torque commands sufficient for lifting up the object to the palm. This is because we have to solve a kind of inverse problem where we obtain a set of torque commands producing a stable motion of object toward the palm. To cope with this, we have proposed the *force-flow diagram*[25] where we can see how the object will move for a given set of torque. By utilizing this diagram, we can easily examine whether a given set of torque commands are sufficient for moving the object to the palm or not.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Through human observation, we found that human changes the grasp pattern according to the scale, the shape of cross section and, the contact friction of objects. We proposed five basic grasping strategies (*direct grasp, sliding based grasp, rolling based grasp, regrasping based grasp, initial adjustment motion*) which are easily applicable for general multi-fingered robot hands. We proposed the guide-line-map for choosing an appropriate strategy among these strategies according to the size, the shape of cross section, and the contact friction of object. We also proposed the strategy flow diagram to explain how to switch grasping strategy from one to another when the robot hand fails in grasping the object. Finally, we tried to relax the assumptions, so that we can pursue the generality of the grasping strategy.

Fig. 20. Estimate that the area of  $O_{object}$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research has been supported by Inter University Robotic Project provided by Ministry of Education Japan. This research has been supported by the Kayamori Foundation of Informational Science Advancement. Finally the authors would like to express their sincere thanks to Mr. N. Thaiprasert, Mr. Y. Hino, Mr. M. Higashimori, Mr. Y. Tanaka, Mr. K. Nakagawa and Mr. M. Sawada for their cooperation for this work.

## APPENDIX

The *success condition of enveloping grasp* is composed of three conditions concerning  $G_{tips}$ ,  $I_a$  and  $I_b$ .  $G_{tips}$  can be obtained by joint angular sensor only, while both  $I_a$  and  $I_b$  need  $O_{object}$  to compute  $a_{ij}$  and  $b$ . Suppose that the shape of cross section is not given. Since the palm sensor is available by assumption A-6, the robot hand can measure the object's height  $H_{object}$ . However, since the robot does not know the shape of cross section of object, the candidate of  $O_{object}$  generally forms an area  $S$  as shown in Fig.20(b). To obtain  $S$ , we define the circle  $C$  whose diameter is equal to that of the inscribed circle of the cross section. For example, Fig.20(a) shows the relationship between  $H_{object}$  and the diameter of  $C$  for a triangular object. Since the finger link never reaches the inside of  $C$ , we can obtain the candidate of  $O_{object}$  as shown in Fig.20(b). Now, we consider the worst scenario in a sense of having the largest area of  $S$ . The worst scenario is expected when we assume triangular cross section, while we have the smallest area of  $S$  for a cylindrical object. For all possible  $O_{object}$  in  $S$ , we obtain the largest  $I_{a-max}$  and  $I_{b-max}$ , so that we can evaluate the worst case. If  $I_{a-max}$  and  $I_{b-max}$  satisfy the following success condition, we say that the enveloping grasp is completed.

$$I_{a-max} \leq I_{ae} \cap I_{b-max} \leq I_{be} \cap G_{tips} < H_{object} \quad (4)$$

## REFERENCES


- [1] S. Sugano, S. Tsuto, and I. Kato: "Force Control of the Robot Finger Joint Equipped with Mechanical Compliance Adjuster," Proc. IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. on Intelligent Robots and Systems, pp. 2005-2013, 1992.
- [2] T. Okada: "Computer Control of Multijointed Finger System for Precise Object-handling," IEEE Trans. on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 289-299, 1982.
- [3] T. Yoshikawa and K. Nagai: "Manipulating and Grasping Forces in Manipulation by Multifingered Robot Hands," IEEE J. of Robotics and Automation, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 67-77, 1991.
- [4] T. Okada: "Object-Handling System for Manual Industry," IEEE Trans. on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 79-86, 1979.

- [5] J.K. Salisbury and J.J. Craig: "Articulated Hands (Force Control and Kinematics Issues)," *Int. J. of Robotics Research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 4-20, 1982.
- [6] S.C. Jacobsen et al. : "Design of the Utah/MIT Dexterous Hand," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 1520-1528, 1986.
- [7] M. Cutkosky: "On Grasp Choice, Grasp Models, and the Design of Hands for Manufacturing Tasks," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 5, No. 3, JUNE, pp. 269-279, 1989.
- [8] G.A. Bekey, H. Liu, R. Tomovic, and W. Karplus: "Knowledge-based Control of Grasping in Robot Hands Using Heuristics from Human Motor Skills," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 9, No. 6, DECEMBER, pp. 709-722, 1993.
- [9] S.B. Kang and K. Ikeuchi: "Toward Automatic Robot Instruction from Perception—Recognizing a Grasp from Observation," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 9, No. 4, AUGUST, pp. 432-443, 1993.
- [10] T. Iberall, J. Jackson, L. Labbe, and R. Zampano: "Knowledge-based Prehension: Capturing Human Dexterity," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 82-87, 1988.
- [11] M. Jeannerod: "Attention and Performance," Chapter Intersegmental Coordination during Reaching at Natural Visual Objects, pp. 153-168, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, 1981.
- [12] C. Bard and J. Troccaz: "Automatic Preshaping for a Dexterous Hand from a Simple Description of Objects," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Workshop on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 865-872, 1990.
- [13] M. Kaneko and K. Honkawa: "Contact Point and Force Sensing for Inner Link Based Grasps," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2809-2814, 1994.
- [14] J.K. Salisbury: "Whole-Arm Manipulation," *Proc. of the 4th Int. Symp. of Robotics Research*, Santa Cruz, CA, 1987. Published by the MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- [15] J.K. Salisbury, W. Townsend, B. Eberman, and D. Dipietro: "Preliminary Design of a Whole-Arm Manipulation System (WAMS)," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 254, 1988.
- [16] K. Mirza and D.E. Orin: "Control of Force Distribution for Power Grasp in the DIGITS System," *Proc. of the IEEE 29th CDC Conf.*, pp. 1960-1965, 1990.
- [17] S. Hirose: "The Development of Soft Gripper for Versatile Robot Hand," *Mechanism and Machine Theory*, Pergamon Press, 13, pp. 351-359, 1978.
- [18] A. Bicchi: "Force Distribution in Multiple Whole-Limb Manipulation," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 196-201, 1993.
- [19] T. Omata and K. Nagata: "Rigid Body Analysis of the Indeterminate Grasp Force in Power Grasps," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 1787-1794, 1996.
- [20] X-Y. Zhang, Y. Nakamura, K. Goda, and K. Yoshimoto: "Robustness of Power Grasp," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2828-2835, 1994.
- [21] J.C. Trinkle, J.M. Abel, and R.P. Paul: "Enveloping, Frictionless Planar Grasping," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, 1987.
- [22] J.C. Trinkle and R.P. Paul: "The Initial Grasp Liftability Chart," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 5, No. 1, FEBRUARY, pp. 47-52, 1989.
- [23] J.C. Trinkle and R.P. Paul: "Planning for Dexterous Manipulation with Sliding Contacts," *J. of Robotics Research*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 24-48, 1990.
- [24] J.C. Trinkle, R.C. Ram, A.O. Farahat, and P.F. Stiller: "Dexterous Manipulation Planning and Execution of an Enveloped Slippery Workpiece," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 442-448, 1993.
- [25] M. Kaneko, M. Higashimori, and T. Tsuji: "Transition Stability of Enveloping Grasps," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 3040-3046, 1998.
- [26] K.P. Kleinmann, J. Henning, C. Ruhm, and H. Tolle: "Object Manipulation by a Multifingered Gripper: On the Transition from Precision to Power Grasp," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2761-2766, 1996.
- [27] N. Sarkar, X. Yun and V. Kumar: "Dynamic Control of 3-D Rolling Contacts in Two-Arm Manipulation," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 364-376, 1997.
- [28] M. Cherif and K.K. Gupta: "Planning Quasi-static Motions for Re-configuring Objects with a Multi-fingered Robotic Hand," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 986-991, 1997.
- [29] I. Kao and M.R. Cutkosky: "Quasistatic Manipulation with Compliance and Sliding," *Int. J. Robotics Research*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 20-40, 1992.
- [30] A.A. Cole, P. Hsu and S.S. Sastry: "Dynamic Control of Sliding by Robot Hands for Regrasping," *IEEE Trans. on Robotics and Automation*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 42-52, 1992.
- [31] M.T. Mason: "Mechanics and Planning of Manipulator Pushing Operation," *Int. J. Robotics Research*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 53-71, 1986.
- [32] Y. Aiyama, M. Inaba and H. Inoue: "Pivoting: A New Method of Graspless Manipulation of Object by Robot Fingers," *Proc. of the IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 136-143, 1993.
- [33] N.B. Zumel and M.A. Erdmann: "Nonprehensile Manipulation for Orientating Parts in the Plane," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2433-2439, 1997.
- [34] K.M. Lynch: "Toppling Manipulation," 1999 *IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2551-2557, 1999.
- [35] M. Kaneko: "Development of a Dexterous Multi-fingered Robot Hand," *J. of the Robotics Society of Japan*, Vol. 16, No. 5, pp. 41-43, 1998. (in Japanese)
- [36] M. Kaneko, Y. Tanaka, and T. Tsuji: "Scale-dependent grasp," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2131-2136, 1996.
- [37] M. Kaneko, Y. Hino, and T. Tsuji: "On Three Phases for Achieving Enveloping Grasps," *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 385-390, 1997.
- [38] M. Kaneko, N. Thaiprasert, and T. Tsuji: "Experimental Approach on Enveloping Grasp for Column Objects," Eds. A. Casal and A.T. de Almeida, *Experimental Robotics V*, the 5th Int. Symp., pp. 35-46, 1997.
- [39] M. Kaneko and T. Tsuji: "Realization of Enveloping Grasp," the *IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation (Video Proceeding)*, 1997.



**Makoto Kaneko** Makoto Kaneko(A'84-M'87) received the B.S. degree in mechanical engineering from Kyushu Institute of Technology, Kyushu, Japan, in 1976, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in mechanical engineering from Tokyo University, Tokyo, Japan, in 1978 and 1981, respectively. From 1981 to 1990, he was a Researcher at the Mechanical Engineering Laboratory (MEL), Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI), Tsukuba Science City. From 1988 to 1989, he was a

Post-Doctoral Fellow at Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany, where he joined a space robotics project. From 1990 to 1993, he was an Associate Professor with Computer Science and System Engineering, Kyushu Institute of Technology. From November 1991 to January 1992, he received an Invited Professorship at Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany. Since October 1993, he has been a Professor at the Industrial Engineering Department, Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan. His research interests include tactile-based active sensing, grasping strategy, sensor applications, and experimental robotics. Dr. Kaneko received the outstanding young engineer award in 1983 from the Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers, the best paper awards from the Robotics Society of Japan in 1994, and from the Japanese Society of Instrumentation and Control Engineers in 1996. He also received the Humboldt Research Award in 1997, the ICRA Best Manipulation Paper Award in 2000, and the Robotics Mechatronics Award from the Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers in 2000. He served as an Associate Editor of *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ROBOTICS AND AUTOMATION* from 1990 through 1994. He has been a Program Committee Member for *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems* since 1991. He also worked as a Program Committee for the 1995, 1996, and 1998 *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. He is a member of the *IEEE Robotics and Automation Society*, the *IEEE Systems, Man, and Cybernetics Society*, and the *IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*. He is also a member of *Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers*, *Robotics Society of Japan*, and *Japanese Society of Instrumentation and Control Engineers*.



**Tatsuya Shirai** Tatsuya Shirai received his B.E. and M.E. degrees in Information Engineering from Kyushu Institute of Technology, Fukuoka, Japan, in 1991 and 1993, respectively, and is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan. He has been interested in mechanics and control of multi-fingered robot hands. He is a member of Robotics Society of Japan.



**Toshio Tsuji** Toshio Tsuji (A'88-M'99) was born in Kyoto, Japan, on December 25, 1959. He received the B.E. degree in industrial engineering, and the M.E. and Doctor of Engineering degrees in systems engineering from Hiroshima University, Higashi-Hiroshima, Japan, in 1982, 1985, and 1989, respectively. From 1985 to 1994, he was a Research Associate in the Faculty of Engineering, Hiroshima University, and was a Visiting Researcher at the University of Genova, Italy, from 1992 to 1993. He is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Hiroshima University. He has been interested in various aspects of motor control in robot and human movements. Dr. Tshuji is a member of the Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers, the Robotics Society of Japan, and the Japanese Society of Instrumentation and Control Engineers.

## LIST OF FIGURES

1	Enveloping grasp for an object placed on a table.	100
2	Column objects used in the experiments. . . . .	101
3	Explanation of $L_o$ and $L_h$ . . . . .	102
4	Grasp pattern classification map. . . . .	102
5	Grasp patterns. . . . .	103
6	Initial adjustment motion . . . . .	103
7	The relation between the robot hand and the object. . . . .	103
8	The map for choosing an appropriate strategy for achieving enveloping grasp. . . . .	104
9	Direct grasp. . . . .	105
10	Sliding based grasp. . . . .	105
11	Success map for a cylindrical object ( $\mu = 0.7$ ). . . . .	105
12	Success map for a cylindrical object ( $\mu = 1.3$ ). . . . .	106
13	Rolling based grasp. . . . .	106
14	Regrasping based grasp. . . . .	106
15	Examples of objects where the upward force is expected (a) and is not expected (b) by a simple pushing motion. . . . .	107
16	Initial adjustment motion (Rotating motion). . . . .	107
17	The strategy flow diagram. . . . .	107
18	Grouping of column objects whose cross sec- tions are convex. . . . .	108
19	The wedge-effect at one edge of the object. . . . .	109
20	Estimate that the area of $O_{object}$ . . . . .	109

LIST OF TABLES

I Groups of grasping strategies . . . . . 104