Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology [Rose-Hulman Scholar](http://scholar.rose-hulman.edu?utm_source=scholar.rose-hulman.edu%2Fmechanical_engineering_grad_theses%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

[Graduate Theses - Mechanical Engineering](http://scholar.rose-hulman.edu/mechanical_engineering_grad_theses?utm_source=scholar.rose-hulman.edu%2Fmechanical_engineering_grad_theses%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) [Mechanical Engineering](http://scholar.rose-hulman.edu/mechanical_engineering?utm_source=scholar.rose-hulman.edu%2Fmechanical_engineering_grad_theses%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) Mechanical Engineering

Fall 11-2014

Workspace Analysis of a Linear Delta Robot: Calculating the Inscribed Radius

Michael Louis Pauly

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholar.rose-hulman.edu/](http://scholar.rose-hulman.edu/mechanical_engineering_grad_theses?utm_source=scholar.rose-hulman.edu%2Fmechanical_engineering_grad_theses%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) [mechanical_engineering_grad_theses](http://scholar.rose-hulman.edu/mechanical_engineering_grad_theses?utm_source=scholar.rose-hulman.edu%2Fmechanical_engineering_grad_theses%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) Part of the [Other Mechanical Engineering Commons](http://network.bepress.com/hgg/discipline/304?utm_source=scholar.rose-hulman.edu%2Fmechanical_engineering_grad_theses%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Recommended Citation

Pauly, Michael Louis, "Workspace Analysis of a Linear Delta Robot: Calculating the Inscribed Radius" (2014). *Graduate Theses - Mechanical Engineering.* Paper 1.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Mechanical Engineering at Rose-Hulman Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses - Mechanical Engineering by an authorized administrator of Rose-Hulman Scholar. For more information, please contact [bernier@rose-hulman.edu.](mailto:bernier@rose-hulman.edu)

Workspace Analysis of a Linear Delta Robot:

Calculating the Inscribed Radius

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

by

Michael Louis Pauly

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering

November 2014

© 2014 Michael Louis Pauly

ABSTRACT

Pauly, Michael Louis

M.S.M.E.

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

November 2014

Workspace Analysis of a Linear Delta Robot: Calculating the Inscribed Radius

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Dave Fisher

One of the most important traits of a robotic manipulator is its work envelope, the space in which the robot can position its end effector. Parallel manipulators, while generally faster, are restricted by smaller work envelopes [1]. As such, understanding the parameters defining a physical robot's work envelope is essential to the optimal design, selection, and use of robotic parallel manipulators.

A Linear Delta Robot (LDR) is a type of parallel manipulator in which three prismatic joints move separate arms which connect to a single triangular end plate [2]. In this study, general inverse kinematics were derived for a linear delta robot. These kinematics were then used to determine the reachable points within a plane in the robot's work envelope, incorporating the physical constraints imposed by a real robot. After simulating several robots of varying parameters, a linear regression was performed in order to relate the robot's physical parameters to the inscribed radius of the area reachable in a plane of the LDR's work envelope. Finally, a

physical robot was constructed and used as a reality check to confirm the kinematics and inscribed radius.

This study demonstrates the relationship between the LDR's physical dimensions and the inscribed radius of its work envelope. Building a physical robot allowed confirmation of the resulting equation, validating an accurate representation of the LDR's physical constraints. By doing so, the resulting equation provides a powerful tool for correctly sizing a LDR based on a desired work envelope.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following persons for sharing their expertise, kind words, and motivation, without whom it is unlikely that this thesis would ever have been written.

In no particular order:

Dr. Dave Fisher

Dr. Carlotta Berry

Dr. Jerry Fine

Jerry Leturgez

Ron Hofmann

Tom Rogge

The Rose-Hulman Robotics Team

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents:

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EE: End Effector

EoAT: End of Arm Tooling

LDR: Linear Delta Robot

LIST OF SYMBOLS

- *b* Delta plate circumscribed radius
- *c* Joint axis y offset
- *d* Total joint axis z offset
- *da* Joint axis z offset
- *d^e* Joint axis z offset to end effector
- *d^s* Joint axis z offset from the slider
- *L* Prismatic joint extension
- *r* Inscribed radius of the workspace
- α Significance level for regression
- β Linear regression term coefficient
- θ Rotation of the spherical joint in the xy plane, measured from ψ
- φ Rotation of the spherical joint measured from the negative z axis
- ψ Angular offset of the spherical joint in the x-y plane

1. INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on describing the work envelope of a Linear Delta Robot (LDR), a type of parallel manipulator. Driven by three prismatic joints, this platform uses the same 4-bar mechanism used in other delta robots to maintain the orientation of the End Effector (EE) plate, while still allowing three degrees of translational freedom [3] [4].

Figure 1: A Linear Delta Robot

 A robot's workspace, often called a work envelope, describes the volume a robot can reach with its End of Arm Tooling (EoAT). For LDRs it is often convenient to quantify the workspace in terms of an inscribed radius, taken from a single plane within the workspace [5] [6]. Measuring this radius is a simple task on a physical LDR but difficult to calculate for a theoretical robot [7]. The objective of this study is to determine the relationship between the inscribed radius of a LDR's workspace and the robot's physical parameters. Figure 2 shows the LDR from Figure 1 when viewed from the right. The LDR's work envelope is shown in blue, with the inscribed radius shown as the red arrow.

Figure 2: Inscribed Radius of a LDR Work Envelope

 One objective of this study is to place an emphasis on studying the physical workspace of a LDR, rather than the theoretical workspace, so additional factors such as joint angle limits and

end effector mounting are considered. Using the calculated inverse kinematics, a simulation program was written to measure the inscribed radius empirically using several different sets of physical parameters. A linear regression was performed comparing the arm length, delta plate radius, joint axis offsets, and spherical joint limits to the inscribed radius, resulting in an equation defining the inscribed radius in terms of the physical parameters of a LDR. Finally, a physical LDR was built to test the inverse kinematics and measure the inscribed radius. This platform was essential to confirm the kinematics and ensure that the assumptions about physical constraints made in the mathematical model were valid, acting as a reality check for the simulation.

 The single resulting equation can be used to evaluate a Linear Delta Robot's work envelope inscribed radius based only on easily measurable physical characteristics of the robot. No kinematic equations are required, meaning that this equation can be used quickly without requiring iterations to evaluate several possible robots quickly. Thus, the found equation is a powerful tool for easily approximating the inscribed radius of a Linear Delta Robot.

2. BACKGROUND

In recent years, robotic manipulators have gained popularity in many industries. Providing high strength, speed, repeatability, and robustness, robots have gained widespread acceptance for jobs deemed too labor-intensive, dangerous, monotonous, or difficult for humans. The growing number of robot models and manufacturers means that users have a plethora of potential robotic candidates for any task, making the selection of an ideal robot a difficult task.

A defining characteristic of any robotic manipulator is its work envelope. This term refers to any point that the robot can reach with its EoAT. Because the work envelope represents the space in which the robot can effectively interact with the environment, it is an essential aspect to consider when selecting or placing a robot. Designing a robot for a prescribed workspace can be an especially difficult problem, depending on the manipulator in question [8]. It is important to note that generally the work envelope only considers the EoAT position, but not orientation. Many times a robot will be able to reach a location, but cannot interact with a part or fixture because it has the wrong orientation. While work envelopes are a three dimensional space, they are often described with a radius (or radii) within a cross-sectional plane, as seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Example Work Envelope of a Serial Manipulator [9]

An essential tool for describing a robot's position are forward and inverse kinematics [10]. Forward kinematics are used to determine a robot's end effector position based on the state of the robots actuators. Inverse kinematics are used to calculate the required actuator states to achieve a desired end position. Depending on the manipulator in question, both the forward and inverse kinematics may provide multiple solutions. All valid actuator configurations which reach a single end point are the set of viable poses. Serial manipulators generally have a unique solution to the forward kinematics problem, while having multiple poses which satisfy the inverse kinematics. Parallel manipulators, depending on the type, can have numerous solutions to both forward and inverse kinematics [11]. The Stewart Platform, shown in Figure 4 below, has 40 direct forward kinematic solutions [12].

Figure 4: The Stewart Platform [13]

Robotic manipulators are generally categorized into one of two groups: serial and parallel [12]. Serial robots have one path of joints and links from the base to the end effector, whereas parallel robots have multiple paths from the base to the end effector. In general, serial manipulators are heavier and slower because each joints' motor must be mounted on the arm (or have motion transmitted via some physical linkage), but have larger work envelopes. Parallel manipulators are usually faster, as their motors are housed in the stationary base, but have smaller work envelopes [14]. As such, when using parallel manipulators it is essential to select the correct robot in order to make full use of the work envelope.

Another significant difference between serial and parallel manipulators is the way in which their kinematics are derived. Serial manipulators often use coordinate transformations, in the form of matrices, to relate the position of each link to the previous one [10]. Thus, the end position, expressed as a vector, is found by multiplying the initial position by the transformation matrices for each link. Many transformations are used, one of the most popular being the

Denavit-Hartenberg method. If the full transformation matrix is invertible, then the inverse kinematics is performed by multiplying the desired position by the inverted transformation matrix. This method is limited to a single solution and does not provide multiple poses.

Oh the other hand, parallel manipulators are modeled by systems of equations. Starting at the base, the end position is expressed with regards to the position of each kinematic chain in the robot. For inverse kinematics, the system of equations is solved to determine the required actuator inputs. This proves to be a difficult task, with each manipulator often requiring its own method [5] [11] [12].

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

One of the most popular parallel manipulator designs is the DELTA platform, originally developed by Swiss team lead by Reymond Clavel [3]. Driven by three revolute joints located on the base, motion is transmitted through three parallelogram arms to a semi-triangular end piece, called the delta plate. One of Clavel's models, shown in Figure 5 below, has a fourth revolute joint that allows for rotation of the End Effector about the Z axis.

Figure 5: A Diagram of the Delta Robot from the Original 1990 Patent [3]

The defining aspect of Delta manipulators are their parallelogram arms. Two long links are connected to the adjoining links by spherical joints at each end, forming a 4-bar mechanism. This setup ensures that the two connected links remain parallel, effectively removing one degree of freedom from the system. By using three 4-bar mechanisms, Delta platforms lock the pitch, roll, and yaw of the Delta plate, such that the end effector has a constant orientation regardless of position.

There are various Delta platform configurations, including linear Delta robots, which swap the revolute joints of the original Delta platform for prismatic joints. In most cases, motion is achieved through the use of lead screws and rotational motors, though other linear actuation methods are also used. Figure 6 shows a linear delta platform designed by Clavel. Because of their high accuracy and rigidity, LDRs are sometimes used for 3-D printing, as seen in Figure 7.

Figure 6: Clavel's Linear Delta Design [3]

Figure 7: Linear Delta Robot 3-D Printer [15]

This study focuses on LDRs which use three parallel prismatic joints. The pictures shown throughout this paper and the physical LDR all have coplanar axes, though the derivation of kinematics in Section 4.2 allows for axes which are not coplanar. Previously, these LDRs have been modeled with three spheres, each representing the reach of a single arm, demonstrated in Stock and Miller's work [4]. Theoretically, as each parallelogram arm can rotate to any orientation, any intersection of the outer surfaces of all three spheres could be treated as reachable position. While this approach is valid for a theoretical system, the assumption that the spherical joints can rotate freely to any angle does not apply to most physical systems. Figure 8 shows the LDR used in Stock and Miller's paper; Figure 9 shows a top view of the three spheres which sweep the reach of each arm. In Figure 9, the top view of the LDR is rotated 180 degrees; the green sphere in Figure 9 represents the rightmost slider in Figure 8.

Figure 9: Modeling LDRs with 3 Spheres [4]

 This method does illustrate the possibility for multiple poses, as any intersection between three spheres will be a valid solution. In rare cases, one sphere will lie tangent to the intersection of the two other spheres, resulting in a single unique solution. If two spheres do not intersect, then no solution exists.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL

4.1 Defining the Mathematical Model

In order to accurately predict the work envelope of a real LDR, a new model which includes physical constraints is required. The model used in this study will focus primarily on the restriction of the position of the spherical joints, while also accounting for the end effector mounting and the coupling of the prismatic and spherical joints.

To begin, a Cartesian coordinate system is created, and attached to the base of the LDR as shown below in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Location and Orientation of the Coordinate System Origin

Next, the physical parameters of the LDR are mapped to variables. This study uses the following convention: constant lengths are assigned lowercase letters, actuator variables are

assigned uppercase letters, and angular measurements are assigned Greek letters. Subscripts indicate the kinematic path (joint axis) associated with the variable. Joint axis 1 is the lower left prismatic joint, joint axis 2 is the center joint, and joint axis 3 is the far joint. The y and z direction offsets, c_i and d_{ai} , respectively, for each axis are shown in Figure 11. For the LDR constructed in this study, d_{ai} is zero for all axes.

Figure 11: Defining Joint Axis Offsets

Each prismatic joint is a slider which connects to the 4-bar mechanism via spherical joints. The slider's x displacement is L_i , measured from the y-z plane, shown above. Because the two arms in each 4-bar mechanism have a constant length and are always parallel, they are modelled as a single link of length *a*. This study uses three angles to describe the rotation of the

spherical joint. In order to measure the same angular displacement for each of the links, an angular offset, ψ_i , is used. ψ_i is the rotation from a hypothetical spherical joint facing along the positive x axis. This constant is used to define the base or zero position of each upstream spherical joint. θ_i , the lateral rotation of each spherical joint, is then measured from ψ_i in the x-y plane. By using ψ_i , it is possible to directly compare the θ_i values of each joint and determine if they exceed the possible rotation of the physical joints. Figure 12 shows the angular offsets, and Figure 13 shows an example θ_i value measured from one of these offsets.

Figure 12: Top View of the LDR's Default Position

Figure 13: θ_i Measured with regard to ψ_i

The third angle measured, φ_i , measures the 4-bar mechanisms' rotation from the negative z axis. Length *b* is the horizontal distance from the center of the delta plate to the center of the downstream spherical joint. Two additional z offsets are also needed. The distance from the prismatic joint's axis to the spherical joint is designated d_{si} ; the distance from the downstream spherical joint to the end effector is labelled d_{ei} . Figure 14 shows the z distance offsets, using the bottom of the delta plate as the end effector in the simulations. For the constructed LDR, a pointer was made to extend below the bottom of the delta plate to allow easy measurement to the center.

Figure 14: Side View of the LDR with Parameters

To simplify future equations, a single parameter, d_i , will be used as the z offset, as defined in Equation 1 below.

$$
d_i = d_{ai} + d_{si} + d_{ei} \tag{1}
$$

Of particular concern to this study are *b*, effective radius of the delta plate, *c*, the y offset of the joint axes, and θ and φ , angles which describe the spherical joints. These parameters are often ignored in other analyses but are important when considering an actual robot. Depending on the desired size of the end effector its required mounting footprint, the radius of the delta plate might be substantial or at least nontrivial. Additionally, few spherical joints exist that provide unlimited rotation in all three directions, so limiting the allowable ranges of θ and φ will more closely model physical systems.

4.2 Kinematics

 Finding the forward kinematic equations is straightforward. Following the kinematic chain from the origin to the end position for each axis gives the following result:

$$
x = L_i + b \cos(\psi_i) + a \cos(\psi_i + \theta_i) \sin(\varphi_i)
$$
 (2)

$$
y = c_i + b\sin(\psi_i) + a\sin(\psi_i + \theta_i)\sin(\varphi_i)
$$
 (3)

$$
z = d_i - a \cos(\varphi_i) \tag{4}
$$

 Because the three equations above apply to each axis, there are nine equations to solve for the nine unknown parameters (L, φ) , and θ for each axis). However, as each joint axis is independent and can be solved individually, we can consider each axis as its own three degree of freedom system.

 Solving for inverse kinematic equations is accomplished by rearranging the forward kinematic equations. Beginning with Equation 4, it is a simple matter to solve for φ_i .

$$
\varphi_i = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{d_i - z}{a}\right) \tag{5}
$$

With φ_i known, Equation 3 could be rearranged to isolate θ_i , then solved by substituting Equation 5 for φ_i . However, that would result in the use of an inverse sine function. Previous experience has shown that MATLAB's inverse sine function is unreliable for four-quadrant solving. Thus, another method is used, utilizing MATLAB's more robust, four-quadrant inverse tangent function. This requires defining a quantity in terms of its sine and cosine. In order to accomplish this, Equations 2 and 3 are rearranged as shown.

$$
x - L_i - b \cos(\psi_i) = a \cos(\psi_i + \theta_i) \sin(\varphi_i)
$$
 (6)

$$
y - c_i - b\sin(\psi_i) = a\sin(\psi_i + \theta_i)\sin(\varphi_i)
$$
 (7)

Equations 6 and 7 can be solved for $cos(\psi_i + \theta_i)$ and $sin(\psi_i + \theta_i)$, but L_i is still unknown and must be solved for first. This is done by squaring Equations 6 and 7, then adding them together, resulting in Equation 8.

$$
(x - L_i - b \cos(\psi_i))^2 + (y - c_i - b \sin(\psi_i))^2 =
$$
\n
$$
a^2 \cos(\psi_i + \theta_i)^2 \sin(\phi_i)^2 + a^2 \sin(\psi_i + \theta_i)^2 \sin(\phi_i)^2
$$
\n(8)

Applying the trigonometric identity in Equation 9 to Equation 8 provides a quadratic equation with *Li* as the only unknown.

$$
\cos(\psi_i + \theta_i)^2 + \sin(\psi_i + \theta_i)^2 = 1\tag{9}
$$

$$
(x-Li - b cos(\psii))2 + (y - ci - b sin(\psii))2
$$

=
$$
a2 sin(\varphii)2
$$
 (10)

Solving Equation 10 yields the final equation for *Li*.

$$
L_i = x - b \cos(\psi_i)
$$

$$
\pm \sqrt{a^2 \sin(\varphi_i)^2 - (y - c_i - b \sin(\psi_i))^2}
$$
 (11)

With L_i solved for, Equations 6 and 7 can be rearranged as shown below, then used to solve for θ_i with MATLAB's atan2 function.

$$
\cos(\psi_i + \theta_i) = \frac{(x - L_i - b\cos(\psi_i))}{a\sin(\varphi_i)}
$$
(12)

$$
\sin(\psi_i + \theta_i) = \frac{(y - c_i - b\sin(\psi_i))}{a\sin(\varphi_i)}
$$
(13)

$$
\theta_i = \alpha \tan 2(\sin(\psi_i + \theta_i), \cos(\psi_i + \theta_i)) - \psi_i \tag{14}
$$

Thus, Equations 5, 11, and 14 model the inverse kinematics for a LDR. Three

characteristics of these equations are worth noting. First, the angle φ_i only varies with z position. Because of this, if d_i is the same for all three joint axes, then the magnitude of φ_i will be the same (this study assumes that *a* is constant for all joint axes). Next, each of the equations can provide complex solutions, either from a trigonometric inverse or the square root of a negative number. In either case, a complex solutions signifies that the position in question would be unreachable for a physical robot. Finally, each equation can be solved to provide two solutions. For Equations 5 and 14, the two solutions arise from the inverse trigonometric functions when their ranges are extended to $-\pi$ to π . In Equation 11, the two solutions come from the positive and negative values that can be the result of the square root terms. The two possible states for each axis allow for a total of eight (2^3) possible robot poses for a single desired position. Stock and Miller provide an excellent illustration of the eight possible poses:

Figure 15: All Possible LDR Poses for a Reachable Position [4]

For this study, the pose in the upper left is chosen, so that L_2 is always greater than L_1 and L_3 . This choice was made primarily to accommodate the physical robot, which has ψ angles most similar to those shown. Thus, the inverse kinematic equations for L_1 , L_2 , and L_3 become:

$$
L_1 = x - b \cos(\psi_1) - \sqrt{a^2 \sin(\varphi_1)^2 - (y - c_1 - b \sin(\psi_1))^2}
$$
 (15)

$$
L_2 = x - b\cos(\psi_2) + \sqrt{a^2 \sin(\varphi_2)^2 - (y - c_2 - b\sin(\psi_2))^2}
$$
 (16)

$$
L_3 = x - b\cos(\psi_3) - \sqrt{a^2 \sin(\varphi_3)^2 - (y - c_3 - b\sin(\psi_3))^2}
$$
 (17)

4.3 Physical Model

 In order to verify the kinematics equations, a physical LDR was constructed. The prismatic joints were created from threaded sliders on lead screws, actuated by stepper motors. Ball and socket joints were used for the spherical joints. Kinematics calculations and motor control are performed with an Arduino Uno, which receives position commands via USB cable from a serial messenger, in this case a laptop computer. This position command was then converted to a linear distance for each slider, which in turn was converted to a number of ticks for each stepper to rotate. Positional data is stored on the Arduino EEPROM, which retains the information even when power is disconnected. Contact switches were placed along the slider track at known locations, allowing the robot to be reset to a known position should the positional data get corrupted or lost. Figure 16 shows the constructed LDR.

Figure 16: The Constructed LDR
As stated previously, a goal of this study is to determine an equation for inscribed radius which accounts for physical limitations of a system. As such, certain attributes of the LDR were chosen to be less than ideal. The delta plate is larger than necessary to hold the EoAT used, to allow for potentially larger tooling. The ball and socket joints that were chosen had a notable restriction on φ rotation, as shown in Figures 17 and 18 below. A complete table of the constructed LDR properties can be found in Appendix A.

Figure 17: Rotation Limits on the Spherical Joints

Figure 18: Spherical Joints on the Delta Plate

 To aid in measurement, a pointer was constructed and attached to the delta plate as shown in Figure 19. This allowed for easier measurement to the x-y center of the delta plate.

Figure 19: Pointer used as an End Effector

 The tracks to guide the sliders were laser cut from a single piece of acrylic to ensure that all three sliders would move in precise, parallel paths. At the end of each path a limit switch was installed. The purpose of these switches, seen in Figure 20, was twofold. First, they allow for recalibrating of each prismatic joint's length. Second, they keep each slider out of the danger zone at the end of the track, in which the sliders could hit the end of the track cause the couplers to slip, and thus cause the lead screws to slip and lose position.

Figure 20: Limit Switches for the Prismatic Joints

5. METHODS

5.1 Overview

One can see from Equation 2 that the LDR's reach in the x direction is primarily driven by the positions of the three prismatic joints. To increase the LDR's reach in the x direction, one can simply increase the travel of the prismatic joints. However, the LDR's reach in the y and z directions is based on the arm length, delta plate size, joint axis offsets, and angles of the spherical joints, whose interactions are not nearly as intuitive. This study therefore focuses on the points reachable in a y-z plane at a fixed x value. Due to the nature of the LDR, the reachable points in the plane will form a rough semicircle, the minimum radius of which will be the inscribed radius for that set of physical parameters.

The radii found, in conjunction with their corresponding physical parameters, were then used in a linear regression model to determine the equation predicting the inscribed radius. The resulting coefficients then yielded an equation relating inscribed radius to the physical parameters in the form shown below in Equation 18.

$$
r = \beta_0 + \beta_1 a + \beta_2 b + \beta_3 c + \beta_4 \varphi_{\lim} + \beta_5 \theta_{\lim} \tag{18}
$$

5.2 Description of the Data

Several values of *a*, *b*, and *c*, were chosen for testing, along with different allowable ranges for φ and θ , called φ_{lim} and θ_{lim} , respectively. For each combination of these five physical parameters, a MATLAB program was written to test a grid of points with the inverse kinematics equations. Points within a y-z plane at a constant x value were tested. If the returned values for L_i , φ_i , and θ_i were complex, or if φ_i or θ_i was outside range of φ_{lim} or θ_{lim} , then the point was

determined to be unreachable and stored. An origin point (not the robot system origin) was selected to be the highest (greatest z value) point that lay along the centerline (the work envelope was observed to be symmetric about the z axis). The inscribed radius was calculated as the minimum distance from any unreachable to the origin, considering only points below the origin. Figure 21, below, shows an example of the unreachable points (blue) and the inscribed radius (red). This trial used $d_i = -1$, so points with a z value of -1 or higher were not calculated, as it was already known that they would be unreachable.

Figure 21: MATLAB Plot of Unreachable Points and the Inscribed Radius

The inscribed radius *r* and the values of *a*, *b*, *c*, φ _{lim}, and θ _{lim} were stored for processing. A complete table of the values for r, a, b, c, φ_{lim} , and θ_{lim} can be found in Appendix 2.

5.3 Data Processing

Linear regression was used to relate the inscribed radius *r* with a, b, c, φ_{lim} , and θ_{lim} . Because φ_{lim} and θ_{lim} are angles, the values of $sin(\varphi_{lim})$, $cos(\varphi_{lim})$, $sin(\theta_{lim})$, and $cos(\theta_{lim})$ were also considered. To determine which of the φ_{lim} and θ_{lim} terms to use, all possible combinations of one φ_{lim} term and θ_{lim} term were tested. Any combination which had a statistically insignificant term was eliminated. Of those combinations which remained, the combination which had the largest absolute sum of *t* values was chosen. A significance level of α =0.05 was chosen and a two-sided confidence interval was used.

With the proper angular terms selected, a final linear regression was performed to solve for the coefficients in Equation 18. The same significance level of α =0.05 was used to determine which terms, if any, were not statistically significant.

5.4 Using the Models

The models were used to predict the performance of the constructed LDR. Based on the values shown in Appendix A the constructed LDR's inscribed radius was calculated. Testing was performed by selecting several points near the edge of the work envelope. The *L1*, *L2*, and *L³* needed to reach these positions were calculated by the LDR's Arduino controller and the LDR was then moved to each position. The actual position of the EE was recorded and compared to the expected values calculated by the MATLAB kinematics program.

6. RESULTS

Once the data was collected, nine linear regressions were performed to select the best possible combination of φ_{lim} , cos (φ_{lim}) , or sin (φ_{lim}) and θ_{lim} , cos (θ_{lim}) , or sin (θ_{lim}) . For each regression, the absolute sum of the *t* scores for the angular terms was computed. As seen below in Table 1, the combination which most accurately represents the data is φ_{lim} and $cos(\theta_{lim}).$

	θ_{lim}	$cos(\theta_{lim})$	$sin(\theta_{lim})$
φ _{lim}	45.06	45.47	31.06
$cos(\varphi_{lim})$	45.04	45.45	31.05
$sin(\varphi_{lim})$	44.03	44.42	30.48

Table 1: t Scores for Angular Terms

Thus, the terms φ_{lim} and $cos(\theta_{lim})$ were selected and a final linear regression was performed. The physical parameters, along with their β coefficients, significance levels, and *t* values are shown below in Table 2.

Parameter	β	p	t
Constant	-1.3789	0.085	-1.72
a	0.3789	0.000	7.17
\boldsymbol{b}	0.4742	0.000	5.18
\mathcal{C}	-0.5537	0.000	-6.05
φ _{lim}	3.677	0.000	12.62
$cos(\theta_{lim})$	-20.809	0.000	-32.85

Table 2: Linear Regression Results

Based on the p values for each term, all terms except the constant are statistically significant. The linear regression resulted in an R-squared value of 77.23, meaning that over three-quarters of the inscribed radius's value is modelled by the given equation. Therefore, a best estimate for the inscribed radius of a LDR's workspace is

$$
r = 0.3789a + 0.4742b - 0.5537c + 3.677\varphi_{\text{lim}} - 19.462\cos(\theta_{\text{lim}})
$$
 (19)

Based on this result, the inscribed radius for the constructed LDR was calculated to be 8.74 inches, compared to the 5.59 inches found by the MATLAB simulation, shown below in Figure 22.

 Several points were chosen near the bottom of the work envelope for testing. The expected values for y and z, the actual y and z values, along with the L_1, L_2 , and L_3 lengths required to reach each position are shown below in Table 3. All measurements were taken at *x=8* inches.

Table 3: Linear LDR Position Testing

7. DISCUSSION

From Equation 19 it is immediately apparent that the $cos(\theta_{lim})$ term immensely restricts the inscribed radius. Especially for small manipulators, decreasing this term (by increasing θ_{lim}) should be the first step to increasing a LDR's work envelope. As it exists in Equation 19, one could theoretically increase the radius by causing θ_{lim} to cause $cos(\theta_{lim})$ to become negative. In practice, this would likely not add any benefit beyond being able to reach a point with a second pose.

Interestingly, increasing the axis separation with *c* decreases the inscribed radius. Closer axes allow for more movement, while spread axes restrict movement to points across the x-z plane. However, close axes cause greater θ angles when moving at low $φ$ angles near the x-z plane, so care must be taken not to reduce *c* enough to lessen the inscribed radius.

As expected, increasing *a* increases the inscribed radius, as it directly contributes to a joint axis's reach in all directions. Surprisingly, *b* also has a positive impact on the inscribed radius, and has close to the same impact as *a*. Initially, a large delta plate radius was thought to be a detriment, causing more extreme φ and θ angles, but apparently the benefit of increased reach in x and y had a greater impact on the radius. A large delta plate could still create issues in motor positional or velocity control. Finally, because it directly affects the reach in z, increasing φ_{lim} also increases the radius.

 The regression model is not accurate for all cases. The most obvious example that if either of the joint limits were zero, a physical manipulator would have an inscribed radius of zero, though the regression would predict a non-zero radius. This can also be seen with an arm length of $a = 0$ or an axis separation of $c = 0$.

The positions of the physical LDR differed from the expected values largely due to mechanical slop in the system, primarily due to the rotation of the sliders. While the tracks that the sliders move along were intended to stop this, the semi-flexible acrylic did allow for some rotation about the joint axis. Additionally, the acme nuts used on the lead screws were found to have some wobble which allowed them to rotate along the axis. The ball and socket joints used were composed of a metal ball within plastic socket. After some use, the plastic became mildly worn down, which allowed a miniscule amount of linear movement as well as rotational movement in the spherical joints. The combined effect of this variability lead to the delta plate being pulled down (and thus inward) by gravity. Thus, all experimental results had y values closer to zero and z values less than the predicted results, shown below in Figure 23.

Figure 23: Positional Results on the Physical LDR

Despite these issues, the physical LDR served as a successful sanity check to confirm that the kinematics and work envelope calculations were roughly correct. The positional kinematics were confirmed by moving the end effector to the expected position (by hand) without moving the sliders, proving that the LDR could reach that position with the given *L* inputs. Figure 24 demonstrates this, showing that the experimental results still align with the predicted work envelope.

Figure 24: Positional Results within the Work Envelope

8. LIMITATIONS

 On the physical LDR, the largest limitation was the range of *L*. Because this range was too small, points near the top of the work envelope could not be tested, meaning that the inscribed radius could not be calculated as the origin could not be found. While unfortunate, this oversight was not catastrophic as the LDR could still move around the bottom of the work envelope, the most important and commonly used area. Additionally, the platform still acted as a useful device to confirm the kinematics.

9. CONCLUSIONS

Despite some limitations, this study was largely successful in deriving the forward kinematics, inverse kinematics, and an equation defining the inscribed radius for a LDR. While the lower R-squared value indicates that the regression model does not capture all the variation in the inscribed radius, Equation 19 still provides a powerful tool for estimating the inscribed radius of a LDR. It affirms the importance of considering the impact of all the selected physical parameters, and places heavy emphasis on the spherical joint angle restrictions. Using the physical LDR as a reality check confirmed both the kinematics and the edge of the work envelope, and was a valuable tool in understanding the capabilities and limitations of LDRs. From the evidence shown, it should be clear that understanding and controlling the work envelope is an essential step when designing or using a robotic manipulator. Hopefully, the methods and equation presented in this thesis will provide insight to those attempting to accurately define the workspace or kinematics of a linear delta robot.

10. FUTURE WORK

In order to improve the models, more physical LDRs should be constructed in order to physically verify the equations. This study used a single LDR as a reality check, and while the physical model roughly matched the equations, a single data point does not prove a trend. To truly confirm the inscribed arc radius equation, an array of LDRs with varying parameters should be built and tested, though this would obviously be a substantial investment of materials and time.

Other future work could include LDRs with different ψ configurations. This study exclusively used the ψ values shown in Table 4 below. These values were chosen to imitate Clavel's original delta manipulator by being even separated by $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ radians. However, due to the nature of the 4-bar mechanisms on the arms, there is no reason that other ψ values could not work.

φ_i	Value (rads)	
1	π 3	
2	π	
3	$-\pi$ $\overline{3}$	

Table 4: ψ Values

 Additionally, while Clavel's original design used constant values of *a* and *b* for all three arms, Delta robots can be (and sometimes are) constructed with varying arm lengths and delta plate sizes. As Equations 2, 3, and 4, show, each joint axis can be calculated independently, so

solving for LDRs that have differing *a* and *b* values for each joint would be a simple change that could yield interesting results.

While this study focused on the inverse kinematics to find unreachable points, a robot's Jacobian matrix can also be used to find limits or singularities in a robot's workspace. Some attempts were made to derive a useful Jacobian from the inverse kinematics, but without success. If a future study were to calculate the Jacobian, it might be more computationally efficient in determining the unreachable points for the inscribed radius calculations. Additionally, the Jacobian could provide information about areas within the workspace which would cause a LDR to lose rigidity.

Finally, a more complex regression model could be attempted to find a more suitable equation. This study did not include interaction terms or higher order terms in order to limit the complexity, as the determination of the inscribed radius equation was done empirically. However, looking at the inverse kinematics equations shows a number of interaction terms (some with two-degree interactions), as well as higher order terms, so a more complex model could be justified. Alternatively, an effort could be made to derive the inscribed radius equation entirely from the kinematics.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Uddin, S. Refaat, S. Nahavandi and H. Trinh, "Kinematic Modelling of a Robotic Head with Linear Motors," Deakin University, School of Engineering and Technology, Geelong.
- [2] R. Clavel, "A Fast Robot with Parallel Geometry," in *18th International Symposium on Industrial Robotics*, Lausanne (Switzerland), 1998.
- [3] R. Clavel, "Device for the positioning of an element in space". U.S. Patent 4,976,582, 11 Dec 1990.
- [4] M. Stock and K. Miller, "Optimal Kinematic Design of Spatial Parallel Manipulators: Application to the Linear Delta Robot," *ASME Journal of Mechanical Design,* vol. 125, 2003.
- [5] Q. Yuan, S. Ji, Z. Wang, G. Wang, Y. Wan and L. Zhan, "Optimal Design of the Linear Delta Robot for a Prescribed Cuboid Dexterous Workspace based on Performance Chart," in *WSEAS Int. Conf. on Robotics, Control, and Manufacturing Technology*, Hangzhou, 2008.
- [6] X.-J. Liu, J. Wang, K.-K. Oh and J. Kim, "A New Approach to the Design of a DELTA Robot with a Desired Workspace," *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems,* vol. 39, pp. 209-225, 2004.
- [7] Y. Zhao, "Dynamic optimum design of a three translational degrees of freedom parallel robot while considering anisotrophic property," *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing.,* vol. 29, pp. 100-112, 2012.
- [8] M. A. Laribi, L. Romdhane and S. Zeghloul, "Analysis and dimensional synthesis of the DELTA robot for a prescribed workspace," *Mechanism and Machine Theory,* vol. 42, pp. 859-870, 2007.
- [9] FANUC Robotics, *FANUC Robot M-2000iA Mechanical Unit Operators Manual,* Rochester Hills, MI: FANUC America, 2014.
- [10] S. Kucuk and Z. Bingul, Industrial Robotics: Theory, Modelling, and Control, Berlin, 2006.
- [11] Y.-J. Chiu and M.-H. Perng, "Forward Kinematics of a General Fully Parallel Manipulator with Auxillary Sensors," *The International Journal of Robotics Research,* 1 May 2001.
- [12] L.-W. Tsai, Robot Analysis, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [13] J.-H. Ryu, Parallel Manipulators, New Developments, I-Tech Education, 2008.
- [14] E. A. Baran, T. E. Kurt and A. Sabanovic, *Lightweight Design and Encoderless Control of a Minature Direct Drive Linear Delta Robot,* Istanbul: Sabanci University.
- [15] J. L. Irwin, J. M. Pearce, G. Anzolone and D. E. Oppliger, "The RepRap 3-D Printer Evolution in STEM Education," in *121st ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, Indianapolis, 2014.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PHYSICAL LDR PARAMETERS

Appendix A shows the complete list of physical parameters for the constructed Linear Delta Robot. All lengths are measured in inches; all angles are measured in radians.

Parameter	Value
\boldsymbol{a}	9.25
\boldsymbol{b}	\mathfrak{Z}
c _l	-3.5
$\mathcal{C}2$	$\boldsymbol{0}$
c_3	3.5
\boldsymbol{d}	-2.656
ψ_1	$\frac{\pi}{3}$
	π
ψ_2 ψ_3	$-\pi$ $\overline{3}$

Table A.1: Constructed Linear Delta Physical Parameters

Appendix B shows the calculated inscribed radius for each set of hypothetical physical parameters.

a	\bm{b}	$\mathcal C$	φ_{lim}	θ_{lim}	r
8	2	3	0.942478	1.256637	2.570992
8	$\overline{2}$	3	0.942478	1.413717	3.059412
8	$\overline{2}$	3	0.942478	1.570796	3.059412
8	\overline{c}	3	1.256637	1.256637	2.886174
8	$\overline{2}$	3	1.256637	1.413717	3.962323
8	$\overline{2}$	3	1.256637	1.570796	4.972927
8	$\overline{2}$	3	1.570796	1.256637	3.001666
8	$\overline{2}$	3	1.570796	1.413717	4.20119
8	$\overline{2}$	3	1.570796	1.570796	5.300943
8	$\overline{2}$	4	0.942478	1.256637	2.720294
8	$\overline{2}$	4	0.942478	1.413717	2.720294
8	$\overline{2}$	4	0.942478	1.570796	2.720294
8	$\overline{2}$	4	1.256637	1.256637	3.863936
8	$\overline{2}$	4	1.256637	1.413717	4.640043
8	$\overline{2}$	4	1.256637	1.570796	4.640043
8	\overline{c}	4	1.570796	1.256637	4.00125
8	$\overline{2}$	4	1.570796	1.413717	5.200961
8	$\overline{2}$	4	1.570796	1.570796	5.755867
8	$\overline{2}$	5	0.942478	1.256637	2.202272
8	$\overline{2}$	5	0.942478	1.413717	2.202272
8	$\overline{\mathbf{c}}$	5	0.942478	1.570796	2.202272
8	\overline{c}	5	1.256637	1.256637	3.894868
8	$\overline{2}$	5	1.256637	1.413717	3.894868
8	$\overline{2}$	5	1.256637	1.570796	3.894868
8	$\overline{2}$	5	1.570796	1.256637	4.767599
8	$\overline{2}$	5	1.570796	1.413717	4.767599
8	$\overline{2}$	5	1.570796	1.570796	4.767599
8	3	3	0.942478	1.256637	1.726268
8	3	3	0.942478	1.413717	2.594224
8	3	3	0.942478	1.570796	3.2
8	3	3	1.256637	1.256637	2.002498
8	3	3	1.256637	1.413717	3.114482
8	3	3	1.256637	1.570796	4.123106
8	3	3	1.570796	1.256637	2.10238

Table B.1: Inscribed Radii from MATLAB Simulation

APPENDIX C: INSCRIBED RADII SIMULATION CODE

Appendix C shows the MATLAB script used to calculate the inscribed radii.

```
% This program calculates the inscribed radius for numerous
% LDRs of varying parameters
% Prepare workspace
clear all
close all
% Set constants
x=20;psi=[pi/3,pi,-pi/3];
d=[-1,-1,-1];
% Set empty variables
L=[0, 0, 0];
phi=[0,0,0]; 
theta=[0,0,0]; 
origin=-1; 
% Set up data storage
data=zeros(5*3^4, 6);dataSetCount=1; 
% Set up flags
posReachable=0; 
UR_count=1;
originFound=0; 
% Loop through parameters
for a=8:1:12 
      for b=2:1:4 
           for c=3:1:5 
                for phi_lim=0.3*pi:0.1*pi:0.5*pi 
                     for theta_lim=0.4*pi:0.05*pi:0.5*pi 
                          UR_count=1; 
                          origin=-1; 
                          originFound=0; 
                          for y= -20:0.1:20 
                              for z=-1:-0.1:-14 posReachable=1; 
                                   testPos=[x, y, z];
[L,theta,phi]=inverseKinematicsATAN(testPos,a,b,[-c,0,c],d,psi);
                                   if((max(imaq([L,theta,phi]))) -=0)
                                         posReachable=0; 
end and the contract of the con
                                   if(max(abs(theta))>theta_lim) 
                                         posReachable=0; 
end and the contract of the con
                                   if(max(abs(phi))>phi_lim) 
                                         posReachable=0;
```

```
end and the contract of the con
                                  if (posReachable==0) 
                                      UR_y(UR_count)=y;
                                      UR_z(UR_count)=z;
                                       UR_count=UR_count+1; 
end and the contract of the con
                                  if (posReachable && y==0 && originFound==0) 
                                       origin=z; 
                                       originFound=1; 
end and the contract of the con
end and the contract of the con
                         end
                        % Calculate inscribed radius
                         radius=findInscribedRadius(UR_y,UR_z,origin); 
                         % Plot if desired
% figure
% plot(UR_y,UR_z,'.')
% title(dataSetCount);
% xlabel(origin);
% ylabel(radius);
                        data(dataSetCount,:)=[a,b,c,phi_lim,theta_lim,radius];
                         dataSetCount=dataSetCount+1; 
                    end
               end
          end
     end
end 
function [length,theta,phi]=inverseKinematicsATAN(position,a,b,c,d,psi)
% Calculates the prismatic joint lengths, thetas, and phis for a LDR when
% given input position and physical parameters.
x=position(1); 
y=position(2); 
z = position(3);for i=1:1:3phi(i)=acos((d(i)-z)/a);
     length(i)=x-b*cos(psi(i))-sqrt(a^2*sin(phi(i))^2-(y-c(i)-
b*sin(psi(i)))<sup>2</sup>);
     if(i==2)length(i)=x-b*cos(psi(i))+sqrt(a^2*sin(phi(i))^2-(y-c(i)-
b*sin(psi(i)))^2); end
     sinterm=(y-c(i)-b*sin(psi(i)))/(a*sin(phi(i)));
      costerm=(x-length(i)-b*cos(psi(i)))/(a*sin(phi(i))); 
      if(imag(sinterm)==0 && imag(costerm)==0) 
         theta(i)=atan2(sinterm, costerm)-psi(i);
         if (y \le 0 \& x = i = 2)theta(i)=atan2(sinterm, costerm)+psi(i);
               % Psi(2)= pi and pi=-pi for trig functions. 
               % Necessary so that theta(2) doesn't become
               % approx -2pi instead of zero for negative
               % y positions.
          end
```

```
 else
        theta(i)=10+10*i;
         % Set theta as a large complex number if out of bounds.
     end
end
end
% Finds the max radius when given an array of points 
% that CANNOT be reached. Also requires an origin 
% z position to calculate distance.
function radius=findInscribedRadius(y,z,origin) 
numPoints=length(y); 
radius=10000; 
currentRadius=0; 
for i=1:numPoints 
     if (z(i)<origin) 
        currentRadius=sqrt((z(i)-origin)^2+(y(i))^2);
         if(currentRadius<radius) 
             radius=currentRadius; 
         end
     end
end
```
APPENDIX D: PHYSICAL LDR CODE

Appendix D shows the Arduino code used on the constructed Linear Delta Robot.

// A program to control the constructed LDR // Include libraries #include <math.h> #include <EEPROM.h> #include <Wire.h> #include <Adafruit_MotorShield.h> #include "utility/Adafruit_PWMServoDriver.h" #include <LinearDeltaCom.h> #include <AccelStepper.h>

// Add all the #defines and global variables that would be class variables here

// // Constants //

// Memory Constants #define EEPROM_ADDRESS_BACK_TICKS_START 0x0018 #define EEPROM_ADDRESS_MID_TICKS_START 0x0020 #define EEPROM_ADDRESS_FRONT_TICKS_START 0x0028 // Define default physical parameters #define DEFAULT_a 9.25 #define DEFAULT_b 3 #define DEFAULT_c1 -3.5 #define DEFAULT_c2 0 #define DEFAULT_c3 3.5 #define DEFAULT_d1 -2.656 #define DEFAULT_d2 -2.656 #define DEFAULT_d3 -2.656 #define DEFAULT_psi1 1.04719 #define DEFAULT_psi2 3.14159 #define DEFAULT_psi3 -1.04719 #define DEFAULT_ticksPerRev 200 #define DEFAULT_threadsPerInch 10 // Define I/O Assignments #define L1_switch_pin 2 #define L2_switch_pin 3 #define L3_switch_pin 4

// // Variables //

// Physical parameters float a; float b; float c1; float c2; float c3; float d1; float d2; float d3; float psi1; float psi2; float psi3;

long ticksPerRev; long threadsPerInch; float currentPosition[3]; long currentTicks[3];

Adafruit_MotorShield AFMSbot(0x60);
Adafruit_MotorShield AFMStop(0x61); Adafruit_StepperMotor *frontStepper = AFMStop.getStepper(200, 2); Adafruit_StepperMotor *midStepper = AFMSbot.getStepper(200, 1); Adafruit_StepperMotor *backStepper = AFMStop.getStepper(200, 1); LinearDeltaCom deltaCom; AccelStepper stepperFront(forwardstep1, backwardstep1); AccelStepper stepperMid(forwardstep2, backwardstep2); AccelStepper stepperBack(forwardstep3, backwardstep3);

```
void setup(){ 
  AFMSbot.begin(); 
  AFMStop.begin(); 
  setDefaultParams(); 
 loadEEPROM(); 
 Serial.begin(115200); 
 delay(1000); 
 deltaCom.registerMoveCallback(movePos); 
  deltaCom.registerXMoveCallback(xMove); 
 deltaCom.registerYMoveCallback(yMove); 
 deltaCom.registerZMoveCallback(zMove); 
 deltaCom.registerHomeCallback(resetLengths); 
 deltaCom.registerRequestPositionCallback(sendPositionData); 
}
```

```
void loop(){ 
  stepperFront.run(); 
  stepperMid.run(); 
  stepperBack.run(); 
}
```
// // Setup Functions // void setDefaultParams(){ a=DEFAULT_a; b=DEFAULT_b; c1=DEFAULT_c1; c2=DEFAULT_c2; c3=DEFAULT_c3; d1=DEFAULT_d1; d2=DEFAULT_d2; d3=DEFAULT_d3; psi1=DEFAULT_psi1; psi2=DEFAULT_psi2; psi3=DEFAULT_psi3; ticksPerRev=DEFAULT_ticksPerRev; threadsPerInch=DEFAULT_threadsPerInch; pinMode(L1_switch_pin,INPUT_PULLUP); pinMode(L2_switch_pin,INPUT_PULLUP); pinMode(L3_switch_pin,INPUT_PULLUP); stepperFront.setAcceleration(100); stepperMid.setAcceleration(100); stepperBack.setAcceleration(100); stepperFront.setMaxSpeed(600); stepperMid.setMaxSpeed(600); stepperBack.setMaxSpeed(600); } // AccelStepper functions void forwardstep1() { frontStepper->onestep(FORWARD, SINGLE); } void backwardstep1() { frontStepper->onestep(BACKWARD, SINGLE); } void forwardstep2() {

```
 midStepper->onestep(FORWARD, SINGLE); 
} 
void backwardstep2() { 
 midStepper->onestep(BACKWARD, SINGLE); 
} 
void forwardstep3() { 
 backStepper->onestep(FORWARD, SINGLE); 
} 
void backwardstep3() { 
 backStepper->onestep(BACKWARD, SINGLE); 
} 
void serialEvent(){ 
  while(Serial.available()){ 
   deltaCom.handleRxByte(Serial.read()); 
  } 
} 
//////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////// 
// Movement Functions 
//////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////// 
void movePos(float targetX, float targetY, float targetZ){ 
 Serial.print("Order received: Move"); 
  Serial.print("\n"); 
 //Calculate lengths 
  int positionReachable=1; 
  float targetPosition[]={ 
   targetX,targetY,targetZ }; 
  float finalLengths[3]; 
  long finalTicks[3]; 
 long deltaTicks[3];
  inverseKinematics(targetPosition,finalLengths); 
 for (int i=0; i < 3; i++){
   if((finalLengths[i]<1.75) || (finalLengths[i]>15.25)){ 
    positionReachable=0; 
     Serial.println(); 
     Serial.print("Position Unreachable!"); 
    Serial.println(); 
   } 
 } 
 for(int i=0; i < 3; i++){
   finalTicks[i]=length2ticks(finalLengths[i]); 
   deltaTicks[i]=finalTicks[i]-currentTicks[i]; 
 } 
  // Make the move 
  if(positionReachable==1){ 
   stepperFront.move(deltaTicks[0]); 
   stepperMid.move(deltaTicks[1]); 
   stepperBack.move(deltaTicks[2]); 
   // Update position 
  for (int i=0; i < 3; i++){
    currentPosition[i]=targetPosition[i]; 
    currentTicks[i]=finalTicks[i]; 
   } 
  } 
 updateEEPROM(); 
} 
void xMove(float deltaX){ 
  Serial.print("Order received: MoveX"); 
  Serial.print("\n"); 
  float targetPosition[3]={ 
  currentPosition[0],currentPosition[1],currentPosition[2] };
 targetPosition[0]=targetPosition[0]+deltaX; 
 movePos(targetPosition[0],targetPosition[1],targetPosition[2]); 
} 
void yMove(float deltaY){ 
 Serial.print("Order received: MoveY");
```
 Serial.print("\n"); float targetPosition[3]={ currentPosition[0],currentPosition[1],currentPosition[2] }; targetPosition[1]=targetPosition[1]+deltaY; movePos(targetPosition[0],targetPosition[1],targetPosition[2]); } void zMove(float deltaZ){ Serial.print("Order received: MoveZ"); Serial.print("\n"); float targetPosition[3]={ currentPosition[0],currentPosition[1],currentPosition[2] }; targetPosition[2]=targetPosition[2]+deltaZ; movePos(targetPosition[0],targetPosition[1],targetPosition[2]); } void moveHome(){ float homePos[]={ 8,0,-11 }; movePos(homePos[0],homePos[1],homePos[2]); } void resetLengths(){ Serial.print("Order received: ReHome"); Serial.print("\n"); while(!(digitalRead(L1_switch_pin)&&digitalRead(L2_switch_pin)&&digitalRead(L3_switch_pin))){ if(digitalRead(L1_switch_pin)==0){ stepperFront.move(-1); } else { stepperFront.move(0); } if(digitalRead(L2_switch_pin)==0){ stepperMid.move(1); } else { stepperMid.move(0); } if(digitalRead(L3_switch_pin)==0){ stepperBack.move(-1); } else { stepperBack.move(0); } stepperFront.run(); stepperMid.run(); stepperBack.run(); } currentTicks[0]=3813; currentTicks[1]=30438; currentTicks[2]=3938; moveHome(); } // // Memory Functions // void loadEEPROM(){ // Ticks currentTicks[0]=256*(unsigned long) EEPROM.read(EEPROM_ADDRESS_BACK_TICKS_START)+ (unsigned long) EEPROM.read(EEPROM_ADDRESS_BACK_TICKS_START+1);

 currentTicks[1]=256*(unsigned long) EEPROM.read(EEPROM_ADDRESS_MID_TICKS_START)+(unsigned long) EEPROM.read(EEPROM_ADDRESS_MID_TICKS_START+1);

 currentTicks[2]=256*(unsigned long) EEPROM.read(EEPROM_ADDRESS_FRONT_TICKS_START)+(unsigned long) EEPROM.read(EEPROM_ADDRESS_FRONT_TICKS_START+1);

}

void updateEEPROM(){

```
 // Ticks 
  EEPROM.write(EEPROM_ADDRESS_BACK_TICKS_START, currentTicks[0]/256); 
  EEPROM.write(EEPROM_ADDRESS_BACK_TICKS_START+1, currentTicks[0]%256); 
 EEPROM.write(EEPROM_ADDRESS_MID_TICKS_START, currentTicks[1]/256); 
  EEPROM.write(EEPROM_ADDRESS_MID_TICKS_START+1, currentTicks[1]%256); 
  EEPROM.write(EEPROM_ADDRESS_FRONT_TICKS_START, currentTicks[2]/256); 
 EEPROM.write(EEPROM_ADDRESS_FRONT_TICKS_START+1, currentTicks[2]%256); 
} 
//////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////// 
// Helper Functions 
//////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////// 
long length2ticks(float length){ 
 long ticks=length*ticksPerRev*threadsPerInch; 
 return ticks; 
} 
float ticks2length(float ticks){ 
 float length=ticks/ticksPerRev/threadsPerInch; 
 return length; 
} 
void inverseKinematics(float targetPosition[], float lengths[]){ 
  float x=targetPosition[0]; 
  float y=targetPosition[1]; 
  float z=targetPosition[2]; 
 float t1=a*a-d1*d1+2*d1*z-z*z; float t2=a*a-d2*d2+2*d2*z-z*z; 
  float t3=a*a-d3*d3+2*d3*z-z*z; 
 float L1=x-b*cos(psi1)-sqrt(1/t1*(t1-sin(psi1)*sin(psi1)*b*b-2*sin(psi1)*b*c1+2*sin(psi1)*b*y-c1*c1+2*c1*y-y*y))*sqrt(t1);
 float L2=x-b*cos(psi2)+sqrt(1/t2*(t2-sin(psi2)*b*b-2*sin(psi2)*b*c2+2*sin(psi2)*b*y-c2*c2+2*c2*y-y*y))*sqrt(t2);
  float L3=x-b*cos(psi3)-sqrt(1/t3*(t3-sin(psi3)*sin(psi3)*b*b-2*sin(psi3)*b*c3+2*sin(psi3)*b*y-c3*c3+2*c3*y-y*y))*sqrt(t3); 
 lengths[0]=L1; lengths[1]=L2; 
 lengths[2]=L3; 
} 
void sendPositionData(){ 
  Serial.println(); 
  Serial.print("Position Request Received"); 
  Serial.println(""); 
  Serial.print(" x="); 
  Serial.print(currentPosition[0]); 
  Serial.print(" y="); 
  Serial.print(currentPosition[1]); 
 Serial.print(" z=");
  Serial.print(currentPosition[2]); 
  Serial.println(""); 
  Serial.print("J1 ticks="); 
  Serial.print(currentTicks[0]); 
  Serial.println(""); 
 Serial.print("J2 ticks=");
  Serial.print(currentTicks[1]); 
 Serial.println("");
  Serial.print("J3 ticks="); 
 Serial.print(currentTicks[2]);
  Serial.println(""); 
 Serial.print("\n"); 
}
```
APPENDIX E: PHYSICAL LDR COMMUNICATION LIBRARY

Appendix E shows the LinearDeltaCom Arduino library source file used to communicate

via USB serial with the constructed Linear Delta Robot.

```
#include "Arduino.h" 
#include "LinearDeltaCom.h" 
// Communication Functions 
LinearDeltaCom::LinearDeltaCom() { 
          _{\text{nextOpenByteInMessageBuffer} = 0;} 
/** 
 * Convenience method to handle multiple bytes. 
 * Just calls the handleRxByte method with each byte individually. 
 */ 
void LinearDeltaCom::handleRxBytes(byte newRxBytes[], int length) { 
          for (int i = 0; i < length; i++) {
                      handleRxByte(newRxBytes[i]); 
 } 
} 
/** 
 * Handle a newly received byte. 
 * If the byte is the MESSAGE_TERMINATOR process the message. 
 * If the byte is not the MESSAGE_TERMINATOR then just save it. 
 */ 
void LinearDeltaCom::handleRxByte(byte newRxByte) {
           if (newRxByte == MESSAGE_TERMINATOR) { 
                      // Convert the rx message buffer to a String and parse. 
                       _rxMessageBuffer[_nextOpenByteInMessageBuffer] = '\0'; 
                      String rxStr = String(_rxMessageBuffer); 
                      _parseStringCommand(rxStr); // The real work happens here. 
                     _{\text{nextOpenByteInMessageBuffer = 0}; } else { 
                      // Mid message. Save the byte. 
                      _rxMessageBuffer[_nextOpenByteInMessageBuffer] = newRxByte; 
                      _nextOpenByteInMessageBuffer++; 
 } 
} 
/** 
 * Process the complete message. 
 */ 
void LinearDeltaCom::_parseStringCommand(String command) { 
           int spaceIndex = command.indexOf(' '); 
           //String commandStr; 
           if (command.startsWith("MOVE ")) { 
                      int direction = 1; 
                      float coordinates[4]; 
                      String moveStr = command; 
                     while (spaceIndex != -1 && direction < 4) {
                                moveStr = moveStr.substring(spaceIndex + 1);coordinates[direction] = str2flt(moveStr); direction++; 
                                 spaceIndex = moveStr.indexOf(' '); 
 } 
                      if(_moveCallback != NULL){ 
                                 _moveCallback(coordinates[1],coordinates[2],coordinates[3]);
```

```
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("XMOVE")) { 
                   String xMoveStr = command.substring(spaceIndex + 1);
                   if (\_xMoveCallback != NULL) {
                              _xMoveCallback(_str2flt(xMoveStr)); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("YMOVE")) { 
                   String yMoveStr = command.substring(spaceIndex + 1);
                    if (_yMoveCallback != NULL) { 
                              _yMoveCallback(_str2flt(yMoveStr)); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("ZMOVE")) { 
                   String zMoveStr = command.substring(spaceIndex + 1); if (_zMoveCallback != NULL) { 
                              _zMoveCallback(_str2flt(zMoveStr)); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("SMOOTHMOVE")) { 
                    int smoothDirection = 1; 
                    float smoothCoordinates[4]; 
                    String smoothMoveStr = command; 
                   while (spaceIndex != -1 && smoothDirection < 4) {
                             smoothMoveStr = smoothMoveStr.substring(spaceIndex + 1);
                             smoothCoordinates[smoothDirection] = _str2flt(smoothMoveStr);
                              smoothDirection++; 
                              spaceIndex = smoothMoveStr.indexOf(' '); 
 } 
                    if(_smoothMoveCallback != NULL){ 
                              _smoothMoveCallback(smoothCoordinates[1],smoothCoordinates[2],smoothCoordinates[3]); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("SPEED")) { 
                   String speedStr = command.substring(spaceIndex + 1);
                    if (_setSpeedCallback != NULL) { 
                              _setSpeedCallback(_str2flt(speedStr)); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("SMOOTHSPEED")) { 
                   String smoothSpeedStr = command.substring(spaceIndex + 1);
                    if (_setSmoothSpeedCallback != NULL) { 
                              _setSmoothSpeedCallback(_str2flt(smoothSpeedStr)); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("HOME")) { 
                    if (_homeCallback != NULL) { 
                              _homeCallback(); 
 } 
           } else if (command.startsWith("POSITION")) { 
                    if (_requestPositionCallback != NULL) { 
                              _requestPositionCallback(); 
 } 
 } 
// Attach the callbacks 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerMoveCallback( 
                    void (*moveCallback)(float x, float y, float z)){
          _moveCallback=moveCallback; 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerXMoveCallback( 
                    void (*xMoveCallback)(float x)){ 
           _xMoveCallback=xMoveCallback; 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerYMoveCallback( 
                    void (*yMoveCallback)(float y)){ 
          _yMoveCallback=yMoveCallback; 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerZMoveCallback( 
                    void (*zMoveCallback)(float z)){ 
           _zMoveCallback=zMoveCallback;
```
}

}

}

}

}

```
void LinearDeltaCom::registerSmoothMoveCallback( 
                      void (*smoothMoveCallback)(float x, float y, float z)){ 
           _smoothMoveCallback=smoothMoveCallback; 
} 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerSetSpeedCallback( 
                      void (*setSpeedCallback)(float speed)){ 
           _setSpeedCallback=setSpeedCallback; 
} 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerSetSmoothSpeedCallback( 
                      void (*setSmoothSpeedCallback)(float smoothSpeed)){ 
           _setSmoothSpeedCallback=setSmoothSpeedCallback; 
} 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerHomeCallback( 
                      void (*homeCallback)()){ 
           _homeCallback=homeCallback; 
} 
void LinearDeltaCom::registerRequestPositionCallback( 
                      void (*requestPositionCallback)()){ 
           _requestPositionCallback=requestPositionCallback; 
} 
// Helper function 
float LinearDeltaCom::_str2flt(String inputString){
          char charArray[inputString.length()+1];
           inputString.toCharArray(charArray,sizeof(charArray)); 
           float outputFloat=atof(charArray); 
           return outputFloat;
```

```
}
```