Coordinated Particle Relocation Using Finite Static Friction with Boundary Walls

Victor M. Baez¹, Aaron T. Becker¹, Sándor P. Fekete², and Arne Schmidt²

¹ Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, University of Houston, USA ¹ {vjmontan, atbecker}@uh.edu
² Department of Computer Science, TU Braunschweig, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany. {s.fekete, arne.schmidt}@tu-bs.de

Abstract

We present methods for achieving arbitrary reconfiguration of two particles in convex workspaces, based on the use of external forces, such as a magnetic field or gravity. This concept can be used for a wide range of applications in which particles do not have their own energy supply.

A crucial challenge for achieving any desired target configuration is breaking global symmetry in a controlled fashion. Previous work made use of specifically placed barriers; however, introducing precisely located obstacles into the workspace is impractical for many scenarios. In this paper, we present a different, less intrusive method: making use of the interplay between static friction with a boundary and the external force to achieve arbitrary reconfiguration. Our key contributions are a precise characterization of the critical coefficient of friction that is sufficient for rearranging two particles in triangles, convex polygons, and regular polygons.

1 Introduction

Reconfiguring a large set of objects in a prespecified manner is a fundamental task for a large spectrum of applications, including swarm robotics, smart materials and advanced manufacturing. In many of these scenarios, the involved items are not equipped with individual motors or energy supplies, so actuation must be performed from the outside. Moreover, reaching into the workspace to manipulate individual particles of an arrangement is often impractical or even impossible; instead, global external forces (such as gravity or a magnetic force) may have to be employed, targeting each object in the same, uniform manner. These limitations of individual navigation apply even in scenarios of swarm robotics: For example, the well-known kilobots do have individual actuation and energy supply, but often make use of an external light source for navigation [10]; as a consequence, directing a swarm of kilobots by switching on a light beacon works just like activating an external force. This concept of global control has also been studied for using biological cells as reactive robots controlled by magnetic fields [2, 8]. Global control also has applications in assembling nano- and micro-structures. Related work shows how to assemble shapes by adding one particle at a time [7, 4], or combining multiple pairs of subassemblies in parallel in one time step [12].

Considering this approach of navigation by a global external force gives rise to a number of problems, including navigation of one particle from a start to a goal position [9], particle computation [5, 6], or emptying a polygon [1]. Zhang et al. [15, 16] show how to rearrange a rectangle of agents in a workspace that is only constant times larger than the number of agents.

* A video showing context and animations of our results can be found in [3].
† Work from these authors was partially supported by National Science Foundation IIS-1553063 and IIS-1619278.
Figure 1 A robot arm moving a triangle to reconfigure two particles. Top left: Two particles are close together. Top right: Blue particles has been separated from the red particle with zig-zag moves. Bottom left: Situation after a south-east and a south-west move. Bottom right: After the blue particle is kept in the bottom left corner, the red particles is moved away with zig-zag moves.

A crucial issue for all these tasks is how to combine the use of a uniform force (which is the same for all involved items) with the individual requirements of object relocation (which may be distinct for different particles): How can we achieve an arbitrary arrangement of particles if all of them are subjected to the same external force? Previous work (such as [6]) has shown how arbitrary reconfiguration of an ensemble is possible with the help of specifically placed barriers; however, introducing precisely located obstacles into the workspace is impractical for many scenarios. In this paper, we present a different, less intrusive method: making use of the interplay between static friction with a boundary of the workspace and the external force to achieve any desired configuration. A real-world example is shown in Figure 1.

Shahrokhi et al. [13, 14] already considered reconfiguration problems of particles using friction at the walls. However, they assume walls have infinite friction, i.e., a particle lying at a wall cannot be moved when there is a movement parallel to the wall. This differs from the more realistic assumptions in this paper, in which we only consider finite friction as in [11].

1.1 Our Results.
We provide a fundamentally new approach to manipulating a swarm of objects by an external, global force, demonstrating how static boundary friction can be employed to achieve arbitrary reconfiguration. Our results include the following.

- We show that any two particles in an arrangement can be arbitrarily relocated in a convex workspace, provided sufficient friction as a function of the geometry.
- More specifically, for a triangle with second smallest angle \( \beta \), we prove that an angle of \( \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta \) is always sufficient to guarantee any reconfiguration.
Figure 2 Left: An input force command \( u(t) \) within the cone \( \pm \theta \) about the normal to the boundary results in no motion of \( r_1 \). Right: An input force command \( u(t) \) outside the cone results in a motion of both particles. Observe that \( r_1 \) slides along the boundary with a resulting force \( u_{\text{res}}(t) \).

Figure 3 Left: A six-sided polygon \( P \) with start positions \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) for two particles and their goal positions \( \tilde{r}_1 \) and \( \tilde{r}_2 \). Middle: The \( \Delta \) configuration of the polygon and the positions of the start and end configuration. Right: Lightgray (darkgray) area corresponds to the \( C_i \)-area (\( C_j \)-area, resp.).

2 Preliminaries

Definition 1. Let \( \theta \) be the angle of friction and \( \mu := \tan \theta \) be the coefficient of friction. For a particle \( r \) lying at a boundary side \( b \), let \( N(b) \) be the normal to \( b \). If the angle between force command \( \vec{u} \) and \( N(b) \) is at most \( \theta \), then \( r \) does not move at all. If the angle is larger than \( \frac{\pi}{2} \) then \( r \) moves with full speed. In this paper we do not consider the remaining case.

Problem 1. Given a workspace, i.e., a convex polygon with \( n \) corners \( C_1, \ldots, C_n \), particles \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \), and an angle of friction \( \theta \), is it possible to reach the configuration \( \tilde{r}_1 \) and \( \tilde{r}_2 \)?

In this paper, we do not make any assumption on the initial positions of \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \), except that they are well separated, i.e., they have a distance \( \varepsilon > 0 \) to each other.

Definition 2 (\( \Delta \) Configuration). The \( \Delta \) configuration space \( \Delta_P \) of a convex polygon \( P \) with vertices \( C_1, \ldots, C_n \) is defined as \( \Delta_P := \text{ch}(C_i - C_j \mid C_i, C_j \in P) \), where \( \text{ch}(\cdot) \) denotes the convex hull (for an example see Figure 3). This gives us the set of all relative positions of \( r_2 \) to \( r_1 \).

From this definition follows that \( \Delta_P = \Delta_{-P} \), where \( -P \) is \( P \) rotated by \( \pi \). This motivates the following definition.

Definition 3. Let \( C \) be some vertex of \( P \). The \( C \)-area in \( \Delta_P \) is the union of \( P \) and \( -P \) having \( C \) centered at the origin (see Figure 3 right).

Note that the union of \( C \)-areas for all \( C \in P \) equals \( \Delta_P \).

3 Reconfiguration of two particles

Just like in the context of sorting algorithms in computer science or discrete mathematics, a critical component for achieving arbitrary reconfiguration of larger ensembles is the ability
to rearrange two specific particles. For our purposes of employing external forces and static friction, the additional aspects of geometry and physics have to be considered. These are addressed in this section.

The main idea for this first step is to try to completely cover the $\Delta$ configuration. We start by developing a strategy for separating two particles in Subsection 3.1, which gives us a lower bound for $\theta$ for every strategy in this section. This is followed by an upper bound for $\theta$ in triangles (Subsection 3.1) and arbitrary convex polygons (Subsection 3.2), i.e., we can guarantee any reconfiguration with any angle of friction higher than this bound. By each strategy we develop, more parts of the $\Delta$ configuration are covered. Thus, our goal is to give strategies, whose union of covered areas is exactly the $\Delta$ configuration.

### 3.1 Reconfiguration of two particles in arbitrary triangles

As a first step, we provide a sufficient large angle of friction to separate two specific particles.

#### Lemma 4. Assume particle $r_1$ is positioned in a corner with angle $\alpha$, then we can move $r_2$ to any position in the polygon without moving $r_1$ by performing zig-zag moves, if $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2}$ (see Fig. 1 and 4a).

**Proof.** Omitted due to space constraints.

Now, let $T$ be a triangle with corners $A$, $B$ and $C$, and angles $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$. Furthermore, let $\alpha$ be the smallest angle in $T$ and we assume that $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2}$ is guaranteed. Consider two particles $r_1$ and $r_2$ within $T$ and their goal positions $\tilde{r}_1$ and $\tilde{r}_2$. We have the following strategies to reach the goal positions (see also Fig. 4 for a graphical sketch):

- **Blue:** Move $r_1$ to $A$. As shown in Figure 4a, use zig-zag moves to place $r_2$ in $T$ while $r_1$ is fixed in $A$, such that $r_2 - r_1 = \tilde{r}_2 - \tilde{r}_1$. Then, translate $r_1$ and $r_2$ to their goal positions.
- **Red:** First, place $r_2$ in $A$ and move $r_1$ to $B$. Then, place $r_2$ anywhere in the area spanned by $\triangle AB$ and the angle $\frac{\alpha}{2} - \beta + \theta$. Afterwards, translate $r_1$ and $r_2$ to their goal positions.
- **Green:** First, Place $r_2$ in $A$ and move $r_1$ to $C$. Then, place $r_2$ in the area spanned by $\triangle AC$ and the angle $\frac{\alpha}{2} - \gamma + \theta$, such that $r_2 - r_1 = \tilde{r}_2 - \tilde{r}_1$. Afterwards, translate $r_1$ and $r_2$ to their goal positions.
- **Orange:** Place $r_2$ in $C$ and $r_1$ in $B$ (as we will see later, this is always possible if $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2}$). Then, place $r_2$ in the area spanned by $\triangle BC$ and the angle $\frac{\alpha}{2} - \beta + \theta$, such that $r_2 - r_1 = \tilde{r}_2 - \tilde{r}_1$. Afterwards, translate both particles to their goal position.
- **Violet:** Place $r_2$ in $B$ and $r_1$ in $C$. Then, place $r_2$ anywhere in the area spanned by $\triangle CB$ and the angle $\frac{\alpha}{2} - \gamma + \theta$, such that $r_2 - r_1 = \tilde{r}_2 - \tilde{r}_1$. Finally, translate both particles to their goal position.

These strategies can also be used by switching the particles $r_1$ and $r_2$: Assume that $r_1$ lies in corner $A$. To switch $r_1$ and $r_2$, we separate both particles to corners $B$ and $C$, then we use strategy orange or violet (depending on which particle is in which corner), and as a last step, we move $r_2$ to $A$.

#### Observation 1. In the $\Delta$ configuration, the covered areas of strategies that overlap are red with orange and green with violet. The blue strategy covers the $A$-area, red and orange cover parts of the $B$-area, and green and violet cover parts of the $C$-area (see Figure 5).

#### Lemma 5. If $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2} - \gamma$, then the area of the red and orange strategy cover the $B$-area.
(a) Blue strategy. Dotted lines in the right figure represent the vector $\hat{r}_2 - \hat{r}_1$. We move $r_1$ to the cross with zig-zag moves and then translate both particles to their goal positions.

(b) Red and green strategy

(c) Orange strategy

(d) Violet strategy

Figure 4 Illustration of the five strategies. Colored areas correspond to valid goal positions for $r_2$, if the goal position of $r_1$ is $\hat{r}_1$. Left column: We fix $r_1$ and move $r_2$. Right column: We switch the intermediate locations of $r_1$ and $r_2$. 
Proof. We can prove that the red strategy covers the $B$-area if $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta$, and that the orange strategy covers the $B$-area if $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha > \frac{\pi}{2} - \gamma$. Therefore, the lemma holds. Due to space constraints, full details are omitted. ▶

With a similar proof, we can show the following lemma:

Lemma 6. If $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta$, then the area of the green and violet strategy cover the $C$-area.

Theorem 7. Let $T$ be a triangle with angles $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma$. If $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta$, then we can guarantee any reconfiguration of two particles, i.e., $\Delta_T$ is completely covered by our strategies.

Proof. To cover the $A$-, $B$-, and $C$-area of the $\Delta$ configuration, the angle of friction $\theta$ must be greater than $\max(\frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta, \frac{\pi}{2} - \gamma)$. This is true for $\theta > \frac{\pi}{2} - \beta$. ▶

Because $\frac{\pi}{2} - \gamma - \frac{\pi - 2\gamma}{2} = \frac{\alpha}{2}$, the $B$-area is always covered if $\theta > \frac{\alpha}{2}$. This leads to the following corollary.

Corollary 8. For a triangle $T$ with angles $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma$, at least two thirds of all configurations can be guaranteed if $\theta > \frac{\alpha}{2}$.

3.2 Reconfiguration of two particles in convex polygons

In this section we generalize the strategy for triangles, i.e., for a particle $r_1$ in corner $C_i$ and a particle $r_2$ in corner $C_j$, moving particle $r_2$ to cover the $C_i$-area. As shown in Figure 6, we cannot guarantee full coverage with this strategy, because any movement for $r_2$ in direction to $C_1$ would also move $r_1$. This happens for all pairs of vertices $(C_i, C_j)$ of $P$, where the segment $C_jC_{j+1}$ has a larger negative slope than the segment $C_iC_{i-1}$, i.e., if the sum of exterior angles between vertices $C_i$ and $C_j$ is smaller than $\gamma_i$. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 9. For a vertex $C_i \in P$, let $\delta_i$ be the exterior angle at vertex $C_i$. Let $P_{i,j}^+ := \{C_i, C_{i+1}, \ldots, C_{j-1}, C_j\}$ and $P_{i,j}^- := \{C_i, C_{i-1}, \ldots, C_{j+1}, C_j\}$. We define

$$\eta_{i,j}^+ := \sum_{C_k \in P_{i+1,j-1}^+} \delta_k \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{i,j}^- := \sum_{C_k \in P_{i-1,j+1}^-} \delta_k.$$
We can cover the reconfiguration is possible.

Furthermore, let \( P_i := \{ C_j \in P \mid \eta_{i,j}^+ \geq \gamma_i \land \eta_{i,j-1}^- \geq \gamma_i \} \), i.e., \( P_i \) contains every vertex of \( P \) such that we can use the strategy described in the beginning of this section. Note that all indices are modulo \( n \).

\begin{lemma}
For a vertex \( C_i \) of \( P \), we have \(|P_i| \geq 1\).
\end{lemma}

\begin{proof}
Assume that \(|P_i| = 0\). W.l.o.g., let \( j \) be the largest index, such that \( \eta_{i,j}^+ < \gamma_i \). If \( \eta_{i,j}^- > \gamma_i \), then it immediately follows that \( C_{j+1} \in P_i \) and \(|P_i| \geq 1\). Otherwise, we have two adjacent vertices \( C_j \) and \( C_{j+1} \) such that \( \eta_{i,j}^+ < \gamma_i \) and \( \eta_{i,j}^- < \gamma_i \). This implies that \( 2\gamma_i > \eta_{i,j+1}^- + \eta_{i,j-1}^- = -\delta_i + \sum_{k \in P} \delta_k = -\delta_i + 2\pi > 2\pi - 2\delta_i = 2\gamma_i \). This is a contradiction and therefore \(|P_i| \geq 1\).
\end{proof}

\begin{lemma}
Let \( P \) be a convex polygon with vertices \( C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1} \) and angles \( \gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{n-1} \).
We can cover the \( C_i \)-area if \( \theta > \min_{j \in P_i} \left( \frac{\gamma_j}{2}, \max \left( \frac{2\pi}{2}, \eta_{i,j}^+ - \frac{\pi}{2}, \eta_{i,j}^- - \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right) \).
\end{lemma}

\begin{proof}
Omitted due to space constraints.
\end{proof}

Combining Lemmas 10 and 11 yields the following theorem.

\begin{theorem}
Let \( P \) be a convex polygon with vertices \( C_0, \ldots, C_{n-1} \) and angles \( \gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{n-1} \).
If \( \theta > \max \left( \min \left( \frac{\gamma_j}{2}, \max \left( \frac{2\pi}{2}, \eta_{i,j}^+ - \frac{\pi}{2}, \eta_{i,j}^- - \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right) \right) \), then every configuration of two particles can be reached.
\end{theorem}

\begin{corollary}
If \( P \) is a regular polygon with \( n \) vertices and if \( \mu > \cot(\pi/n) \), then every reconfiguration is possible.
\end{corollary}

4 Conclusion

We introduced a novel approach for rearranging the positions of particles by applying global uniform forces, making use of different local static friction to achieve arbitrary goal positions. To this end, we provided strategies enabling arbitrary rearrangements of two particles in convex workspaces, giving a characterization of the critical coefficient of friction in terms of the boundary geometry. Future work can now investigate optimal motion planning.
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