



OPTIMAL DIMENSIONAL SYNTHESIS OF PLANAR PARALLEL MANIPULATORS WITH RESPECT TO WORKSPACES

by

Alexander Morrison Hay

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor (Mechanical Engineering)

in the

Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment and Information Technology,
University of Pretoria, Pretoria

October 2003





SUMMARY

The development of appropriate design methodologies in this study required three separate issues to be addressed. The first of these was the development, testing and selection of numerical optimization algorithms suitable for the solution of the practical optimization problems encountered. Two optimization algorithms, the spherical quadratic steepest descent (SQSD) algorithm¹

Summary

and the Dynamic-Q algorithm² for constrained problems were developed and tested. These methods compare well with conjugate gradient, and sequential quadratic programming methods respectively, exhibiting robustness and efficiency when applied to a number of test

OPTIMAL DIMENSIONAL SYNTHESIS OF PLANAR PARALLEL MANIPULATORS WITH RESPECT TO WORKSPACES

by

Alexander Morrison Hay

Promoter: **Professor J.A. Snyman**

Department of Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering

Degree: *Philosophiae Doctor* (Mechanical Engineering)

Parallel manipulators have attracted increasing interest from researchers over the past couple of decades. These manipulators consist of a moving platform, connected to a fixed base by means of a number of separate kinematic chains, placed in parallel. Due to this particular architecture, parallel manipulators possess a number of advantages over traditional serial manipulators. Some of the disadvantages of parallel manipulators, however, are their limited workspaces and nonlinear behavior throughout their workspaces. As a result, development of design methodologies for such manipulators is an important issue in order to ensure performance to their full potential. The methodologies developed in this study are based on the use of numerical optimization techniques.



The development of appropriate design methodologies in this study required three separate issues to be addressed. The first of these was the development, testing and selection of *numerical optimization* algorithms suitable for the solution of the practical optimization problems encountered. Two optimization algorithms, the spherical quadratic steepest descent (SQSD) algorithm¹ for unconstrained problems, and the Dynamic-Q algorithm² for constrained problems were developed and tested. These methods compare well with conjugate gradient, and sequential quadratic programming methods respectively, exhibiting robustness and efficiency when applied to a number of test problems.

The second topic addressed is the important issue of the determination of manipulator *workspaces*. The existing chord method for workspace determination is refined, and applied for the first time to the determination of new types of manipulator workspaces for a planar three-degree-of-freedom (3-dof) manipulator. The chord method is also modified for the determination of planar *tendon-driven* parallel manipulator workspaces. A new and efficient method for determining tension distributions in over-constrained tendon-driven manipulators is proposed. The chord method is easily applied to the determination of manipulator workspaces, and determines them accurately and efficiently.

The final issue addressed is that of *dimensional synthesis* of manipulators for prescribed and desired workspaces. Various specific methodologies are investigated and applied to a 2-dof parallel manipulator³. The most promising

¹J.A. Snyman and A.M. Hay, The spherical quadratic steepest descent method for unconstrained minimization with no explicit line searches. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 42:169–178, 2001.

²J.A. Snyman and A.M. Hay, The Dynamic-Q optimization method: An alternative to SQP? *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 44:1589–1598, 2002.

³A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, Methodologies for the optimal design of parallel manipulators. Accepted for publication in the *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 2003 (in press).



methodology is then used to optimize a 3-dof planar parallel manipulator⁴⁵, using various strategies for dealing with the extra angular orientational degree of freedom of the moving platform. An alternative approach is used in optimizing a planar tendon-driven parallel manipulator⁶. The numerical optimization algorithm used in all cases is the Dynamic-Q method, which performs efficiently and robustly in determining optimal designs, even when numerical noise is present in the problem. It is believed that the new methodologies presented provide efficient, practical and easily generalizable numerical alternatives to existing methods for the dimensional synthesis of parallel manipulators.

Keyterms: optimization algorithm, parallel manipulator, optimal design, workspace analysis, mechanism synthesis.

Alexander Morrison Hay

Prompter: Professor J.A. Snyman

Departement van Mekaniese en Ligwarkkundige Ingenieurswese

Grad. Philosophiae Doctor (Mekaniese Ingenieurswese)

⁴A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, The optimal synthesis of parallel manipulators for desired workspaces. In J. Lenarčič and F. Thomas, editors, *Advances in Robot Kinematics*, 337–346, Caldes de Malavella, Spain, June 2002. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

⁵A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, The synthesis of parallel manipulators for optimal desired workspaces with respect to the condition number. CD-ROM Proceedings of *ASME 2002 Design Engineering Technical Conferences*, Paper number DETC2002/MECH-34306, Montreal, Canada, October 2002.

⁶A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, Analysis and optimization tools for a reconfigurable tendon-driven manipulator. CD-ROM Proceedings of *CIRP 2nd International Conference on Reconfigurable Manufacturing*, Ann Arbor, MI, August 2003.



SAMEVATTING

Samevatting

OPTIMALE DIMENSIONELE SINTESE VAN IN-VLAK PARALLEL-MANIPULEERDERS MET BETREKKING TOT WERKRUIMTES

deur

Alexander Morrison Hay

Promotor: **Professor J.A. Snyman**

Departement van Meganiese en Lugvaartkundige Ingenieurswese

Graad: *Philosophiae Doctor* (Meganiese Ingenieurswese)

Gedurende die afgelope paar dekades is toenemende belangstelling deur navorsers in parallel-manipuleerders getoon. Hierdie manipuleerders bestaan uit 'n bewegende platform, gekoppel aan 'n vaste basis deur middel van 'n aantal afsonderlike kinematiese kettings, wat in parallel met mekaar geplaas is. As gevolg van hul besondere argitektuur, het parallel-manipuleerders 'n aantal voordele bo tradisionele serie-manipuleerders. Sekere nadele van parallel-manipuleerders is egter, hul beperkte werkruimtes en nie-lineêere gedrag binne die werkruimtes. Gevolglik, is die ontwikkeling van ontwerpmetodologië vir sulke manipuleerders van uiters belang, om te verseker dat hul tot volle potensiaal funksioneer. Die metodologië wat in hierdie studie ontwikkel is, is gebaseer op die gebruik van numeriese optimeringstegniese.



SAMEVATTING

v

Die ontwikkeling van gepaste ontwerp-metodologië in hierdie studie, vereis dat drie verskillende sake aangespreek word. Die eerste van hierdie is die ontwikkeling, toetsing en seleksie van numeriese optimerings-algoritmes wat geskik is vir die oplos van die praktiese optimeringsprobleme wat in dié studie voorkom. Twee optimerings-algoritmes, die sferiese kwadratiese steilste daling (SQSD) algoritme¹ vir onbegrensde probleme, en die Dynamic-Q algoritme² vir begrensde probleme, is ontwikkel en getoets. Hierdie metodes vergelyk onderskeidelik goed met die toegevoegde gradiënt en agtereenvolgende kwadratiese programmerings (SQP) metodes.

Die tweede belangrike onderwerp wat aangespreek word is die bepaling van manipuleerder werkruimtes. Die bestaande koord-metode vir werkruimte-bepaling is verfynd, en vir die eerste keer toegepas in die bepaling van nuwe tipes werkruimtes van 'n in-vlak manipuleerder met 3-vryheidsgrade. Die koord-metode is ook aangepas vir die bepaling van die werkruimtes van 'n in-vlak tendon-aangedrewe parallel-manipuleerder. Die toepassing van die koord-metode lei met gemak tot die doeltreffende en akkurate bepaling van hierdie werkruimtes.

Die finale saak wat bestudeer word is die dimensionele sintese van manipuleerders vir voorgeskrewe en verlangde werkruimtes. Verskeie spesifieke metodologië word ondersoek en toegepas op 'n 2-vryheidsgrade parallel-manipuleerder³. Vervolgens is die mees belowende metodologie gebruik in die op-

¹J.A. Snyman and A.M. Hay, The spherical quadratic steepest descent method for unconstrained minimization with no explicit line searches. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 42:169–178, 2001.

²J.A. Snyman and A.M. Hay, The Dynamic-Q optimization method: An alternative to SQP? *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 44:1589–1598, 2002.

³A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, Methodologies for the optimal design of parallel manipulators. Accepted for publication in the *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, 2003 (in press).



timering van 'n 3-vryheidsgrade in-vlak parallel-manipuleerder⁴⁵, waar verskeie strategieë gebruik is om die addisionele hoek-orientasie-vryheidsgraad te hanteer. 'n Alternatiewe benadering is gevolg in die optimering van die tendon-aangedrewe in-vlak parallel-manipuleerder⁶. In al die gevalle is die Dynamic-Q numeriese optimerings-algoritme gebruik. Dié metode is doeltreffend en betroubaar, selfs wanneer numeriese geraas in die probleem teenwoordig is. Die vertroue is dat die nuwe metodologie wat hier aangebied word, doeltreffende, praktiese en maklik veralgemeende numeriese alternatiewe tot bestaande metodes vir dimensionele sintese van parallel-manipuleerders, verteenwoordig.

Sleutelterme: optimerings-algoritme, parallel-manipuleerder, optimale ontwerp, werkruimte-analise, meganisme-sintese

⁴A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, The optimal synthesis of parallel manipulators for desired workspaces. In J. Lenarčič and F. Thomas, editors, *Advances in Robot Kinematics*, 337–346, Caldes de Malavella, Spain, June 2002. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

⁵A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, The synthesis of parallel manipulators for optimal desired workspaces with respect to the condition number. CD-ROM Proceedings of *ASME 2002 Design Engineering Technical Conferences*, Paper number DETC2002/MECH-34306, Montreal, Canada, October 2002.

⁶A.M. Hay and J.A. Snyman, Analysis and optimization tools for a reconfigurable tendon-driven manipulator. CD-ROM Proceedings of *CIRP 2nd International Conference on Reconfigurable Manufacturing*, Ann Arbor, MI, August 2003.



Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Prof. Jan de Wit for his guidance, wisdom and the many things learnt from him; which have not only been restricted to the subjects of optimization and parallel manipulation. It has been a privilege to work with such an excellent teacher and researcher.

I would like to thank my family for their constant and generous financial support, without which I could not have pursued my academic interests. Assistance was also gratefully received from the National Research Foundation and the Mellon Foundation.



Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Prof. Jan for his guidance, wisdom and the many things learnt from him, which have not only been restricted to the subjects of optimization and parallel manipulators. It has been a privilege to work with such an excellent mentor and researcher.

I would like to thank my parents for their encouragement and generous financial support, without which I could not have pursued my academic interests. Assistance was also gratefully received from the National Research Foundation and the Mellon Foundation.

1	Introduction: Overview of parallel manipulators and literature review	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Brief history of parallel manipulator development	3
1.3	Workspace determination of parallel manipulators	8
1.3.1	Classification of workspace types	8
1.3.2	Methods for workspace determination	10
1.4	Optimal design of parallel manipulators	16
1.4.1	Optimization of performance	17



Contents

1.4.2	Workspace synthesis	20
1.5	Numerical optimization methods	22
1.5.1	Deterministic methods	22
1.5.2	Stochastic methods	25
1.6	Motivating for the study	26
1.6.1	Optimization of parallel manipulators	26
1.6.2	The need for new methodologies	i
1.6.3	Objectives of this study	30
	Summary	i
	Samevatting	iv
	Acknowledgements	viii
	Nomenclature	xxiv
1	Introduction: Overview of parallel manipulators and literature review	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Brief history of parallel manipulator development	3
1.3	Workspace determination of parallel manipulators	6
1.3.1	Classification of workspace types	8
1.3.2	Methods for workspace determination	10
1.4	Optimal design of parallel manipulators	16
1.4.1	Optimization of performance	17



1.4.2	Workspace synthesis	20
1.5	Numerical optimization methods	22
1.5.1	Deterministic methods	22
1.5.2	Stochastic methods	25
1.6	Motivation for the study	26
1.6.1	Optimization of parallel manipulators	26
1.6.2	The need for new methodologies	28
1.6.3	Objectives of this study	29
I	OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHMS	31
2	The spherical quadratic steepest descent algorithm	32
2.1	Introduction	32
2.2	The classical steepest descent method	33
2.3	The spherical quadratic steepest descent method	34
2.4	Convergence of the SQSD method	37
2.5	Numerical results and conclusion	40
3	The Dynamic-Q optimization algorithm	46
3.1	Introduction	46
3.2	Sequential quadratic programming methods	47
3.3	The Dynamic-Q method	50



3.4	Numerical results and conclusion	54
II MANIPULATOR OPTIMIZATION 57		
4	Choice of a suitable dimensional synthesis methodology	58
4.1	Introduction	58
4.2	Coordinates and kinematic constraints	59
4.3	The planar two-degree-of-freedom parallel manipulator	60
4.4	Candidate optimization algorithms	62
4.5	Best overall fit to a prescribed workspace	63
4.5.1	Optimization formulation	64
4.5.2	Numerical results	67
4.6	Efficient inclusion of a prescribed workspace	75
4.6.1	Optimization formulation	75
4.6.2	Numerical results	76
4.7	Synthesis with respect to a performance measure	78
4.7.1	Optimization formulation	79
4.7.2	The condition number of the manipulator	81
4.7.3	Numerical results	83
4.8	Conclusion	86
5	The three-degree-of-freedom planar parallel manipulator	88



5.1	Introduction	88
5.2	The three-degree-of-freedom parallel manipulator	89
5.3	The kinematics and condition number of the manipulator	91
5.4	Constant orientation workspace determination	94
5.4.1	Workspace definition	94
5.4.2	Mapping the constant orientation workspace boundary	94
5.4.3	Determination of bifurcation points	96
5.5	Dextrous workspace determination	97
5.5.1	Workspace definitions	98
5.5.2	Mapping the dextrous workspace boundary	100
5.5.3	Determination of bifurcation points	102
5.5.4	Numerical results	105
5.6	Optimization for a single prescribed constant orientation workspace	108
5.6.1	Optimization formulation	108
5.6.2	Numerical results	109
5.7	Optimization for multiple prescribed constant orientation workspaces	112
5.7.1	Optimization formulation	112
5.7.2	Numerical results	113
5.8	Optimization for a prescribed dextrous workspace	116



5.8.1	Optimization formulation	116
5.8.2	Numerical results	117
5.9	Conclusion	120
6	The planar tendon-driven parallel manipulator	121
6.1	Introduction	121
6.2	The tendon-driven parallel manipulator	122
6.2.1	Kinematic analysis	125
6.2.2	Static analysis	127
6.3	Calculation of the cable tensions	127
6.3.1	Minimum norm approach	127
6.3.2	Constrained ℓ_2 -norm approach	128
6.3.3	Constrained ℓ_1 -norm approach	130
6.4	Constant orientation workspace determination	133
6.4.1	Workspace definition	133
6.4.2	Discretization method	134
6.4.3	Chord method	138
6.5	Dextrous workspace determination	144
6.6	Dimensional synthesis for maximal dextrous workspace	146
6.6.1	Optimization formulation	146
6.6.2	Numerical results	147



6.7	Conclusion	151
7	Conclusion	154
7.1	Optimization algorithms	154
7.2	Workspace determination	155
7.3	Dimensional synthesis of manipulators	156
7.4	Recommendations	157
A	Test functions used for SQSD	175
B	The dynamic trajectory optimization algorithm	177
B.1	Background	177
B.2	Basic dynamic model	178
B.3	Basic algorithm for unconstrained problems	179
B.4	Modification for constrained problems	180
C	Review of the chord method for workspace determination	182
C.1	Introduction	182
C.2	A general planar parallel manipulator	183
C.3	Maximal workspace definition	184
C.4	Finding an initial point of the workspace boundary	184
C.5	Basic chord methodology	186
C.6	Determination of bifurcation points	188



D Location of the minimum value of κ^{-1} for the two-dof manipulator	190
E Minimum norm solution of a set of equations	197

List of Figures

1.1 Parallel manipulator publications by year 1953-2002	2
1.2 The spherical parallel mechanism patented by Gosselin	3
1.3 Pollard's spatial industrial robot	4
1.4 The universal tyre-testing machine of Gough	5
1.5 Octahedral hexapod motion simulator by Capod	6
1.6 The Z^2 machining head by DST	7
4.1 The 2-dof parallel manipulator	61
4.2 Prescribed and calculated workspace	66
4.3 Various cases for numerical calculation of workspace area	66
4.4 Prescribed workspace and workspace corresponding to starting design	68
4.5 O synthesis convergence histories from SP1	71
4.6 O synthesis convergence histories from SP2	71
4.7 O synthesis convergence histories from SP3	72
4.8 O synthesis convergence histories from SP4	73



List of Figures

4.5	O synthesis workspaces corresponding to optimal designs	71
4.6	B synthesis workspaces corresponding to optimal designs	77
4.7	E synthesis convergence histories	77
4.8	F synthesis convergence histories	77
1.1	Parallel manipulator publications by year 1955-2002	2
1.2	The spherical parallel mechanism patented by Gwinnett	3
1.3	Pollard's spatial industrial robot	4
1.4	The universal tyre-testing machine of Gough	5
1.5	Octahedral hexapod motion simulator by Cappel	7
1.6	The Z^3 machining head by DST	7
4.1	The 2-dof parallel manipulator	61
4.2	Prescribed and calculated workspaces	65
4.3	Various cases for numerical calculation of workspace areas	66
4.4	Prescribed workspace and workspaces corresponding to starting designs	69
4.5	O synthesis convergence histories from SP1	71
4.6	O synthesis convergence histories from SP2	71
4.7	O synthesis convergence histories from SP3	72
4.8	O synthesis convergence histories from SP4	72



4.9	O synthesis workspaces corresponding to optimal designs . . .	74
4.10	E synthesis workspaces corresponding to optimal designs . . .	77
4.11	E synthesis convergence histories	77
4.12	P synthesis (a) prescribed workspaces P1-P3, manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the starting design and (b) prescribed workspace P1 and corresponding optimal manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours	85
4.13	P synthesis manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the optimal design for prescribed workspaces (a) P2 and (b) P3	85
4.14	P synthesis convergence histories for (a) P1, (b) P2, and (c) P3	86
5.1	The 3-dof parallel manipulator	90
5.2	The importance of mapping bifurcation points	97
5.3	Finding an initial point on the dextrous workspace boundary .	101
5.4	Dextrous workspaces of M1	106
5.5	Dextrous workspaces of M2	106
5.6	Dextrous workspaces of M3	107
5.7	SO synthesis (a) prescribed workspaces P1-P3, manipulator workspace and corresponding κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the starting design and (b) prescribed workspace P1 and corresponding optimal manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours .	111
5.8	SO synthesis manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the optimal design for prescribed workspaces (a) P2 and (b) P3	111



5.9 SO synthesis convergence histories for (a) P1, (b) P2 and (c) P3 112

5.10 MO synthesis prescribed workspaces P1-P3 and manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the starting design 114

5.11 MO synthesis manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the optimal design for prescribed workspace P1 . 115

5.12 MO synthesis manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the optimal design for prescribed workspace P2 . 115

5.13 MO synthesis manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the optimal design for prescribed workspace P3 . 115

5.14 MO synthesis convergence histories for (a) P1, (b) P2 and (c) P3 116

5.15 D synthesis (a) prescribed workspaces P1-P3, manipulator workspace and corresponding κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the starting design and (b) prescribed workspace P1 and corresponding optimal manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours . 118

5.16 D synthesis manipulator workspace and κ^{-1} contours corresponding to the optimal design for prescribed workspaces (a) P2 and (b) P3 118

5.17 D synthesis convergence histories for (a) P1, (b) P2 and (c) P3 119

6.1 Planar tendon-driven manipulator definitions 123

6.2 The planar tendon-driven manipulator 124

6.3 Comparison of workspaces obtained with cable forces calculated using the minimum norm and constrained ℓ_2 -norm approaches 130



6.4 Workspaces of the 3-cable TDPM determined using the discretization method 136

6.5 Workspaces of the 4-cable TDPM determined using the discretization method 137

6.6 (a) Workspace of a 4-cable manipulator and (b) cable tensions along a section through the workspace 140

6.7 Determination of bifurcation points 142

6.8 Workspaces of the 3-cable TDPM determined using the chord method 144

6.9 Workspaces of the 4-cable TDPM determined using the chord method 145

6.10 3-cable TDPM (a) starting and (b) optimized design for L1 (R3) 149

6.11 3-cable TDPM (a) starting and (b) optimized design for L2 (R3) 150

6.12 3-cable TDPM (a) starting and (b) optimized design for L3 (R1) 150

6.13 4-cable TDPM (a) starting and (b) optimized design for L1 (R3) 152

6.14 4-cable TDPM (a) starting and (b) optimized design for L2 (R2) 152

6.15 4-cable TDPM (a) starting and (b) optimized design for L3 (R1) 153

C.1 A general planar parallel manipulator 183

C.2 Finding an initial point on the maximal workspace boundary . 185

C.3 The chord methodology 187

D.1 Solutions to $\frac{\partial \kappa^{-1}}{\partial x} = 0$ 194



D.2 Solutions to $\frac{\partial \kappa^{-1}}{\partial y} = 0$ 195

List of Tables

2.1	Performance of the SQSD and SD algorithms	42
2.2	Performance of the FR and PR algorithms	43
3.1	Performance of the Dynamic-Q and SQP optimization algorithms	55
4.1	Parameters specifying the prescribed workspace for O synthesis	63
4.2	O synthesis starting designs	68
4.3	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP1	69
4.4	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP2	70
4.5	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP3	70
4.6	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP4	70
4.7	E synthesis solutions	70
4.8	Parameters specifying prescribed workspace P3	80
4.9	P synthesis solutions	86
5.1	Geometric parameters for manipulator designs M1-M3	105



List of Tables

5.2	Performance of chord method for dynamic workspace determination	107
5.3	SD synthesis solutions	110
5.4	MO synthesis solutions	114
5.5	MO synthesis solutions	119
6.1	TDPM moving platform cable attachment points	124
2.1	Performance of the SQSD and SD algorithms	42
2.2	Performance of the FR and PR algorithms	43
3.1	Performance of the Dynamic-Q and SQP optimization algorithms	55
4.1	Parameters specifying the prescribed workspace for O synthesis	68
4.2	O synthesis starting designs	68
4.3	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP1	69
4.4	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP2	70
4.5	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP3	70
4.6	O synthesis solutions obtained from SP4	70
4.7	E synthesis solutions	76
4.8	Parameters specifying prescribed workspace P3	84
4.9	P synthesis solutions	86
5.1	Geometric parameters for manipulator designs M1-M3	105



5.2	Performance of chord method for dextrous workspace determination	107
5.3	SO synthesis solutions	110
5.4	MO synthesis solutions	114
5.5	D synthesis solutions	119
6.1	TDPM moving platform cable attachment points	124
6.2	Geometrical parameters for the 3 and 4-cable TDPM	125
6.3	Load conditions L1-L3	125
6.4	Numerical values of limits used in calculating TDPM workspaces	134
6.5	3-cable TDPM optimized designs for L1	149
6.6	3-cable TDPM optimized designs for L2	149
6.7	3-cable TDPM optimized designs for L3	149
6.8	4-cable TDPM optimized designs for L1	151
6.9	4-cable TDPM optimized designs for L2	151
6.10	4-cable TDPM optimized designs for L3	151



List of Algorithms

2.1	SD algorithm	33
2.2	SQSD algorithm	36
3.1	Simple SQP algorithm	48
3.2	Dynamic-Q algorithm	53
5.1	Dextrous workspace determination	104
6.1	Tension limit algorithm	132
6.2	Discretization algorithm	135
6.3	Bisection algorithm	141

\mathbf{y}	Manipulator input coordinates
\mathbf{w}	Manipulator intermediate coordinates
\mathbf{y}^*	Moving platform orientation
$W^*(\mathbf{y}^*)$	Constant (rigid) orientation workspace
W^*	Maximal workspace
$W^*(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$	Distance workspace
$W^*(\mathbf{y}^*)$	Orientation workspace
∂W	Workspace boundary
\mathbf{x}	Vector of design variables
f	Objective function
\mathbf{g}	Vector of inequality constraints
\mathbf{h}	Vector of equality constraints
ϵ_s	Convergence tolerance on step size
ϵ_g	Convergence tolerance on gradient value
ϵ_f	Convergence tolerance on function value



Nomenclature

In this work vectors will be denoted in bold font. The following notation will be used:

\mathbb{R}^n	n -dimensional Euclidean (real) space
x, y, z	Cartesian reference frame axes
\mathbf{q}	Manipulator generalized coordinates
\mathbf{u}	Manipulator output coordinates
\mathbf{v}	Manipulator input coordinates
\mathbf{w}	Manipulator intermediate coordinates
ϕ_P	Moving platform orientation
$W^C[\phi^{\text{fix}}]$	Constant [angular] orientation workspace
W^M	Maximal workspace
$W^D[\phi^{\text{min}}, \phi^{\text{max}}]$	Dextrous workspace
$W^O[\mathbf{u}^{\text{fix}}]$	Orientation workspace
∂W	Workspace boundary
\mathbf{x}	Vector of design variables
f	Objective function
\mathbf{g}	Vector of inequality constraints
\mathbf{h}	Vector of equality constraints
ε_x	Convergence tolerance on step size
ε_g	Convergence tolerance on gradient value
ε_f	Convergence tolerance on function value



ρ	Move limit for SQSD and Dynamic-Q algorithms
Γ	Finite difference interval
d	Chord length for chord workspace determination method
\mathbf{d}	Vector of manipulator design variables
\mathbf{b}^i	Point on workspace boundary
\mathbf{B}^j	Bifurcation point on workspace boundary
W_p	Prescribed workspace
W_c	Calculated workspace
δW_p	The part of workspace W_p not intersecting W_c
δW_c	The part of workspace W_c not intersecting W_p
\mathbf{O}'	Position of local coordinate system $x' - y'$
(β_p, r_p)	Polar coordinate description of prescribed workspace
(β_c, r_c)	Polar coordinate description of calculated workspace
l_i	Length of manipulator actuator (leg) i
\mathbf{J}	Manipulator Jacobian matrix
κ	Condition number of the Jacobian matrix
t_i	Tension in tendon i
\mathbf{S}	Manipulator structure matrix
\mathbf{T}	Transformation matrix from local to global coordinate systems
\mathbf{f}^{Ci}	Force transferred to the moving platform by tendon i
ℓ^i	Displacement vector along tendon i
\mathbf{f}^P	External load applied to the moving platform
τ^P	External torque applied to the moving platform

Parallel manipulators have been increasingly studied and developed over the last couple of decades (Marras [2], Dasgupta and Mandyam [3]). From both a theoretical viewpoint as well as for practical applications, Parallel manipulators are certainly not a new discovery, however advances in computer technology and development of sophisticated control techniques, amongst other factors, have allowed for the more recent practical implementation of