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Abstract

The middle-size league soccer competition is an important RoboCup event designed to promote advancements in Artificial Intelligence (AI) and robotics. In recent years, soccer robots using a dribbling mechanism, through which the ball is controlled using two driving rollers, have been adopted by teams worldwide. A survey conducted during the 2017 World Cup in Nagoya revealed that the teams determined their roller arrangements heuristically without the use of a formal mathematical process. In this study, we focus on sphere slip speed to develop a mathematical model for sphere rotational motion, allowing for slip. Using this framework, we derived the relationship between the sphere slip and mobile speeds and evaluated the roller arrangements used by the participating teams.

1. Introduction

RoboCup is an international project that promotes innovation in Artificial Intelligence (AI), robotics, and related domains. It represents an attempt to develop AI and autonomous robotics research by providing a fundamental problem that can be solved by integrating a wide range of technologies. In particular, the middle-size league soccer competition is a RoboCup event providing a dynamical environment in which many robots cooperate with humans within the same space.

Various developments have been made in the RoboCup middle-size league soccer robot [1,2]. These robots generally have a mechanism similar to that of an omnidirectional movement mechanism using three-omni wheels [3] or that using four-omni wheels [4] and so on, and in recent years, this mechanism is involved in controlling the rotation of a ball. The ball holding mechanism is used.

In the past, several teams have equipped their robots such as arm type [5,6], bar type [7,8] and single-wheel type [9] with ball dribbling mechanisms for controlling the rotation of the ball. To be useful in soccer play, the dribbling performance of such mechanisms must be skillful. However, they cannot grasp a ball and control. Recently, dribbling devices use rollers to grasp the upper half of the ball to enable them to maintain a pull on it while driving in reverse. Friction is generated between the ball and rollers by a spring mounted on a supporting lever. To maintain dribbling, it is essential that the roller and ball rotate with approximately the same speed and that the ball moves in the same direction as the robot. Many robots, such as that deployed by the Turtles team [10], rely on ball handling force and use a roller arrangement in which there is no slip between the roller and ball. To determine their roller arrangement, the Turtles rely on heuristic measures and experimental results. Although slip causes loss of speed in a moving sphere, the resulting friction can improve the ball holding power and rotational stability. Accordingly, slip is an important factor.

The authors conducted an investigation of the ball dribbling mechanisms employed by the teams at the 2017 middle-size league soccer competition in Nagoya, Japan. Table 1 lists our survey results, including team name and roller type, shape, and arrangement angle. The four shapes [□□□□ in the "Symbol" column indicate the roller angles used by the respective teams. Figure 1 shows the rotational axis, ball velocity, and roller velocity in reverse motion of a dual-roller arrangement. The RV-Infinity [11] roller arrangement in Table 1 involves no slip (see Figure 1a) because the roller velocity corresponds to the ball velocity; i.e., the rollers' rotational axes are aligned on a plane that includes the origin of the ball's sphere [12,13]. In another approach, CAMBADA avoids slippage through the use of unconstrained rollers (omni-rollers).

Other teams, namely the Turtles [10], Falcons, Musashi150 [14], NuBot [15], and Water, have adopted roller arrangements that allow for slip to occur (see Figure 1b) through a differential between roller and ball velocity. Based on analysis of sphere rotational motion in which slip is allowed, we developed a sphere kinematics model in which dual-constraint rollers allow for slipping [16].

In this study, we validated the model introduced in Kimura et al. [16] and evaluated the roller arrangements used by the competition teams from the standpoint of sphere speed, efficiency, and sphere slip speed (ball-holding power).
The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a sphere kinematics model that allows for slipping. In Section 3, we validated the model introduced in Kimura et al. [16] and theoretical formula of sphere slip velocity vector. In Section 4, we considered the distribution of slip velocity vector and the roller arrangement of a ball dribbling mechanism based on the results of a robotic experiment. Finally, in Section 5, we present a summary and discuss future research.

\section{The Slip Velocity Vector of the Sphere}

We quantify the slip between the sphere and roller.

As shown in Figure 2a, the center \( O \) of a sphere with radius \( r \) is fixed as the origin of the coordinate system \( \Sigma = xyz \). The \( i \)-th constraint roller is in point contact with the sphere at a position vector \( P_i \), and is arranged such that the center of mass of the roller \( P_a, P_e \) and \( O \) are on the same line. \( \omega \) denotes the angular velocity vector of the sphere. \( \eta_i \) denotes the unit vector along the rotational axis of constraint roller. \( v \) the denotes peripheral speed of the constraint roller. \( \alpha \) \((-90^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 90^\circ)\) denotes roller arrangement angle between \( \eta_i \) and \( \text{span}[P_i, P_j] \) which has unit normal vector \( e \). The great circle \( C_e \) passes thorough \( P_i \) and \( P_j \), are on the sphere. Normal orthogonal base \( \{X_i, e\} \) exist on the tangent plane \( \text{span}[X_i, e] \) at the \( P_i \) (see Figure 2b and c). \( \mathbf{V}^P \) and \( \mathbf{V}^R \) are sphere’s rotational speed and roller’s rotational speed at \( P_i \), respectively. The slip velocity of sphere \( \zeta_i \) can be represented as difference between \( \mathbf{V}^P \) and \( \mathbf{V}^R \). \( \zeta_i \) can be represented as \( S_iX_i + T_i e \) (linear combination of \( X_i \) and \( e \)) and the coefficients \( S_i \) and \( T_i \) can be represented as Equations (1)–(3).

\[
S_i = \langle \zeta_i, X_i \rangle \quad \text{(1)}
\]

\section{Verification of Theoretical Formula}

In this chapter, we verified theoretical formulas including sphere kinematic (Section 3.1) and sphere slip velocity vector (Section 3.2) in reverse motion.

As shown in Figure 3, the conditions are given as follows: \( \theta_{i1} = 215^\circ, \theta_{i2} = 325^\circ, \theta_{i3} = 60^\circ, r = 0.1 \text{ (m)}, \alpha = \alpha, \alpha = -\alpha \) (symmetry roller arrangement). Five experiments were conducted, each at the same four different degrees angles (\( \alpha = 0^\circ, 10^\circ, 20^\circ, 30^\circ \)).

\subsection{Verification of Kinematics}

As shown in Table 2, \( ||V||, \phi \) and \( \rho \) are values calculated from \( v_i, v_j = -0.91 \text{ (m/s)} \) by Equations (11) and (14) refer to Kimura et al. [16]. \( v_i^P, v_j^P \) are theoretical values (controlled values which have target values \( v_i, v_j = -0.91 \text{ (m/s)} \)). \( ||V||, \phi_e \) and \( \rho_e \) are theoretical values calculated from \( v_i^P, v_j^P \) by Equations (11) and (14) refer to Kimura et al. [16]. \( ||V||, \phi_e \) and \( \rho_e \) are experimental values measured from

\[
T_i = \langle \zeta_i, e \rangle = 0 \text{ (for all } v_i, v_j \rangle \quad \text{(2)}
\]

\[
\zeta_i = \mathbf{V}^P_i - \mathbf{V}^R_i = \omega \times P_i - v_ie \quad \text{(3)}
\]
encoder. $v_1^e$, $v_2^e$ are experimental values calculated from $||v||$, $\varphi$, and $\rho$ by Equation (22) refer to Kimura et al. [16].

### 3.1.1. Inverse kinematics

Figures 4–7 exhibit the theoretical data $v_1^m$, $v_2^m$ and experimental data $v_1'$, $v_2'$. And, Tables 3–6 show the absolute mean error calculated in interval of 7–8 (s). We consider comparison between $v_1^m$, $v_2^m$ and $v_1^e$, $v_2^e$ in detail, see below.

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 0^\circ$, $v_1^e$ and $v_2^e$ are close to $v_1^m$ and $v_2^m$, respectively (see Figure 4). As shown in Table 3, $|v_1^m - v_1'|$ is almost <0.04 (m/s), $|v_2^m - v_2'|$ is <0.04 (m/s).

![Figure 4](image1.png) Comparison theoretical value $v_1^m$ and experimental value in $\alpha = 0^\circ$.

![Figure 5](image2.png) Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 10^\circ$.

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 10^\circ$, $v_1^e$ and $v_2^e$ are close to $v_1^m$ and $v_2^m$, respectively (see Figure 5). As shown in Table 4, $|v_1^m - v_1'|$ is almost <0.04 (m/s), $|v_2^m - v_2'|$ is <0.04 (m/s).

![Figure 6](image3.png) Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 20^\circ$.

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 20^\circ$, $v_1^e$ and $v_2^e$ are close to $v_1^m$ and $v_2^m$, respectively (see Figure 6). As shown in Table 5, $|v_1^m - v_1'|$ is <0.09 (m/s), $|v_2^m - v_2'|$ is <0.06 (m/s).

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 30^\circ$, the limitations of the motor drivers and intense dynamical friction that caused heat between the roller surfaces and the sphere obliged us to cease the second and subsequent experiments. However, $||v||$, $\varphi$, and $\rho$ are partially close to $||v||$, $\varphi$ and $\rho$, respectively (see Figure 7). And, $|v_1^m - v_1'|$ is 0.08 (m/s), $|v_2^m - v_2'|$ is 0.05 (m/s) (see Table 6).

![Figure 7](image4.png) Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 30^\circ$.

Thus, inverse kinematics is validated.
3.1.2. Forward kinematics

Figures 8–11 exhibit the theoretical data $||V||_m$, $\phi_m$, $\rho_m$ and experimental data $||V||_e$, $\phi_e$, $\rho_e$. And, Tables 7–10 show the absolute mean error calculated in interval of 7–8 (s). We consider comparison between $||V||_m$, $\phi_m$, $\rho_m$ and $||V||_e$, $\phi_e$, $\rho_e$, respectively in detail, see below.

Figure 8  Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 0^\circ$. (a) Sphere mobile speed. (b) Sphere direction and angle of sphere rotational axis.

Figure 9  Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 10^\circ$. (a) Sphere mobile speed. (b) Sphere direction and angle of sphere rotational axis.

Figure 10  Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 20^\circ$. (a) Sphere mobile speed. (b) Sphere direction and angle of sphere rotational axis.

Figure 11  Comparison theoretical value and experimental value in $\alpha = 30^\circ$. (a) Sphere mobile speed. (b) Sphere direction and angle of sphere rotational axis.

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 0^\circ$, $||V||_m$, $\phi_m$ and $\rho_m$ are close to $||V||_e$, $\phi_e$ and $\rho_e$, respectively (see Figure 8). As shown in Table 7, $||V||_m - ||V||_e$ is <0.06 (m/s), $|\phi_m - \phi_e|$ is <3.9 (°), and $|\rho_m - \rho_e|$ is <6.3 (°).

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 10^\circ$, $||V||_m$, $\phi_m$ and $\rho_m$ are close to $||V||_e$, $\phi_e$ and $\rho_e$ (see Figure 9). As shown in Table 8, $||V||_m - ||V||_e$ is <0.04 (m/s), $|\phi_m - \phi_e|$ is <3.1 (°), and $|\rho_m - \rho_e|$ is <3.9 (°).
Table 7 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 0^\circ$

| $\frac{||V_i||_m - ||V_i||_e}{V_i}$ (m/s) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| $|\varphi_m - \varphi_i|$ (°) | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 0.8 |
| $|\rho_m - \rho_i|$ (°) | 0.7 | 0.9 | 6.3 | 5.3 | 0.9 |

Table 8 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 10^\circ$

| $\frac{||V_i||_m - ||V_i||_e}{V_i}$ (m/s) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| $|\varphi_m - \varphi_i|$ (°) | 1.2 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| $|\rho_m - \rho_i|$ (°) | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 |

Table 9 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 20^\circ$

| $\frac{||V_i||_m - ||V_i||_e}{V_i}$ (m/s) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| $|\varphi_m - \varphi_i|$ (°) | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 4.3 |
| $|\rho_m - \rho_i|$ (°) | 1.9 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |

Table 10 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 30^\circ$

| $\frac{||V_i||_m - ||V_i||_e}{V_i}$ (m/s) | 1 |
|---------------------------------|---|
| $|\varphi_m - \varphi_i|$ (°) | 9.7 |
| $|\rho_m - \rho_i|$ (°) | 5.1 |

Table 11 Values calculated from $v_i, v_j = -0.91$ (m/s)

| $\alpha$ | 0° | 10° | 20° | 30° |
|----------|----|-----|-----|-----|
| $S_i$ (m/s) | 0 | -0.16 | -0.31 | -0.45 |
| $T_i$ (m/s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $S_j$ (m/s) | 0 | 0.16 | 0.31 | 0.45 |
| $T_j$ (m/s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 20^\circ$, $||V_i||, \varphi_i$ and $\rho_i$ are close to $||V_i||_m, \varphi_m$ and $\rho_m$, respectively (see Figure 10). As shown in Table 9, $||V_i||_m - ||V_i||$ is <0.07 (m/s), $|\varphi_m - \varphi_i|$ is <4.3 (°), and $|\rho_m - \rho_i|$ is <21 (°).

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 30^\circ$, the data have intense behavior due to limitations of the motor drivers. However, $||V_i||, \varphi_i$ and $\rho_i$ are partially close to $||V_i||_m, \varphi_m$ and $\rho_m$, respectively (see Figure 11). And, $||V_i||_m - ||V_i||$ is 0.04 (m/s), $|\varphi_m - \varphi_i|$ is 9.7 (°), and $|\rho_m - \rho_i|$ is 51 (°) (see Table 10).

Thus, forward kinematics is validated.

### 3.2. Consideration of Slip Velocity Vector

As shown in Table 11, $S_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) are values calculated from $v_i, v_j = -0.91$ (m/s) by Equation (1). $S_i^m$ ($i = 1, 2$) are theoretical values calculated from $V_i^m$ and $V_j^m$ by Equation (1). $S_i^e$ and $T_i^e$ ($i = 1, 2$) are experimental values calculated from $||V||, \varphi, \rho, V_i^e$ and $V_j^e$ by Equations (1) and (2). Using Equation (2) as $v_i = v_i^m (i = 1, 2)$, we give $T_i^m = 0$ ($i = 1, 2$). And, as $v_i = v_i^e (i = 1, 2)$, we give $T_i^e = 0$ ($i = 1, 2$). Thus, $||v_i^m - v_i^e|| = 0$ and, $\zeta_i$ and $\zeta_j$ are corresponding to tangent vectors on a great circle $C_i$. Figures 12–15 exhibit the theoretical data $S_i^m$ ($i = 1, 2$) and experimental data $S_i^e$ ($i = 1, 2$). And, Tables 12–15 show the absolute mean error [calculated in interval of 7–8 (s)]. We consider comparison between $S_i^m$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $S_i^e$ ($i = 1, 2$) in detail, see below.
In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 0^\circ$, $S^1_1$ and $S^1_2$ are close to $S^0_1$ and $S^0_2$, respectively (see Figure 12). As shown in Table 12, $\|S^0_1 - S^1_1\|$ is <0.04 (m/s) and $\|S^0_2 - S^1_2\|$ is <0.04 (m/s).

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 10^\circ$, $S^1_1$ and $S^1_2$ are close to $S^0_1$ and $S^0_2$, respectively (see Figure 13). As shown in Table 13, $\|S^0_1 - S^1_1\|$ is <0.04 (m/s) and $\|S^0_2 - S^1_2\|$ is <0.04 (m/s).

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 20^\circ$, $S^1_1$ and $S^1_2$ are close to $S^0_1$ and $S^0_2$, respectively (see Figure 14). As shown in Table 14, $\|S^0_1 - S^1_1\|$ is <0.09 (m/s) and $\|S^0_2 - S^1_2\|$ is <0.05 (m/s).

In the evaluation case of $\alpha = 30^\circ$, the data have intense behavior due to limitations of the motor drivers. However, $S^1_1$ and $S^1_2$ are partially close to $S^0_1$ and $S^0_2$, respectively (see Figure 15). And, $\|S^0_1 - S^1_1\|$ is 0.13 (m/s) and $\|S^0_2 - S^1_2\|$ is 0.08 (m/s) (see Table 15).

Thus, Equations (1)–(3) is validated by experiment.

Table 12 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 0^\circ$

|        | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| $S^0_1 - S^1_1$ (m/s) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| $S^0_2 - S^1_2$ (m/s) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.01 |

Table 13 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 10^\circ$

|        | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| $S^0_1 - S^1_1$ (m/s) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| $S^0_2 - S^1_2$ (m/s) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 |

Table 14 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 20^\circ$

|        | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| $S^0_1 - S^1_1$ (m/s) | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.09 |
| $S^0_2 - S^1_2$ (m/s) | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.05 |

Table 15 Absolute mean error [7–8 (s)] in $\alpha = 30^\circ$

|        | 1    |
|--------|------|
| $S^0_2 - S^1_1$ (m/s) | 0.13  |
| $S^1_1 - S^0_1$ (m/s) | 0.08  |

### 4. CONSIDERATION OF WORLD TEAMS’ ROLLERS ARRANGEMENT

Figure 16 shows the relationship between the sphere slip speed and sphere mobile speed. The horizontal and vertical axes show $S^i_1$ (i = 1, 2) and $\|V\|$, respectively.

The configurations [●●] (left-side roller) and [◆◆◆] (right-side roller) indicate the coordinates $S^i_1$, $\|V\|$, and $S^i_2$, $\|V\|$, respectively, corresponding to the experimental mean values calculated over intervals of 7–8 (s).

#### 4.1. Vertical Coordinate (Mobile Speed)

For [●●], $\|V\|$ is close to 0.89 (m/s), and [◆◆◆] are close to 0.98 (m/s). The corresponding distributions of $\|V\|$ for [●●] are within the range from 0.86 to 0.92 (m/s) and [◆◆◆] are close to 0.66 (m/s). Thus, [●●] and [◆◆◆] have the highest spherical speed efficiencies.

#### 4.2. Horizontal Coordinate (Sphere Slip Speed)

For [●●], the values of $S^0_1$ and $S^0_2$ are generally distributed within the range from 0.01 to 0.03 (m/s). The corresponding distributions of $S^0_1$ and $S^0_2$ for [●●], [■•], and [◆◆] are mostly within the ranges from 0.13 to 0.18 (m/s), 0.23 to 0.34 (m/s), and 0.24 to 0.45 (m/s), respectively.

Under this kinematics model, it assumed that the roller and sphere contact at a single point. In reality, of course, they would contact along a surface, causing, $\zeta$ to generate a frictional force $F_i$ in opposition to $\zeta$. Referring to consideration, in which $\zeta$ and $\zeta_2$ are aligned back-to-back along a great circle, the frictional forces $F_1$ and $F_2$ generated by $\zeta$ and $\zeta_2$, respectively, would be in and are opposite directions and face-to-face (from Section 3 refer to Kimura et al. [16]).

For [■•] and [◆◆], there is an above-moderate frictional force. The [●●] and [◆◆◆] configurations adopted by RV-infinity, the Turtles, and the Falcons have the highest spherical speed efficiencies. However, [●●], the RV-infinity roller configuration, has nearly no friction $\|S^1_1\|$ and $\|S^1_2\|$ are close to 0 (m/s). By contrast, the configuration [◆◆◆] adopted by the Turtles and Falcons

![Figure 16](image-url) Relationship between sphere slip speed and sphere mobile speed. (a) Left-side roller. (b) Right-side roller.
has moderate friction \(|\pm| |S|\) and \(|\pm| |S|\) closely distributed within a range from 0.13 to 0.18 (m/s).

Thus, by adopting \([\bullet]\), the Turtles and Falcons have developed roller systems with the optimum arrangement at \(\alpha = 10^\circ\).

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, we verified derive the sphere kinematics that allows for slipping and considered sphere slip velocity vector and evaluated the roller arrangement used by the world teams. As a result, Tech United Turtles and Falcons have adopted optimum roller arrangement in teams of mobile speed efficiency.

In future studies, by applying the ball-dribbling mechanism, this model should be verified experimentally.
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