Hierarchical Adaptive Motion Planning with Nonlinear Model Predictive Control for Safety-Critical Collaborative Loco-Manipulation

Mohsen Sombolestan¹ and Quan Nguyen¹

Abstract

As legged robots take on roles in industrial and autonomous construction, collaborative loco-manipulation is crucial for handling large and heavy objects that exceed the capabilities of a single robot. However, ensuring the safety of these multi-robot tasks is essential to prevent accidents and guarantee reliable operation. This paper presents a hierarchical control system for object manipulation using a team of quadrupedal robots. The combination of the motion planner and the decentralized locomotion controller in a hierarchical structure enables safe, adaptive planning for teams in complex scenarios. A high-level nonlinear model predictive control planner generates collision-free paths by incorporating control barrier functions, accounting for static and dynamic obstacles. This process involves calculating contact points and forces while adapting to unknown objects and terrain properties. The decentralized loco-manipulation controller then ensures each robot maintains stable locomotion and manipulation based on the planner's guidance. The effectiveness of our method is carefully examined in simulations under various conditions and validated in real-life setups with robot hardware. By modifying the object's configuration, the robot team can maneuver unknown objects through an environment containing both static and dynamic obstacles. We have made our code publicly available in an open-source repository at https://github.com/DRCL-USC/collaborative_loco_manipulation.

Keywords

Safety-critical Motion Planning, Legged Robots, Collaborative Manipulation, Nonlinear MPC

1 Introduction

As robots are deployed in diverse applications such as industrial facilities and autonomous construction, there will be instances where manipulating objects surpasses the actuation capabilities of a single robot Khatib et al. (1999). When humans face similar challenges, they collaborate to efficiently and reliably move objects too heavy for an individual to handle alone. Multi-agent systems utilizing wheeled robots are the most prevalent method for transporting payloads across well-structured terrain due to their ease of control, efficiency, and adaptable wheel configurations Tallamraju et al. (2019). In realworld applications, collaborative loco-manipulation of large and bulky objects often involves complex maneuvers, increasing the risk of collisions with the environment. When operating near humans, it becomes even more critical to implement safety measures to prevent collisions. We aim to enable legged robot teams to achieve similar collaborative capabilities.

Collaborative object manipulation has been a subject of research since the early developments in robot manipulators Tarn et al. (1986); Khatib (1988) and mobile robots Khatib et al. (1996). Some initial studies also utilized adaptive control for collaborative manipulation in mobile robots, operating without assumptions about the object's mass through the use of a centralized controller Hu et al. (1995); Li et al. (2008). Over time, methods evolved to employ decentralized controllers Liu and Arimoto (1998); Fink et al.



Figure 1. Snapshots of collaborative object manipulation with safety considerations. More results presented in: https://youtu.be/cU_gevkW86I

(2008); Verginis et al. (2017); Culbertson et al. (2021). These techniques typically depend on a rigid connection between objects and robots during manipulation tasks.

¹Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

Corresponding author:

Mohsen Sombolestan, Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, 90089 Email: somboles@usc.edu Additionally, in certain scenarios, it is necessary to measure the manipulators' relative positions from the center of mass (COM) of the object Prattichizzo and Trinkle (2008).

Legged robots are recognized for their rapid movement and ease of maneuvering due to their flexible locomotion capabilities. The progress in model predictive control (MPC) for legged robots Di Carlo et al. (2018); Li and Nguyen (2021) has enabled the development of realtime control systems capable of executing various walking gaits. Most studies on quadruped robots have focused on locomotion Focchi et al. (2017); Bledt et al. (2018) and loco-manipulation by individual robots Chiu et al. (2022); Sleiman et al. (2021); Zimmermann et al. (2021); Rigo et al. (2023); Wolfslag et al. (2020); Ferrolho et al. (2023). In our previous works, we also addressed issues with significant uncertainties in the robot model Sombolestan and Nguyen (2024); Sombolestan et al. (2021), handling objects with unknown properties Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b), and in this work, we aim to extend it for collaborative manipulation by a team of robots.

However, there is limited research on the collaboration among multiple quadruped robots. In scenarios where multiple general-purpose robots are available rather than specialized, larger robots, the collaboration among several quadruped robots can be highly beneficial. These robots can work together to perform tasks beyond the capabilities of a single robot, such as object manipulation in industrial factory locations and last-mile delivery operations. Research has explored using multiple quadruped robots to tow a load with cables toward a target while avoiding obstacles Yang et al. (2022). A recent trend involves using interconnected legged robots for collaborative manipulation with holonomically constant properties defining the configuration setup. For instance, Kim et al. (2023) developed both centralized and distributed MPCs as high-level planners, followed by a distributed whole-body tracking controller that makes two quadruped robots to carry a payload. Another study introduced a passive arm concept to facilitate collaboration between robots and between robots and humans for payload transportation Turrisi et al. (2024). This research area has even expanded to bipedal robots, where researchers designed a decentralized controller using reinforcement learning for multi-biped robot carriers, adaptable to varying numbers of robots Pandit et al. (2024). However, many manipulation tasks, including those mentioned, often require prior knowledge of the manipulated object's properties and the terrain, such as mass, geometry, and friction coefficient.

In our previous work Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023a), a preliminary version of this research was presented, where we introduced collaborative manipulation with a team of quadrupedal robots using quadratic programming (QP)based force distribution but without incorporating safety considerations. In this work, which builds upon our previous work, we address the challenge of manipulating objects with uncertain characteristics to navigate through an environment filled with dynamic and static obstacles to ensure safety and stability throughout the manipulation process. Ensuring safety requires optimizing the path of the manipulated object to avoid collisions with obstacles, as well as preventing collisions between each robot and the obstacles. Our method is scalable to accommodate any number of robots, providing flexibility in operation. Some snapshots demonstrating our results of manipulating an object using two robots in an environment with an obstacle are shown in Fig. 1.

Our method comprises a high-level adaptive motion planner employing Model Predictive Control (MPC) and a loco-manipulation tracking controller. The planner addresses real-world challenges in object manipulation, particularly regarding safety and obstacle avoidance. The safety aspect is guaranteed through control barrier functions integrated into the MPC planner, allowing it to avoid collisions with dynamic obstacles. The system considers not only the potential collisions between the manipulated object and obstacles but also ensures each robot avoids obstacles independently.

Moreover, our approach does not rely on assumptions about object properties such as mass, inertia, and the center of mass (COM) location, nor on terrain properties like the friction coefficient. These factors are managed through our adaptive dynamic formulation, derived from an adaptive law, and stability is guaranteed via a control Lyapunov function. This comprehensive motion planning provides optimal manipulation forces and contact point locations for each robot, enabling safe maneuvering of the manipulated object in the environment with obstacles to reach the target location.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. First, in Sec. 2, we define our problem statement explicitly, outlining all assumptions and requirements. Next, in Sec. 3, we provide the necessary preliminaries to ensure the paper is accessible. Following this, we present an overview of our control system in Sec. 4. In Sec. 5, we explain the component of our proposed motion planner, and in Sec. 6, we elaborate on the formulation of the nonlinear model predictive control for the motion planner. We then present our results, achieved both in simulation and on robot hardware, in Sec. 7. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Sec. 8.

2 Problem Statement

We aim to manipulate a rigid object with unspecified inertia characteristics, including mass (m_b) , body-frame inertia about the center of mass (COM) (I_G) , and the location of the COM (r_p) . Our objective is to control this object using a group of N_r agents, each indexed by $i \in \{1, \ldots, N_r\}$. A visual representation of the object with multiple agents is depicted in Fig. 2. The number of robots involved can vary, as our method allows for the distribution of force among any number of robots.

In this scenario, we assume the object possesses a flat surface suitable for robot contact. Two frames, the world frame W and the body frame B, are associated with the object's COM. A body-fixed point p serves as the reference for all measurements related to the object and can be arbitrarily chosen. Additionally, we have estimates of each corner's location on the object, defining the allowable range of motion for each robot along the object's surface to ensure they do not surpass its boundaries. Moreover, each robot is capable of providing its own state estimation, allowing us to determine the contact point location r_i relative to the reference point p. The robots have freedom of movement along the object's surface, indicating they are not



Figure 2. Schematic of collaborative object manipulation

rigidly attached. Furthermore, we assume negligible friction between the robots and the object at the contact points. Therefore, each robot can only apply a perpendicular force $f_{r,i}$ onto the object's surface (along \hat{n}_i) while undergoing tangential movement d_i along the object surface (along \hat{t}_i). We consider the initial contact point from which each robot starts as the origin of the contact frame (o_i), and the distance d_i is measured from this point. This initial location can be represented as $r_{i,o}$ with respect to the reference point p. Note that all vectors mentioned in Fig. 2, such as $f_{r,i}$, $r_{0,i}$, r_p , \hat{n}_i , and \hat{t}_i , are represented in the body frame B and they are twodimensional vectors.

Now, let us consider the scenario where the robot navigates through an environment containing N_o obstacles, denoted by $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_o\}$. The schematic illustrating multiple agents within this environment alongside multiple obstacles is presented in Fig. 3. Ensuring safety involves optimizing the path of the manipulated object to prevent any collisions between that and the obstacles. Additionally, we must account for the potential collision of each agent with the obstacles. Therefore, for each obstacle, it is necessary to define $N_r + 1$ barrier functions, totaling $N_o(N_r + 1)$, to ensure comprehensive non-collision and safety for the entire system. The specifics of each barrier function's definition will be elaborated upon in Sec. 6.5.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Equation of Motion for a Rigid Object

The equation motion of a rigid body object can be written as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{F} = m_b \boldsymbol{\ddot{x}}_G \tag{1a}$$

$$M_G = R I_G R^T \dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}} + \boldsymbol{\omega} imes (R I_G R^T \boldsymbol{\omega})$$
 (1b)

where \mathbf{R} is the rotation matrix from body frame B to the world frame W, ω is the angular velocity of the object, and $\dot{\omega}$ is the angular acceleration. Since, in our problem, the COM position is unknown, we should derive the equation of motion of the rigid object with respect to the reference point p:

$$F = m_b \ddot{x}_p - m_b (\dot{\omega} \times Rr_p) - m_b \omega \times (\omega \times Rr_p) \quad (2a)$$
$$M_p = RI_p R^T \dot{\omega} + \omega \times (RI_p R^T \omega) - m_b Rr_p \times \ddot{x}_p \quad (2b)$$



Figure 3. Schematic of object manipulation considering the safety Each barrier function *B* specifies the safety requirement for agents or manipulated objects with respect to the obstacles

where F and M_p are the force and moment required for object manipulation, respectively, \ddot{x}_p is the object's linear acceleration at point p, and I_p is the object's moment of inertia with respect to p.

Considering that the object is on the ground and will be manipulated within planar coordinates, we can limit our focus to the planar aspect of the equation of motion. To achieve this, we define the configuration variable $q_b = [x_p, \theta]$, where x_p is the position of reference point p in the world frame and θ represents the object's yaw angle. We also take into account an external wrench f_k and express the equation of motion in a compact form as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{q}_b) \ddot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b + \boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{q}_b, \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b) \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b + \boldsymbol{f}_k \tag{3}$$

(4)

where τ is the wrench applied to the rigid object from a team of robots.

The control barrier functions can benefit from the expression of system dynamics in a control-affine format. Considering $\boldsymbol{x}_b = [\boldsymbol{q}_b, \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b]^T$, then, we have a control-affine system as follow:

 $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_b = f_b(\boldsymbol{x}_b) + q_b(\boldsymbol{x}_b)\boldsymbol{\tau}$

where:

$$f_b(\boldsymbol{x}_b) = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b \\ -\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{q}_b)^{-1}(\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{q}_b, \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b)\dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b + \boldsymbol{f}_k) \end{bmatrix}$$
(5a)

$$g_b(\boldsymbol{x}_b) = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0}_{3\times3} \\ \boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{q}_b)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$
(5b)

3.2 Control Barrier Functions (CBFs)

Control Barrier Functions (CBFs) serve as a mechanism for generating controllers that are demonstrably safe, akin to

the manner in which Control Lyapunov Functions (CLFs) Sontag (1999) ensure stability. In various respects, CBFs mirror the extension of Lyapunov functions to CLFs. We consider the system (4) safe if x_b remains within a safe set S for all time. The theoretical definition for this criterion is that S is *forward invariant*, signifying that for any initial state $x_b(0)$ within S, $x_b(t)$ stays within S for all $t \ge 0$ Ames et al. (2014).

The determination of the safe set relies on the system configuration, which, in our scenario, includes the manipulated object and the positions of each robot to avoid collisions with nearby obstacles. Therefore, the safe set S can be defined as a continuously differentiable function denoted by $B(\mathbf{x}_b)$:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{ \boldsymbol{x}_b : B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) \ge 0 \}, \tag{6a}$$

$$\partial \mathcal{S} := \{ \boldsymbol{x}_b : B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) = 0 \}.$$
(6b)

Definition 1. A continuously differentiable function B is a control barrier function (CBF) for (4) if there exists an extended class \mathcal{K}_{∞} function α such that Ames et al. (2017):

$$\sup_{\tau} \dot{B}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \geq -\alpha(B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})), \tag{7}$$

for all $x_b \in S$, where

$$\dot{B}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b},\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \underbrace{\frac{\partial B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}_{b}} f_{b}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})}_{:=L_{f}B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}_{b}} g_{b}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})}_{:=L_{g}B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})} \boldsymbol{\tau} \quad (8)$$

with $L_f B(\mathbf{x}_b)$ and $L_g B(\mathbf{x}_b)$ the Lie derivatives Slotine and Li (1991) of B with respect to $f_b(\mathbf{x}_b)$ and $g_b(\mathbf{x}_b)$, respectively.

The function B as defined in equation (6) corresponds specifically to a Zeroing Control Barrier Function (ZCBF). Another type of barrier function known as Reciprocal Control Barrier Function (RCBF), as described by Ames et al. (2017), tends to become unbounded at the boundaries of the set, meaning that $B(x_b)$ approaches infinity as x_b approaches the boundary ∂S . Research has shown that ZCBFs offer simpler and smoother performance compared to RCBFs in real-world systems.

Theorem 1. If *B* is a CBF for (4), then any locally Lipschitz continuous controller $\tau = k(\mathbf{x}_b)$ satisfying

$$\dot{B}(\boldsymbol{x}_b, k(\boldsymbol{x}_b)) \ge -\alpha(B(\boldsymbol{x}_b)), \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{x}_b \in \mathcal{S}$$
 (9)

guarantees that (4) is safe with respect to S Ames et al. (2017).

Now, let us consider the function $B(x_b)$ to have an arbitrarily high relative degree $r \ge 1$, which implies

$$B^{(r)}(\boldsymbol{x}_b, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = L_f^r B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) + L_g L_f^{r-1} B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) \boldsymbol{\tau}$$
(10)

where $L_g L_f^{r-1} B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) \neq 0$ and $L_g L_f B = L_g L_f^2 B = \cdots = L_g L_f^{(r-2)} B = 0$. Let us define:

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) := \begin{bmatrix} B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \\ \dot{B}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \\ \ddot{B}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \\ \vdots \\ B^{(r-1)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \\ L_{f}B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \\ L_{f}^{2}B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \\ \vdots \\ L_{f}^{r-1}B(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) \end{bmatrix}$$
(11)

Then, by defining $\boldsymbol{\mu} = L_f^r B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) + L_g L_f^{r-1} B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) \boldsymbol{\tau}$, we obtain:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \boldsymbol{D}_b \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{G}_b \boldsymbol{\mu}, B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) = \boldsymbol{C}_b \boldsymbol{\eta},$$

where

$$D_{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G_{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$
$$C_{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By choosing $\mu \geq -K_{\alpha}\eta(x_b)$, it follows that $B(x_b) \geq C_b e^{(D_b - G_b K_{\alpha})t} \eta(x_{b,0})$. These derivations lead to the following definition Ames et al. (2019).

Definition 2. A *r*-times continuously differentiable function *B* is an exponential control barrier function (ECBF) for (4) if there exists a row vector $\mathbf{K}_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{r}$ such that $\forall \mathbf{x}_{b} \in \{S \setminus \partial S\}$:

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \left[L_f^r B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) + L_g L_f^{r-1} B(\boldsymbol{x}_b) \boldsymbol{\tau} \right] \ge -\boldsymbol{K}_{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{x}_b) \quad (13)$$

where results in $B(\mathbf{x}_b) \geq C_b e^{(\mathbf{D}_b - \mathbf{G}_b \mathbf{K}_\alpha)t} \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{x}_{b,0})$ whenever $B(\mathbf{x}_{b,0}) \geq 0$.

Note that for r = 1, the definition 2 becomes the same as definition 1 with a simple and specific instance of $\alpha(B(\boldsymbol{x}_b))$ is $\alpha B(\boldsymbol{x}_b)$, where $\alpha > 0$.

3.3 Decentralized Loco-manipulation Control

The decentralized loco-manipulation control method developed in Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b) will serve as the controller for locomotion and manipulation for each agent. This method employs a unified MPC responsible for regulating the manipulation force while ensuring the robot's balance.

The equation of motion for each robot, incorporating manipulation forces, is derived based on the state representation introduced in Di Carlo et al. (2018):

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{X}}_i = \boldsymbol{D}_i \boldsymbol{X}_i + \boldsymbol{G}_i \boldsymbol{F}_i^l + \boldsymbol{f}_{r,i}^W / m_i$$
(14)

Here $i \in \{1, ..., N_r\}$ is the robot's index, $f_{r,i}^W$ represents the manipulation force vector in the world frame, m_i denotes the robot mass, F_i^l denotes the vector of ground reaction forces for all the legs, and X_i contains the robot's body's COM location, Euler angles, and velocities. Further details regarding this equation and the definitions of D and G are provided in Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b).

The MPC technique employs linear discrete-time dynamics to predict the system's behavior over a finite time horizon. However, utilizing a conventional discretization method such as zero-order hold necessitates integrating the manipulation term $f_{r,i}^W$ from equation (14) into the state vector, thereby extending it for MPC formulation. Thus, equation (14) can be reformulated as:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_i = ar{\boldsymbol{D}}_i \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i + ar{\boldsymbol{G}}_i \boldsymbol{F}_i^l$$
 (15)



Figure 4. Block diagram of our proposed approach. Our approach includes 1) state estimation for object and obstacle states; 2) a safety-critical motion planner that utilizes an adaptive controller, CLF, and CBFs for team safety and obstacle avoidance within an MPC framework; and 3) a decentralized loco-manipulation controller that employs a unified MPC for simultaneous stable locomotion and manipulation.

where

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{X}_{i} \\ \boldsymbol{f}_{r,i}^{W}/m_{i} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{15}$$
(16a)

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{D}}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{D}_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{13 \times 13} & \boldsymbol{I}_{2 \times 2} \\ & \boldsymbol{I}_{2 \times 2} \\ & \boldsymbol{0}_{5 \times 2} \\ \hline \boldsymbol{0}_{2 \times 13} & \boldsymbol{0}_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{15 \times 15}$$
(16b)

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{G}}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{G}_{i} \\ \boldsymbol{0}_{2 \times 12} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{15 \times 12}$$
(16c)

and ζ_i represents the augmented vector. Therefore, a linear MPC can be formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{F}_{i}^{l}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|\boldsymbol{X}_{i,j+1} - \boldsymbol{X}_{i,j+1}^{d}\|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_{l}} + \|\boldsymbol{F}_{i,j}^{l}\|_{\boldsymbol{R}_{l}}$$
(17a)

s.t.
$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,j+1} = \bar{\boldsymbol{D}}_{i,j}^t \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{i,j} + \bar{\boldsymbol{G}}_{i,j}^t \boldsymbol{F}_{i,j}^l$$
 (17b)

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{c}}_{f} \leq \boldsymbol{C}_{f} \boldsymbol{F}_{i,j}^{l} \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{c}}_{f} \tag{17c}$$

where k denotes the number of prediction horizons, X_i^d represents the desired state of the robot, Q_l and R_l are diagonal positive semi-definite matrices, \bar{D}_i^t and \bar{G}_i^t denote discrete-time system dynamics matrices, and $\underline{c}_f \leq C_f F_i^l \leq \bar{c}_f$ represents the friction cone constraints outlined in Focchi et al. (2017). The desired state X_i^d is obtained through the optimal contact point location necessary for object manipulation.

4 System Overview: Hierarchical Adaptive Motion Planning for Safe Collaborative Object Manipulation

This section will briefly overview our proposed hierarchical adaptive motion planning for the collaborative manipulation of an unknown object using a team of quadruped robots. The object experiences both translational and rotational motion, guided by a team of N_r robots. Our proposed method is illustrated in Fig. 4.

The control system comprises three main components as shown in Fig. 4. The state estimator provides the object's state as the MPC's state vector for the motion planner, along with the states of obstacles needed to ensure collision avoidance within the CBF constraint. Depending on the type of obstacles, which can be either static or dynamic, the state estimator can function as either a dynamic or static estimator.

The main component of our proposed control system is the adaptive safety-critical motion planner, which generates an optimized path for the object using an MPC approach. It consists of three parts. The reference trajectory generator receives the object's goal position and orientation from the user and, based on the distance to the final goal and the object's current state, generates incremental subgoals for the MPC to ensure a smooth transition to the goal. Remember that the object's properties, such as inertia and friction, are unknown to the control system. Therefore, there is an adaptive controller that updates the uncertainty vector based on the object's deviation from the desired trajectory and incorporates this updated uncertainty vector into the dynamic equation within the MPC formulation. Finally, the object's motion planning, which includes optimizing each agent's force and contact point location, is carried out through a nonlinear MPC formulation. This optimization considers stability and safety to prevent collisions between each robot and the object with obstacles. Optimizing the contact point locations ensures collision-free movement and proper object maneuvering along the desired trajectory. Additionally, to ensure the optimized path for the object is feasible and achievable by the team of robots, we have included interaction constraints between the robots and the object. These constraints, such as the direction and magnitude of the force as well as the torque provided by each robot, are incorporated into the dynamic equation constraints in the MPC. Since each robot is not physically connected to the object, it cannot directly apply torque to adjust the object's orientation. Instead, the required torque is generated by adjusting the force and contact point locations to maneuver the object correctly. Moreover, because the object's center of mass is unknown, the adaptive controller plays a crucial role in compensating for the uncertainty in the COM location. The details of our proposed motion planner will be elaborated in Sec. 5 and 6.

Finally, each robot's optimized force and contact point location will be fed to a decentralized loco-manipulation controller for implementation on each robot. The structure of the loco-manipulation controller is similar to the one presented in our previous works Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b). Each robot utilizes a unified MPC for locomotion, with the required manipulation force integrated into the same MPC. The advantage of this unified MPC for both locomotion and manipulation is that it regulates the manipulation force without compromising the robot's stability. The details of the loco-manipulation controller are presented in Sec. 3.3.

5 Adaptive Safety-Critical Motion Planner

In this section, we will elaborate on our adaptive safetycritical motion planner. The motion planner receives the goal configuration for the manipulated object from the user and, based on the state measurements of the object and obstacles in the environment, optimizes the path for the object to reach the target. This optimization, formulated as a nonlinear MPC problem, considers all safety constraints, including obstacle avoidance for both the object and the team of robots, as well as constraints related to the interaction between the robots and the object. Object properties like mass and friction coefficients may be unknown or uncertain in the planner's model, so we employ an adaptive controller to compensate for these uncertainties. As shown in Fig. 4, the motion planner consists of three components: the reference trajectory, the adaptive controller, and the nonlinear MPC. In the following subsections, we will elaborate on the details of each component.

5.1 Reference Trajectory

The reference trajectory module aims to provide a smooth target trajectory based on the final goal provided by the user. Suppose we receive the goal of $x_{b,f}$ from the user. Typically, the target velocity is zero, so we only receive $q_{b,f}$, which contains $x_{p,f}$ and θ_f . The next step is to estimate the time required to reach the target. First, we consider feasible average linear v_{avg} and rotational ω_{avg} velocities for the object to be manipulated. Then, we can calculate the estimated time to reach the target as follows:

$$t_{\text{avg},v} = \frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}_p - \boldsymbol{x}_{p,f}\|}{v_{\text{avg}}}, \quad t_{\text{avg},w} = \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_f\|}{\omega_{\text{avg}}}$$
(18a)

$$t_{\text{avg}} = \max(t_{\text{avg},v}, t_{\text{avg},w}) \tag{18b}$$

Using the estimated time to reach the target t_{avg} and the horizon time T for the motion planner MPC, the reference trajectory module generates subgoal configurations x_b^{ref} for the MPC problem to make the target smoother and more feasible for the MPC to follow based on the distance from the target.

5.2 Adaptive Control for Object Manipulation

In adaptive control for manipulators Slotine and Li (1991), a linear combination of position and velocity error, denoted as s, is commonly used. This method results in exponentially stable dynamics once the surface s = 0 is reached. Therefore, we define the composite error as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{s} = \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_e + \lambda \boldsymbol{q}_e \tag{19}$$

where q_e and \dot{q}_e represented the tracking error for q_b and \dot{q}_b , respectively and λ is a positive scalar value. Then, we define the reference velocity as follows:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_r = \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b - \boldsymbol{s} \tag{20}$$

The dynamic equation (3) can have model uncertainty in practice. We can separate this equation into two parts: the known nominal model and the unknown part, as follows:

$$\tau = \underbrace{\underline{H(q_b)\ddot{q}_b + C(q_b, \dot{q}_b)\dot{q}_b}_{\text{nominal}} + \underbrace{\tilde{H}(q_b)\ddot{q}_b + \tilde{C}(q_b, \dot{q}_b)\dot{q}_b + f_k}_{\text{unknown}}$$
(21)

where \bar{H} and \bar{C} represent the nominal values, and \bar{H} and \bar{C} represent the unknown model. Note that we consider all the friction to be uncertainty within our model.

The part with uncertainty can be parameterized based on an unknown parameter vector Ψ Slotine and Li (1991). Thus, we can decompose the equation of motion with uncertainty into a known regressor matrix $Y_{\Psi,b}$ and a vector of unknown parameters Ψ :

$$H\ddot{q}_b + C\dot{q}_b + f_k = Y_{\Psi,b}\Psi.$$
 (22)

We can also adjust the regressor and rewrite equation (22) to be a function of the reference velocity \dot{q}_r as follows:

$$\ddot{H}\ddot{q}_r + \dot{C}\dot{q}_r + f_k = Y_{\Psi,r}\Psi$$
(23)

In this form, the modified regressor $Y_{\Psi,r}(q_b, \dot{q}_b, \dot{q}_r, \ddot{q}_r)$ depends on the reference velocity and acceleration,

compared to the previous regressor $Y_{\Psi,b}(q_b, \dot{q}_b, \ddot{q}_b)$. Despite this change, both equations (22) and (23) employ the same vector of uncertainties, Ψ . This new form, (23), will aid in designing the adaptation law to ensure system stability.

Note that all uncertainties from the model, including friction, are combined into the vector Ψ , unlike in our previous work Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b), where we had separate vectors for object dynamics model and friction properties. We found that having separate vectors of uncertainty did not significantly enhance the performance of the adaptive controller. Our primary focus is on compensating for the overall uncertainty of the system rather than distinguishing between different sources of uncertainty.

The unknown parameter updates according to the following adaptation laws:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}} = -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{\Psi},r}^{T} \boldsymbol{s}$$
(24)

where Γ_{Ψ} is a positive definite matrix. In Sec. 6.4, we will show how the adaptation law (24) ensures the system's stability when discussing our CLF constraint.

5.3 Nonlinear MPC Problem

The motion planner problem is formulated as a nonlinear MPC problem consisting of a cost function and a set of nonlinear constraints. By defining these constraints, we ensure stability and safety for the team of robots during the manipulation task. These constraints are within the bounds provided for the inputs, such as geometric constraints of the object and manipulation force constraints. The general cost function for a nonlinear optimal control problem is as follows:

$$J(\boldsymbol{u}[0,T],\boldsymbol{x}[0,T]) = S(\boldsymbol{x}(T)) + \int_0^T l_s(\boldsymbol{x}(t),\boldsymbol{u}(t),t) dt$$
(25)

where S(.) is the final cost and $l_s(.)$ is the intermediate cost for a time horizon of T and subject to the dynamic and inequality constraints:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(t) = \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) + \bar{g}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{u}$$
(26a)

$$h_{\text{bound}}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) \ge \boldsymbol{0}$$
 (26b)

$$h_{\text{clf}}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) \ge 0$$
 (26c)

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{\rm cbf}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{u}) > \boldsymbol{0} \tag{26d}$$

where the state vector includes:

$$\boldsymbol{x} = [\boldsymbol{x}_b^T, \boldsymbol{d}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{6+N_r}$$
 (27)

and $\boldsymbol{d} = [d_1, \ldots, d_{N_r}]^T$ represents contact point locations d_i for each of the N_r agents in the team. The input vector is defined as:

$$\boldsymbol{u} = [\boldsymbol{F}_r^T, \dot{\boldsymbol{d}}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times N_r}$$
(28)

where $\mathbf{F}_r = [f_{r,1}, \ldots, f_{r,N_r}]^T$ is a vector represents manipulation forces $f_{r,i}$ and $\mathbf{\dot{d}} = [\dot{d}_1, \ldots, \dot{d}_{N_r}]^T$ represent the rate of change of contact point locations. A detailed explanation of each component of our proposed optimal control problem, including (25) and (26), will be provided in Sec. 6.

As described in Sec. 2 and illustrated in Fig. 2, the manipulation force applied by each robot is perpendicular to the object's surface. Similarly, the contact point location

is always tangential to the object's surface. Therefore, we only consider the force magnitude $f_{r,i}$ and the distance d_i within the state and input vectors instead of treating them as a two-dimensional vector. The change in direction of these vectors is addressed within the dynamic equation, which will be further explained in Sec. 6.2. This approach reduces the dimension of the input vector for the motion planner MPC.

6 Formulation of Nonlinear MPC Problem

This section provides a detailed explanation of the nonlinear MPC formulation. We will thoroughly discuss each component of the optimal problem introduced in Sec. 5.3, elaborating on the methods and considerations involved in their formulation.

6.1 Cost Function

The objective of the cost function is to minimize the deviation in object tracking from the desired path generated by the reference trajectory and to minimize the input vector. We propose the following quadratic cost function:

$$l_{s}(\boldsymbol{x}(t), \boldsymbol{u}(t), t) = \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{b}(t) - \boldsymbol{x}_{b}^{\text{ref}}(t)\|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_{x_{b}}} +$$
(29a)
$$\frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{d}(t) - \boldsymbol{d}_{\text{prev}}^{*}\|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_{d}} + \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\boldsymbol{R}_{u}}$$
$$S(\boldsymbol{x}(T)) = \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{b}(T) - \boldsymbol{x}_{b}^{\text{ref}}(T)\|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_{f}}$$
(29b)

where $||\mathbf{a}||_{\mathbf{Q}}$ denotes the weighted norm $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{a}$. The subgoal configurations x_b^{ref} are provided by the reference trajectory generator described in Sec. 5.1. All the matrices \mathbf{Q}_f , \mathbf{Q}_{x_b} , \mathbf{Q}_d , and \mathbf{R}_u are positive definite. For the contact point location d, we want to minimize the change between the previous optimized solution and the current one, so the reference is d_{prev}^* . This ensures a smooth change in the contact point location, leading to a more stable robot motion behavior. The last term in (29b) will aim to minimize the input value. By including the terminal cost $S(\mathbf{x}(T))$, we place more weight on reaching the goal position rather than the intermediate goals.

6.2 Dynamic Equation

The dynamic equation presented in the nonlinear MPC problem (26a), in addition to considering the single rigid body dynamics, also addresses the constraint related to the interaction of each robot with the object. As mentioned previously, the robots are not connected rigidly to the object; therefore, they cannot directly apply torque to the object. Moreover, each robot can only apply force perpendicular to the object's surface. These constraints should be reflected in the system dynamic equation. Also, remember that there are model uncertainties in the dynamic model of the object, which we are going to compensate for using our proposed adaptive controller presented in Sec. 5.2.

The dynamic equation with uncertainty (21) can be presented in a control-affine form similar to (4) as follows:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_{b} = \bar{f}_{b}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b}) + \bar{g}_{b}(\boldsymbol{x}_{b})\boldsymbol{\tau} + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0}_{3\times 1} \\ -\bar{\boldsymbol{H}}(\boldsymbol{q}_{b})^{-1}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\Psi,b}\boldsymbol{\Psi} \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

where:

$$\bar{f}_b(\boldsymbol{x}_b) = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b \\ -\bar{\boldsymbol{H}}(\boldsymbol{q}_b)^{-1}\bar{\boldsymbol{C}}(\boldsymbol{q}_b, \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b)\dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_b \end{bmatrix}$$
(31a)

$$\bar{g}_b(\boldsymbol{x}_b) = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0}_{3\times3} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{H}}(\boldsymbol{q}_b)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$
(31b)

The wrench vector $\boldsymbol{\tau} = [\boldsymbol{F}^T, M_p]^T$ must be expressed as a function of the state vector (27) and input vector (28) of the nonlinear MPC problem. According to Fig. 2, we have:

$$\boldsymbol{F} = \boldsymbol{R}^T \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} \boldsymbol{f}_{r,i}$$
(32a)

$$M_p = \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} \boldsymbol{r}_i \times \boldsymbol{f}_{r,i}$$
(32b)

where

$$\boldsymbol{f}_{r,i} = f_{r,i} \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}_{r,i} \tag{33a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_i = \boldsymbol{r}_{i,o} + d_i \hat{\boldsymbol{t}}_{r,i}. \tag{33b}$$

The term $r_i \times f_{r,i}$ represents the cross product of the twodimensional vectors. The planar rotation matrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}$ as well as unit vectors $\hat{t}_{r,i}$ and $\hat{n}_{r,i}$ can be determined using the object state x_b . The value of $f_{r,i}$ can be obtained from the input vector \boldsymbol{u} as shown in (28). The vector $\boldsymbol{r}_{i,o}$ is a constant vector indicating the initial location of the contact point for each robot. Therefore, using the equations presented in (32), the wrench vector $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ can be expressed as a function of the state vector and input vector, $\boldsymbol{\tau}(\boldsymbol{x}_b, \boldsymbol{u})$.

Finally, by substituting the unknown uncertainty vector Ψ with its estimated value $\hat{\Psi}$ in the dynamic equation (30), rearranging the equations, and incorporating \dot{d} as a part of the input vector, we can derive the adaptive dynamic equation as appeared in (26a):

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(t) = \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) + \bar{g}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{u}$$
(34)

6.3 State & Input Boundaries

The state and input boundaries presented in (26b) account for the allowable range for the optimized manipulation force and contact point locations. Since the robots are not rigidly attached to the object, the manipulation force applied by each robot always acts as a pushing force. Therefore, the magnitude of the optimized force must always be positive. Additionally, there is a maximum allowable value F_{max} for the force that the robot can apply, which can depend on the robot's size. The boundaries for the manipulation force are as follows:

$$0 \le f_{r,i} \le F_{max} \tag{35}$$

Furthermore, there are boundary limitations on d_i to ensure that each robot remains in contact with the object's surface. The upper bound \bar{d}_i and the lower bound \underline{d}_i specify the limits of the object with respect to the origin o_i as shown in Fig. 2. These boundaries can be formulated as follows:

$$\underline{d}_i \le d_i \le \bar{d}_i \tag{36}$$

We also impose a constraint on the rate of change d_i in their contact point locations to ensure that the velocity of each agent does not exceed a specified maximum value v_{max} :

$$\|d_i\| \le v_{max} \tag{37}$$

6.4 CLF Constraint

The CLF constraint in (26c) ensures the object's stability in tracking the desired trajectory by considering the adaptive dynamic (26a). Let us examine the following Lyapunov candidate function:

$$V(\boldsymbol{s}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) = \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{s}^T \boldsymbol{H} \boldsymbol{s} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}})$$
(38)

where $\tilde{\Psi} = \hat{\Psi} - \Psi$ represents the vector of estimation errors. Note that the inertia matrix H is positive definite. Since Ψ is a constant vector, the derivative of the estimation error $\tilde{\Psi}$ is the same as the derivative of the estimation $\hat{\Psi}$. Using this property, we can differentiate V(t) as follows:

$$\dot{V}(t) = \boldsymbol{s}^T \boldsymbol{H} \dot{\boldsymbol{s}} + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{s}^T \dot{\boldsymbol{H}} \boldsymbol{s} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}^{-1} \dot{\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}}.$$
 (39)

Based on the definition of reference velocity in (20), we have $\dot{q}_b = s + \dot{q}_r$ and $\dot{s} = \ddot{q}_b - \ddot{q}_r$. Therefore, considering the equation of motion (3), the first two terms in equation (39) can be expanded as follows:

$$s^{T}\boldsymbol{H}\dot{\boldsymbol{s}} + \frac{1}{2}s^{T}\dot{\boldsymbol{H}}\boldsymbol{s} = s^{T}\boldsymbol{H}(\ddot{\boldsymbol{q}}_{b} - \ddot{\boldsymbol{q}}_{r}) + \frac{1}{2}s^{T}\dot{\boldsymbol{H}}\boldsymbol{s} = \frac{1}{2}s^{T}(\dot{\boldsymbol{H}} - 2\boldsymbol{C})\boldsymbol{s} + s^{T}[\boldsymbol{\tau} - (\boldsymbol{H}\ddot{\boldsymbol{q}}_{r} + \boldsymbol{C}\dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_{r} + \boldsymbol{f}_{k})] \quad (40)$$

The term $\dot{H} - 2C$ is a skew-symmetric matrix Culbertson et al. (2021), making $s^T (\dot{H} - 2C)s$ equal to zero. Furthermore, recall that the matrices H and C can be decomposed into nominal and unknown parts as described in (21), where $H = \bar{H} + \tilde{H}$ and $C = \bar{C} + \tilde{C}$. Using this decomposition and the definition in (23), substituting (40) into (39) yields:

$$\dot{V}(t) = \boldsymbol{s}^{T} [\boldsymbol{\tau} - \bar{\boldsymbol{H}} \ddot{\boldsymbol{q}}_{r} - \bar{\boldsymbol{C}} \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_{r} - \boldsymbol{Y}_{\Psi,r} \boldsymbol{\Psi}] + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}^{T} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\Psi}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}.$$
(41)

Finally, substituting the adaptation law (24) into equation (41) gives:

$$\dot{V}(t) = \boldsymbol{s}^T [\boldsymbol{\tau} - \bar{\boldsymbol{H}} \ddot{\boldsymbol{q}}_r - \bar{\boldsymbol{C}} \dot{\boldsymbol{q}}_r - \boldsymbol{Y}_{\Psi,r} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}].$$
(42)

According to the Lyapunov theorem Slotine and Li (1991), if we can ensure that $\dot{V}(t) \leq 0$, the system will be uniformly stable because V(t) is positive definite and decrescent, and $\dot{V}(t)$ is negative semi-definite. As a result, the variables s and $\tilde{\Psi}$ will remain bounded.

Additionally, let's define a positive definite function W(s) as follows:

$$W(\boldsymbol{s}) := \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{s}^T \boldsymbol{K}_D \boldsymbol{s}$$
(43)

and assume $\dot{V}(t) + W(s) \leq 0$. Since $\ddot{V}(t) + \dot{W}(t)$ is bounded and $\dot{V}(t) + W(s)$ is uniformly continuous in time, and V(t) is lower bounded, the second version of Barbalat's Lemma Slotine and Li (1991) implies that $\dot{V}(t) + W(s) \rightarrow$ 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which means $W(s) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, s also approaches zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. When s = 0, it can be shown that $\dot{q}_e = -\lambda q_e$ according to the definition of the composite error (19), which corresponds to an asymptotically stable system.

To achieve the asymptotic stability described above, we can include the required property $V(t) + W(s) \le 0$ as a constraint within our motion planner. Thus, we formulate the

CLF constraint as follows:

$$h_{\text{clf}}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) := \boldsymbol{s}^{T} [-\boldsymbol{\tau} + \boldsymbol{H} \boldsymbol{\ddot{q}}_{r} + \boldsymbol{\bar{C}} \boldsymbol{\dot{q}}_{r} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}, r} \boldsymbol{\hat{\Psi}}] - \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{s}^{T} \boldsymbol{K}_{D} \boldsymbol{s}$$
(44)

By choosing a proper input value u, which generates the value $\tau(x_b, u)$ as explained in (32), we can achieve the CLF constraint $h_{\text{clf}} \ge 0$ as presented in (26c).

6.5 CBF Constraints

In most practical scenarios, the environment is filled with obstacles, which can sometimes move, such as when humans are present. Ensuring safety is crucial for any loco-manipulation task, involving both collision avoidance between objects and obstacles and preventing collisions between robots and obstacles. We leverage the flexibility of each robot's movement to adjust the contact point location, enabling the object to follow the desired path while coordinating each robot to avoid obstacles.

Considering N_o obstacles, as mentioned in the problem statement, for each obstacle o_j , there is an associated barrier function for the manipulated object $(B_{o_j}^m > 0)$, which defines the safe boundary around the obstacles. This concept is also applied to the potential collisions between each obstacle and each robot r_i from all N_r agents, defining the barrier functions as $B_{o_j}^{r_i} > 0$. Each barrier function can be defined as the boundary of the safe set for spherical obstacles as follows:

$$B_{o_j}^m(x) = \|\mathcal{O}_j - x_p\| - R_{j,m}$$
 (45a)

$$B_{o_i}^{r_i}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{O}}_j - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_i\| - R_{j,r_i}$$
(45b)

where \mathcal{O}_j and \mathcal{R}_i represent the positions of each obstacle and the robot's center, respectively. $R_{j,m}$ is the obstacle's barrier radius accounting for the size of the manipulated object, and R_{j,r_i} is the obstacle's barrier radius accounting for the size of robot r_i .

The barrier functions defined in (45a) can be used as CBFs of relative degree 2 since it depend only on x_p . The barrier functions defined in (45b) can be used as CBFs of relative degree 1 since \mathcal{R}_i depends on d_i . According to definition 2, which defines ECBFs, we will have:

$$\ddot{B}^{m}_{o_{j}}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) + \beta^{m}_{o_{j}} \dot{B}^{m}_{o_{j}}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha^{m}_{o_{j}} B^{m}_{o_{j}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \ge 0$$
 (46a)

$$B_{o_j}^{r_i}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) + \alpha_{o_j}^{r_i} B_{o_j}^{r_i}(\boldsymbol{x}) \ge 0$$
(46b)

Note that when computing the Lie derivative to obtain B and \dot{B} , the adaptive dynamic equation (26a) will be used. The parameters $\beta_{o_j}^m$, $\alpha_{o_j}^m$, and $\alpha_{o_j}^{\tau_i}$ should be chosen such that the roots of equations (46a) and (46b) are negative real values Nguyen and Sreenath (2016). Thus, the equations (46) will form the CBF constraints (26d) within the motion planner.

6.6 Penalty Cost

All the inequality constraints in the nonlinear optimal control problem (26), including h_{bound} , h_{clf} , and h_{cbf} , will be formulated as penalty costs and incorporated into the cost function. This approach is commonly used in nonlinear MPC problems with numerous constraints to simplify the numerical solver's task Grandia et al. (2023). In this work,

we will utilize relaxed barrier functions Hauser and Saccon (2006); Feller and Ebenbauer (2017). The penalty cost for each inequality constraint h is determined using two positive scalar variables, ρ and ϵ , as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}(h) = \begin{cases} -\rho \ln(h), & \text{if } h \ge \epsilon, \\ \frac{\rho}{2} \left(\left(\frac{h-2\epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^2 - 1 \right) - \rho \ln(\epsilon), & \text{if } h < \epsilon. \end{cases}$$
(47)

This function acts as a log-barrier in the feasible region $(h \ge \epsilon)$, and transitions to a quadratic function when the constraint value is within a distance $h < \epsilon$. The parameter ρ scales the penalty cost, and the values of ϵ and ρ can be chosen based on the sensitivity of each constraint, ensuring stability and safety while optimizing solver performance.

For all inequality constraints, the combined penalty cost is defined as:

$$l_{\mathcal{P}}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{P}(h_{\text{bound}}^{i}) + \mathcal{P}(h_{\text{clf}}) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{P}(h_{\text{cbf}}^{j})$$
(48)

where \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} represent the sets of all state/input boundaries (26b) and CBF constraints (26d), respectively. The combined penalty cost $l_{\mathcal{P}}$ will be added to the intermediate cost l_s in the cost function (25), substituting the inequality constraints.

6.7 Solving the Nonlinear MPC Problem

The continuous control input (28) is parameterized over subintervals of the prediction horizon [t, t + T] to convert it into a finite-dimensional decision problem. This is discretized into N_T steps with $k \in \{0, ..., N_T - 1\}$, where the time step is $\Delta t = T/N_T$ and the control time is defined as $t_k = t + \Delta t \times k$. Using a discretization method like zeroorder hold Fadali and Visioli (2012), we parameterize the state and input as $x_{k+1} = x(t_{k+1})$ and $u_k = u(t_k)$. Thus, the discretized nonlinear MPC problem is formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{U}} \| \boldsymbol{x}_{b,N_T} - \boldsymbol{x}_{b,N_T}^{\text{ref}} \|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_f} + \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \| \boldsymbol{x}_{b,k+1} - \boldsymbol{x}_{b,k+1}^{\text{ref}} \|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_{x_b}}$$

$$+ \|\boldsymbol{a}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{a}_{\text{prev}}\|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_d} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_k\|_{\boldsymbol{R}_u}, \qquad (49a)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = f^{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) + \bar{g}^{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{x}_k)\boldsymbol{u}_k, \tag{49b}$$

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{\text{bound}}^{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{u}_k) \ge 0, \tag{49c}$$

$$h_{\rm clf}^{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{u}_k, \boldsymbol{\Psi}) \ge 0, \tag{49d}$$

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{\mathsf{cbf}}^k(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{u}_k) \ge 0, \tag{49e}$$

where $\boldsymbol{X} = [\boldsymbol{x}_0^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_{N_T}^T]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{U} = [\boldsymbol{u}_0^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_{N_T}^T]^T$ are the vectors of discretized state and input over the prediction horizon, and \bar{f}^k , \bar{g}^k , and $\bar{h}_{(.)}^k$ represent the discrete samples of their continuous counterparts. Considering the penalty cost instead of the inequality constraints described in Sec. 6.6, the discretized nonlinear MPC problem (49) can be expressed as follows:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{U}} \quad S(\boldsymbol{x}_{N_T}) + \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} l_s^k(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{u}_k) + l_{\mathcal{P}}^k(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{u}_k) \quad (50a)$$

s.t.
$$\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} = \bar{f}^k(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) + \bar{g}^k(\boldsymbol{x}_k)\boldsymbol{u}_k,$$
 (50b)

where l_s^k and l_P^k are the discretized versions of their continuous counterparts. The nonlinear MPC problem can

then be reformulated as a general nonlinear problem (NLP) by augmenting the decision variables as $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} = [\boldsymbol{X}^T, \boldsymbol{U}^T]^T$:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}} \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}), \tag{51a}$$

s.t.
$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathbf{0},$$
 (51b)

where $\Phi(\mathcal{X})$ is the cost function and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ represents the dynamic equation constraints.

To efficiently solve the proposed NLP (51), we linearize the problem and solve it iteratively using a sequential quadratic programming (SQP) approach Nocedal and Wright (2006). Given the current iteration solution \mathcal{X}_i , we compute the deviation $\delta \mathcal{X}$. The problem (51) can then be approximated by a quadratic programming (QP) problem with respect to $\delta \mathcal{X}$ as follows:

$$\min_{\delta \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}} \quad \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}_i)^T \delta \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} + \frac{1}{2} \delta \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^T \boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}_i \delta \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}, \quad (52a)$$

s.t.
$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}_i) + \nabla_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}_i)^T \delta \mathcal{X} = \mathbf{0},$$
 (52b)

where $\mathcal{H}_i = \nabla_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \Phi(\mathcal{X}_i)$ is the Hessian matrix. If the Hessian is positive semi-definite, the QP is convex and can be solved efficiently. All the costs defined in (29), including the intermediate cost $l_s(.)$ and the terminal cost S(.), are already in quadratic form, satisfying the Hessian requirements. For any penalty cost, we can approximate the following to exploit the convexity for the Hessian:

$$\nabla^{2}_{\mathcal{X}}\left(\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{h}(\mathcal{X}))\right) \approx \nabla_{\mathcal{X}}\boldsymbol{h}(\mathcal{X})^{T}\nabla^{2}_{\boldsymbol{h}}\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{h}(\mathcal{X}))\nabla_{\mathcal{X}}\boldsymbol{h}(\mathcal{X}),$$
(53)

where $\nabla_{h}^{2} \mathcal{P}(h(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}))$ is a diagonal and positive definite matrix according to the definition of penalty cost $\mathcal{P}(h)$ in (47).

7 Results

To evaluate the performance of the proposed controller, we present results across various scenarios, both in simulation and on hardware. For the simulation, we use the Gazebo simulator along with ROS 1 Noetic. All parameters in the planner and decentralized loco-manipulation controllers remain constant throughout the simulations and hardware experiments. To implement the motion planner's nonlinear MPC problem, we use the OCS2 package Farshidian and others (2017). A time horizon of T = 5 seconds is used for the planner's MPC problem, which is updated at 100 Hz. The rest of the parameters are listed in Table 1. These parameters are initially selected in simulation and fine-tuned during hardware experiments. Further details of the results can be found in the supplementary video accompanying this paper *.

For the decentralized loco-manipulation control setup, we use the exact control system implementation as presented in Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b). Given that the loco-manipulation MPC was linearly formulated through specific assumptions Sombolestan and Nguyen (2023b), we leverage this linearity to formalize the MPC problem as a QP problem and use the qpOASES package Ferreau et al. (2014) as the solver. Our code is accessible in an open-source repository [†].

7.1 Comparative Analysis

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our motion planner structure, we perform a comparative analysis to examine our



(a) Early state of the manipulation task



controller successfully completes the task

(c) Motion planner without adaptive controller gets stuck halfway



(d) Manipulation force plot for robot 1 $(f_{r,1})$



(e) Manipulation force plot for robot 2 $(f_{r,2})$

Figure 5. Comparing the performance of the motion planner with and without the adaptive controller. In the snapshots, the green box is the manipulated object, the red cube is the user-defined target location, and the two blue boxes are static obstacles. The green line represents the straight path from the initial position to the target position of the manipulated object, while the red line indicates the optimized path from the motion planner, considering safety and other constraints.

proposed method. All these simulation designs are kept as simple as possible, focusing only on the effects of specific components in our motion planner.

7.1.1 Effect of Adaptive Controller : For this part, we conduct two identical simulations with two Aliengo robots attempting to manipulate a cubic object in an environment with two static obstacles, aiming to reach a target point. In one simulation, we use our proposed method; in the other, we disable the adaptive controller. In both simulations, the controller assumes the object's mass to be 6 kg, while the

^{*}https://youtu.be/cU_qevkW86I

[†]https://github.com/DRCL-USC/collaborative_loco_manipulation

 Table 1. Motion Planner Settings

Parameter	Value
Reference Trajectory	
$v_{\rm avg}$	0.5 [m/s]
$\omega_{ m avg}$	0.8 [rad/sec]
Adaptive Controller	
Γ_{Ψ}	diag $(3, 2, 1, 1) \times 10^2$
λ	3
MPC Cost Function	
$oldsymbol{Q}_{f}$	diag(150, 150, 3, 3, 3, 8)
$\boldsymbol{Q}_{\boldsymbol{x}_b}$	${\rm diag}(20,22,2,3,3,1)\times 10^{-1}$
$oldsymbol{Q}_d$	$I_{N_r} \times 10^{-1}$
$oldsymbol{R}_{u}$	$I_{2 \times N_r} \times 10^{-2}$
MPC Constraints	
(F_{max}, v_{max})	(0.7 [N], 1 [m/s])
$(lpha,eta)_{ ext{CBF}}$	(4, 4)
$(ho,\epsilon)_{ m CBF}$	(0.8, 0.5)
$(ho,\epsilon)_{ m CLF}$	(1, 0.5)
$(ho,\epsilon)_{ ext{bound}}$	(0.1, 0.01)
$oldsymbol{K}_D$	$3I_3$







(d) Optimized trajectory with the second configuration

Figure 6. Impact of Initial Robot Configuration on Optimized Trajectories. (a) and (b) show the first initial configuration and its resulting optimized trajectory, where the robots navigate the object from the left side of the obstacles. (c) and (d) display the second initial configuration and its resulting optimized trajectory, where the robots maneuver the object through the right side of the obstacles.

actual mass is 8 kg. Additionally, we do not include friction in the dynamic equation, meaning the controller assumes a frictionless contact between the object and the ground. However, in the simulation, we introduce friction with a coefficient of 0.4 between the object and the ground.

The robots successfully manipulate the object to the target location with the adaptive controller. Without the adaptive controller, the robots get stuck midway, unable to push the object further because the force provided by the planner is



(a) Motion planner utilizing CBF constraints for individual robot collision avoidance $(B_{o_i}^{\tau_i})$



(b) Motion planner without CBF constraints for individual robot collision avoidance

Figure 7. Performance comparison of the motion planner with and without CBF constraints for robot collision avoidance. In snapshot (a), the robot maintains a safe distance from obstacles due to the CBF constraints in the motion planner. In snapshot (b), the robot collides with the obstacle due to the absence of CBF constraints.

insufficient to overcome the friction. The force plots of each robot in both scenarios are illustrated in Fig. 5. As shown, the adaptive dynamic helps the planner account for uncertainties and compensate for them in each robot's force, which is significant given the large uncertainties in the system.

7.1.2 Effect of CBFs for Collision Avoidance of Each Robot : In this section, we examine the impact of CBFs on each robot's collision avoidance with obstacles. We conduct two identical simulations: one using our proposed method and the other without the CBFs related to robots and obstacles. The simulation setup is the same as in the previous part, where we examined the adaptive controller.

Note that in the motion planner, we still include CBFs for the collision avoidance of the manipulated object and obstacles, removing only those for each robot. Therefore, the planner still optimizes the trajectory to prevent collisions between the manipulated object and obstacles. However, as shown in Fig. 7, the robots collide with obstacles without CBFs associated with the robots and obstacles. In contrast, using our proposed method, the entire system navigates the environment safely, avoiding any collisions with obstacles.

7.1.3 Impact of Initial Robots Configuration : As previously mentioned, robots are not rigidly connected to the object in our manipulation task scenario. While this setup allows for some flexibility in adjusting each robot's position, especially to avoid collisions, it also introduces challenges for manipulation tasks. Without a rigid connection, applying





(a) Start point

(b) Maintaining safe distance from obstacle

(c) Reaching target location





Figure 9. Experimental Result without Employing the CBFs Constraint for robot-obstacle collision. The Aliengo robot collides with the obstacle while it wants to go around the obstacle.

force and torque is more difficult compared to if the robots were directly connected to the object. Each robot can only exert a force perpendicular to the object's surface and adjust its lateral positions to apply the proper torque and maneuver the object. These considerations are incorporated into the dynamic equations. Therefore, the initial configuration of robots around the object can influence the optimized trajectory. The trajectory is optimized to avoid making it overly difficult for the team of robots to manipulate the object. The planner achieves this through the cost associated with input minimization ($\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{Ru}$) and minimizing the change in the contact point location ($\|\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{d}_{prev}^*\|_{\boldsymbol{Q}_d}$).

To illustrate the initial configuration effect, we conducted two simulations. In both simulations, the object's initial position is at the origin, and the target location is $x_p^f = (5m, 5m)$. Two static cubic obstacles were placed at coordinates (3, 2) and (2, 3); therefore, everything is symmetric for object manipulation purposes. Then, we use two different initial configurations for the team of robots, as shown in Fig. 6a and Fig. 6c. These configurations resulted in different optimized trajectories. In one configuration, the team of robots manipulated the object from the left side of the obstacles (Fig. 6b), while in the other configuration, they navigated through the right side of the obstacles (Fig. 6d). These results demonstrate how the initial configuration of the robot team can lead to different optimized trajectories to achieve optimal behavior.

7.2 Hardware Experiments

We also validated our approach using a team of two robots, a Unitree A1 and an Aliengo, to manipulate an object. In

Prepared using sagej.cls

our setup, an obstacle blocks the path, preventing a direct trajectory to the target position. The object's weight is 6 kg (the box-only weight), with an additional unknown 3 kg load inside the box. Moreover, the dynamic equation lacks a friction model, introducing model uncertainty that the adaptive controller manages. The box's state is tracked using a motion capture system, and the obstacle's position is predetermined in the planner. The results demonstrated in the supplemental video and shown in snapshots in Fig. 8.

In this highly constrained setup, with a distance of approximately 3 meters between the start and target points and an obstacle with a surface area of nearly 0.5 square meters in between, the importance of Control Barrier Functions (CBFs) for preventing robot-obstacle collisions is crucial. To highlight this in our hardware experiment, we removed the CBF constraints for robot-obstacle collision in the motion planner and conducted the experiment. The results showed that while the object's trajectory remained safe, the Aliengo robot collided with the obstacle. This is illustrated in the snapshot provided in Fig. 9.

7.3 Handling Dynamic Obstacles

As previously mentioned, most practical applications involve quadruped robots operating in environments with moving elements. For instance, in warehouses where people are constantly working, ensuring safety is essential for robots operating in proximity to humans. In the following simulation, a team of robots encounters moving obstacles represented by humans in the environment. This simulation uses one Aliengo and one Go1 robot from Unitree, demonstrating that our approach can be implemented with different robot types and is not limited to a specific model. Fig. 10 and supplemental video show that the motion planner updates the trajectory when a human approaches the current optimized path, deviating to maintain a safe distance from the obstacle. This simulation illustrates how our proposed motion planner can use CBFs to manage collision avoidance with dynamic obstacles in the environment.

7.4 Limitations

A key limitation in our problem formulation is that the agents cannot directly apply a moment to the object. As a result, rotational motion is inherently coupled with translational motion since both are driven by the unidirectional forces applied by the robots to the object. These interaction constraints are embedded within the dynamic equations in the motion planner's MPC framework, as defined in (32).



Figure 10. Simulation of quadruped robots encountering dynamic obstacles. The motion planner continuously optimizes the trajectory to avoid moving obstacles and ensure safety.

This constraint, along with the velocity constraint (37), which is restricted by the robots' speed limits, prevents the system's rapid maneuvering and rotations. Therefore, if the planner receives a sharp command, it often fails due to an infeasible optimization problem—particularly because the interaction constraint, enforced as a hard constraint, significantly limits the optimization feasibility.

8 Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper presents a safety-critical framework for object manipulation using a team of quadruped robots. The motion planner is designed in an MPC fashion, considering both stability and safety criteria to ensure the safe navigation of the object through an environment with obstacles. Additionally, the planner employs an adaptive controller to compensate for model uncertainties, addressing practical scenarios. Thus, the motion planner can handle objects with unknown mass and friction coefficients. By defining appropriate CBFs, the motion planner guarantees safety while calculating the optimized trajectory for the object. The manipulation task is then performed using a decentralized loco-manipulation controller for each agent, utilizing the optimized force and contact point locations provided by the motion planner.

We hope this work inspires future research in multientity-legged robot systems, which are crucial for realworld applications. In the future, we plan to overcome the limitations of the interaction constraint by developing a more convex dynamic formulation for the motion planner MPC, enabling greater maneuverability.

References

- Ames AD, Coogan S, Egerstedt M, Notomista G, Sreenath K and Tabuada P (2019) Control barrier functions: Theory and applications. In: 2019 18th European Control Conference, ECC 2019. IEEE. ISBN 9783907144008, pp. 3420–3431. DOI:10.23919/ECC.2019.8796030.
- Ames AD, Grizzle JW and Tabuada P (2014) Control barrier function based quadratic programs with application to adaptive cruise control. *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control* 2015-February(February): 6271–6278. DOI:10.1109/CDC.2014.7040372.
- Ames AD, Xu X, Grizzle JW and Tabuada P (2017) Control Barrier Function Based Quadratic Programs for Safety Critical

Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 62(8): 3861–3876. DOI:10.1109/TAC.2016.2638961.

- Bledt G, Powell MJ, Katz B, Di Carlo J, Wensing PM and Kim S (2018) MIT Cheetah 3: Design and Control of a Robust, Dynamic Quadruped Robot. In: *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. ISBN 9781538680940, pp. 2245–2252. DOI:10.1109/IROS.2018. 8593885.
- Chiu JR, Sleiman JP, Mittal M, Farshidian F and Hutter M (2022) A Collision-Free MPC for Whole-Body Dynamic Locomotion and Manipulation. In: *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE. ISBN 9781728196817, pp. 4686–4693. DOI:10.1109/ICRA46639. 2022.9812280.
- Culbertson P, Slotine JJ and Schwager M (2021) Decentralized Adaptive Control for Collaborative Manipulation of Rigid Bodies; Decentralized Adaptive Control for Collaborative Manipulation of Rigid Bodies. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 37(6). DOI:10.1109/TRO.2021.
- Di Carlo J, Wensing PM, Katz B, Bledt G and Kim S (2018) Dynamic Locomotion in the MIT Cheetah 3 Through Convex Model-Predictive Control. In: *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE. ISBN 9781538680940, pp. 7440–7447. DOI:10.1109/IROS.2018. 8594448.
- Fadali MS and Visioli A (2012) Digital Control Engineering: Analysis and Design. Elsevier Science. ISBN 9780123983244.
- Farshidian F and others (2017) OCS2: An open source library for Optimal Control of Switched Systems. URL https://github.com/leggedrobotics/ocs2.
- Feller C and Ebenbauer C (2017) A stabilizing iteration scheme for model predictive control based on relaxed barrier functions. *Automatica* 80: 328–339. DOI:10.1016/j.automatica.2017.02. 001.
- Ferreau HJ, Kirches C, Potschka A, Bock HG and Diehl M (2014) qpOASES: a parametric active-set algorithm for quadratic programming. *Mathematical Programming Computation* 6(4): 327–363. DOI:10.1007/S12532-014-0071-1/TABLES/5.
- Ferrolho H, Ivan V, Merkt W, Havoutis I and Vijayakumar S (2023) RoLoMa: robust loco-manipulation for quadruped robots with arms. *Autonomous Robots* 47(8): 1463–1481. DOI:10.1007/ s10514-023-10146-0.
- Fink J, Ani Hsieh M and Kumar V (2008) Multi-robot manipulation via caging in environments with obstacles. In: *Proceedings* -

IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation. IEEE. ISBN 9781424416479, pp. 1471–1476. DOI:10.1109/ ROBOT.2008.4543409.

- Focchi M, del Prete A, Havoutis I, Featherstone R, Caldwell DG and Semini C (2017) High-slope terrain locomotion for torquecontrolled quadruped robots. *Autonomous Robots* 41(1): 259– 272. DOI:10.1007/s10514-016-9573-1.
- Grandia R, Jenelten F, Yang S, Farshidian F and Hutter M (2023) Perceptive Locomotion Through Nonlinear Model-Predictive Control. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 39(5): 3402–3421. DOI:10.1109/TRO.2023.3275384.
- Hauser J and Saccon A (2006) A Barrier Function Method for the Optimization of Trajectory Functionals with Constraints. In: *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control.* IEEE. ISBN 1-4244-0171-2, pp. 864–869. DOI: 10.1109/CDC.2006.377331.
- Hu Yr, Goldenberg AA and Zhou C (1995) Motion and Force Control of Coordinated Robots During Constrained Motion Tasks. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 14(4): 351–365. DOI:10.1177/027836499501400404.
- Khatib O (1988) Object manipulation in a multi-effector robot system. In: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Robotics Research. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press. ISBN 0262022729, pp. 137–144.
- Khatib O, Yokoi K, Brock O, Chang K and Casal A (1999) Robots in Human Environments: Basic Autonomous Capabilities. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 18(7): 684–696. DOI:10.1177/02783649922066501.
- Khatib O, Yokoi K, Chang K, Ruspini D, Holmberg R and Casal A (1996) Coordination and decentralized cooperation of multiple mobile manipulators. *Journal of Robotic Systems* 13(11): 755–764. DOI:10.1002/(SICI)1097-4563(199611)13: 11<755::AID-ROB6>3.0.CO;2-U.
- Kim J, Fawcett RT, Kamidi VR, Ames AD and Hamed KA (2023) Layered Control for Cooperative Locomotion of Two Quadrupedal Robots: Centralized and Distributed Approaches. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 39(6): 4728–4748. DOI:10. 1109/TRO.2023.3319896.
- Li J and Nguyen Q (2021) Force-and-moment-based Model Predictive Control for Achieving Highly Dynamic Locomotion on Bipedal Robots. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, volume 2021-Decem. IEEE. ISBN 9781665436595, pp. 1024–1030. DOI:10.1109/CDC45484. 2021.9683500.
- Li Z, Ge SS and Wang Z (2008) Robust adaptive control of coordinated multiple mobile manipulators. *Mechatronics* 18(5-6): 239–250. DOI:10.1016/j.mechatronics.2008.01.001.
- Liu YH and Arimoto S (1998) Decentralized Adaptive and Nonadaptive Position/Force Controllers for Redundant Manipulators in Cooperations. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 17(3): 232–247. DOI: 10.1177/027836499801700302.
- Nguyen Q and Sreenath K (2016) Exponential Control Barrier Functions for enforcing high relative-degree safety-critical constraints. In: *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, volume 2016-July. IEEE. ISBN 9781467386821, pp. 322–328. DOI:10.1109/ACC.2016.7524935.
- Nocedal J and Wright SJ (2006) Numerical Optimization. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer New York. ISBN 978-0-387-40065-5. DOI:10.1007/

978-0-387-40065-5.

- Pandit B, Gupta A, Gadde MS, Johnson A, Shrestha AK, Duan H, Dao J and Fern A (2024) Learning Decentralized Multi-Biped Control for Payload Transport. URL https://arxiv. org/abs/2406.17279v1.
- Prattichizzo D and Trinkle JC (2008) Grasping. In: Springer Handbook of Robotics. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 671–700. DOI:10.1007/978-3-540-30301-5{_}29.
- Rigo A, Chen Y, Gupta SK and Nguyen Q (2023) Contact Optimization for Non-Prehensile Loco-Manipulation via Hierarchical Model Predictive Control. In: *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, volume 2023-May. ISBN 9798350323658, pp. 9945–9951. DOI: 10.1109/ICRA48891.2023.10160507.
- Sleiman JP, Farshidian F, Minniti MV and Hutter M (2021) A Unified MPC Framework for Whole-Body Dynamic Locomotion and Manipulation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* 6(3): 4688–4695. DOI:10.1109/LRA.2021.3068908.
- Slotine JJE and Li W (1991) *Applied nonlinear control*, volume 199. Prentice hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Sombolestan M, Chen Y and Nguyen Q (2021) Adaptive Forcebased Control for Legged Robots. In: *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE. ISBN 9781665417143, pp. 7440–7447. DOI:10.1109/IROS51168. 2021.9636393.
- Sombolestan M and Nguyen Q (2023a) Hierarchical Adaptive Control for Collaborative Manipulation of a Rigid Object by Quadrupedal Robots. In: 2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). IEEE. ISBN 978-1-6654-9190-7, pp. 2752–2759. DOI:10.1109/ IROS55552.2023.10341700.
- Sombolestan M and Nguyen Q (2023b) Hierarchical Adaptive Loco-manipulation Control for Quadruped Robots. In: *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, volume 2023-May. IEEE. ISBN 9798350323658, pp. 12156–12162. DOI:10.1109/ICRA48891.2023.10160523.
- Sombolestan M and Nguyen Q (2024) Adaptive-Force-Based Control of Dynamic Legged Locomotion Over Uneven Terrain. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 40: 2462–2477. DOI:10.1109/ TRO.2024.3381554.
- Sontag ED (1999) Control-Lyapunov functions. In: Blondel V, Sontag ED, Vidyasagar M and Willems JC (eds.) Open Problems in Mathematical Systems and Control Theory. London: Springer London. ISBN 978-1-4471-0807-8, pp. 211– 216. DOI:10.1007/978-1-4471-0807-8{_}40.
- Tallamraju R, Verma P, Sripada V, Agrawal S and Karlapalem K (2019) Energy Conscious Over-actuated Multi-Agent Payload Transport Robot: Simulations and Preliminary Physical Validation. In: 2019 28th IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN). IEEE. ISBN 978-1-7281-2622-7, pp. 1–7. DOI:10.1109/ RO-MAN46459.2019.8956442.
- Tarn T, Bejczy A and Yun X (1986) Coordinated control of two robot arms. In: Proceedings. 1986 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation. IEEE. ISBN 0818606959, pp. 1193–1202. DOI:10.1109/ROBOT.1986. 1087606.
- Turrisi G, Schulze L, Medeiros VS, Semini C and Barasuol V (2024) PACC: A Passive-Arm Approach for High-Payload Collaborative Carrying with Quadruped Robots Using Model

Predictive Control. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/ 2403.19862v2.

- Verginis CK, Mastellaro M and Dimarogonas DV (2017) Robust Quaternion-based Cooperative Manipulation without Force/Torque Information. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 50(1): 1754– 1759. DOI:10.1016/j.ifacol.2017.08.526.
- Wolfslag WJ, McGreavy C, Xin G, Tiseo C, Vijayakumar S and Li Z (2020) Optimisation of Body-ground Contact for Augmenting the Whole-Body Loco-manipulation of Quadruped Robots. In: 2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). IEEE. ISBN 978-1-7281-6212-6, pp. 3694–3701. DOI:10.1109/ IROS45743.2020.9341498.
- Yang C, Sue GN, Li Z, Yang L, Shen H, Chi Y, Rai A, Zeng J and Sreenath K (2022) Collaborative Navigation and Manipulation of a Cable-Towed Load by Multiple Quadrupedal Robots. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* 7(4): 10041–10048. DOI:10.1109/LRA.2022.3191170.
- Zimmermann S, Poranne R and Coros S (2021) Go Fetch! -Dynamic Grasps using Boston Dynamics Spot with External Robotic Arm. In: *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference* on Robotics and Automation, volume 2021-May. IEEE. ISBN 9781728190778, pp. 1170–1176. DOI:10.1109/ICRA48506. 2021.9561835.