



UKAEA-RACE-PR(21)06

M. E. Sayed, J. O. Roberts, K. Donaldson, S. T. Mahon, F. Iqbal, B. Li, S. F. Aixela, G. Mastorakis, E. T. Jonasson, M. P. Nemitz, S. Bernardini, A. A. Stokes

# **Modular Robots for Enabling Operations in Unstructured Extreme Environments**

Enquiries about copyright and reproduction should in the first instance be addressed to the UKAEA Publications Officer, Culham Science Centre, Building K1/O/83 Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 3DB, UK. The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority is the copyright holder.

The contents of this document and all other UKAEA Preprints, Reports and Conference Papers are available to view online free at [scientific-publications.ukaea.uk/](https://scientific-publications.ukaea.uk/)

# **Modular Robots for Enabling Operations in Unstructured Extreme Environments**

M. E. Sayed, J. O. Roberts, K. Donaldson, S. T. Mahon, F. Iqbal, B.  
Li, S. F. Aixela, G. Mastorakis, E. T. Jonasson, M. P. Nemitz, S.  
Bernardini, A. A. Stokes



# Modular Robots for Enabling Operations in Unstructured Extreme Environments

Mohammed E. Sayed<sup>1,†</sup>, Jamie O. Roberts<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Karen Donaldson<sup>1</sup>,  
 Stephen T. Mahon<sup>1</sup>, Faiz Iqbal<sup>1</sup>, Boyang Li<sup>1</sup>, Santiago Franco Aixela<sup>3</sup>,  
 Georgios Mastorakis<sup>3</sup>, Emil T. Jonasson<sup>4</sup>, Markus P. Nemitz<sup>5</sup>,  
 Sara Bernardini<sup>3</sup>, and Adam A. Stokes<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Engineering, Institute for Integrated Micro and Nano Systems, The University of Edinburgh, Scottish Microelectronics Centre, Alexander Crum Brown Road, King's Buildings, Edinburgh, UK, EH9 3FF.

<sup>2</sup>Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) in Robotics and Autonomous Systems, School of Informatics, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3LJ, UK.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, UK.

<sup>4</sup>RACE (Remote Applications in Challenging Environments), United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, Culham Science Centre, Abingdon, OX14 3DB, UK.

<sup>5</sup>Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, 12 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

**\*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.**

Adam A. Stokes  
 Adam.Stokes@ed.ac.uk

## Abstract

Operations in extreme and hostile environments—such as offshore oil and gas, nuclear decommissioning, nuclear facilities maintenance, deep mining, space exploration, and subsea applications require the execution of sophisticated tasks. In nuclear environments, robotic systems have advanced significantly over the past years but still suffer from task failures caused by informational and physical uncertainty of the highly unstructured nature of the environment and exasperated by the time constraints imposed by high radiation levels. We present a survey of current robotic systems that can operate in such extreme environments and offer a novel approach to solving addressing the challenges they impose, encapsulated by the mission statement of *providing structure in unstructured environments* and exemplified by our new self-assembling modular robotic system, the Connect-R.

## Keywords:

Unstructured Environments, Modular Systems, Industrial Robots, Extreme Environments, Nuclear Decommissioning, Scaffolding System, Task Planning, Connect-R

## 1 Introduction

As we push the boundaries of human endeavour, we will inevitably operate in more extreme environments than ever before, including: nuclear zones; offshore environments; space exploration; defence; subsea applications and deep mining. Operations in these hostile, extreme environments require the execution of sophisticated tasks such in deploying systems for inspection, lifting, and cutting. The nature of these environments increases the risk to human life and consequently inflates the cost of operations. The urgency to remove people from these environments has driven industries to look for more cost-effective and safer methods to carry out operations and inspection tasks. Advances in robotics and automation have led people to believe that robots can provide the capability required for these tasks.

Here, we focus on how the current advancement of the field of robotics can affect immediate change in performing these tasks in extreme environments, specifically nuclear commissioning environments. This particular extreme environment has a unique temporal constraint imposed on operators due to the total integrated dose imparted by high levels of radiation, which are of course too severe for human operators leaving robotics as the only viable solution. Figure 1 shows the total integrated dose for 23 different nuclear robotic systems and the amount of time (hours) the robots are able to operate for in a specified nuclear environment (Fukushima Daiichi Unit 2 Reactor). The total integrated dose is the total amount of radiation dose that a robot can withstand before failure. Given the nature of radiation induced failures, a solution that maximises the useful time available to a system is the key factor in determining success. The maximum radiation level measured in Fukushima Daiichi Unit 2 Reactor is 530 Grays (Gy)/hr [1]. As shown in Figure 1, most of these systems have an effective mission-time of 0.2-1.9 hours before failure. One of the most challenging aspects of this environment is the near constant informational and physical uncertainty associated with the highly unstructured work-zone. Although robotic systems might be capable of performing essential tasks in these environments, they will likely end up using most of their time for tasks like localisation, mapping and navigation.

The current approach to operating in these harsh environments is to deploy ever more complex, innovative and expensive field robotics which are often in the form of single units that can perform a myriad of functions to provide the necessary capability. The trend of single robotic systems has had limited success and appears to be approaching operational requirements that cannot be achieved, particularly in environments such as the ones presented by Fukushima. From a total system perspective, the potential for parallel redundancy is severely limited by the singular failure potential of one or a handful of field robots.

Each robot also faces the same problem each time it enters the environment: each field robot will have to perform SLAM and obstacle avoidance and crucially each has a similar effective working time, driven by its TID. This is because the current protective measures that can be applied to electronics in radioactive can only provide so much time. The electronics can not be upgraded further and from a mission completion perspective, deploying successive field robots does not necessarily increase the progress of the intended mission. There is a pressing need for the current technologies available to industry to be utilised in such a way that they can address the operational requirements posed by environments like Fukushima.

A promising answer to these problems are the deployment of modular and multi robot systems. They have some key benefits that are well placed to answer such problems: they are inherently redundant and often one of the guiding design principles of modular robotics is to maximise the parallel redundancy in the system. Stemming from the same principle, these systems are often relatively cheap per individual unit, benefiting from the emergent capability of a system of comparatively simple units.

Whilst modular robotic systems do have significant potential there are still significant barriers to their wide spread adoption in industry, particularly the nuclear decommissioning industry. Practically, modular robotic systems have not yet been built at a physical scale that provides any useful work in such environments. Nuclear decommissioning tasks tend towards heavy engineering and so require significant force and power requirements. Next, the problem of system control is unavoidable and grows as the size of the system grows. The need for precise and explainable control in the system autonomy architecture is of paramount importance when operating on critical infrastructure where mistakes will have detrimental effects that last for thousands of years. Modular robotics also face the major problem of TID, exactly as field robotics do. In this way, it is the major limiting factor that renders any system design principle, innovative control system or specialist capability irrelevant as the hard limit imposed by radiation on the current hardware protection capabilities available.

The question becomes given the present need to operate in such environments and the limiting factor of radiation hardening, what is the best approach to maximise the available operational time in an environment within current capabilities? This work will present a survey of current solutions for the nuclear decommissioning sector and the current state of the art in modular robotics. We will then present the Connect-R, a modular robotic system that is designed to answer the question posed before, as a poten-

tial solution to the urgent industrial need for robotic solutions in their harshest environments.




Figure 1: Total Integrated Dose (TID) of 23 different nuclear robotic systems and the effective time (hr) before failure in the Fukushima Daiichi Unit 2 Reactor (530 Gy/hr). (A) Humans (for comparison) (0.02 Gy) [2]. (B) Shape Changing Robot [3]. (C) AVEXIS [4]. (D) DRV [5]. (E) KUKA iiwa LBR robot [6]. (F) Qunice 1 [7]. (G) Quince 2 [8]. (H) Quince 3 [9]. (I) SC-ROV [5]. (J) Gengo [5]. (K) Trydiver [5]. (L) Underwater ROV [5]. (M) Mini Rover M~K I [10]. (N) The Phantom 300 XTL [10]. (O) General Electric's Minisubmarine [10]. (P) Scorpion [11]. (Q) TEPCO Cleaning Robot [12]. (R) B1 [5]. (S) MEISTeR [5]. (T) Survey Runner [5]. (U) Telescopic Robot [5]. (V) Lake Fischer [5]. (W) PMORPH [5].

## 2 Robotics for Extreme Environments

The use of robots in extreme environments removes the requirement for people to operate in such dangerous environments, which reduces the risk to human lives, reduces the cost of operation in these environments, and helps increase the productivity. The requirements for the robotic systems vary with the different domains they are deployed in and examples of this variation can be seen in current robots designed for extreme environments such as deep sea operations, mapping the sea bed, space exploration, offshore environment monitoring, as well as nuclear maintenance and decommissioning.

The offshore environment is an extreme environment that can benefit from the use of robotic platforms. The international offshore energy industry currently faces the challenges of: a fluctuating oil price, significant and expensive decommissioning commitments for old infrastructure (especially in the North Sea), and small margins on the traded commodity price per kWh of offshore renewable energy [13].

There have been several reported accidents and explosions of offshore rigs, with the most widely reported and studied tragedy being the Deep Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico [14]. The sensitivity of the product from offshore oil and gas platforms and the harshness of the environment leads to critical health and safety challenges. Thus, continuous inspection and monitoring of the offshore facilities is a vital task and requires technologies to prevent accidents and ensure safety of human and marine lives.

Operators are seeking more cost-effective and safer methods for inspection, repair and maintenance of their topside and marine offshore infrastructure. Robots are seen as key enablers in this regard to improve health, safety and environment, and increase the production and cost efficiency. Robots can be deployed in the air, on the rig or in the subsea.

Nuclear environments also present significant risk to human lives due to the radioactive nature of these environments. The Nuclear energy sector provides multiple use cases where robotics is critical for success during the operating lifetime of the reactor. Nuclear Fission plants have a long history of using electro-mechanical and robotic solutions for inspection, refueling and maintenance. Research into Nuclear Fusion has also relied heavily on robotics during the last 30 years [15], and once ready for use generating energy, the Fusion sector will be entirely dependent on robotic remote maintenance solutions due to the high radiation levels completely precluding human access to many facilities [16], [17].

The multitude of legacy nuclear installations which exist around the world also provide a formidable

challenge in terms of their decommissioning, with the UK legacy nuclear facilities alone projected to take over 100 years to fully decommission, costing between £100-200 billion without major technological improvements [18].

Nuclear decommissioning, however, is still an essential task due to the many health risks associated with nuclear assets around the world. Nuclear environments present many challenges including: hazardous working environments requiring protective equipment and radiation hardening of electronics; limited time windows for operation; limited lifetime for electronics; limited access through which to deploy the systems; unstable structures present that prevent occupation; lifting of heavy objects ( $\sim 50\text{kg}$ ) that require mechanical assistance; processing of large volumes of liquids (1000s litres). Therefore, robots are vital for nuclear environments as it is impossible to have operations carried out by humans in these environments. There have been several robotic systems developed in the past for different nuclear zones around the world.

Following the accident at Three Mile Island in 1979, different mobile robotic platforms for inspection, decontamination and dismantling of the TMI-2 zone have been developed. Gelhaus et al. [19] developed the 'ROVER' (Remote Reconnaissance vehicle, RRV) that was a remotely-operated multi-tool vehicle with six wheels. The robot was capable of carrying out environmental monitoring tasks, video transmissions, sampling, cleaning and decontaminating areas of the nuclear zone. LOUIE I [20] is a small lightweight surveying robot developed to take radiation measurement of areas that other robots can't physically reach in the TMI-2 zone. There are other examples of nuclear robotic systems that were developed for the Chernobyl zone after the accident in 1986. Potemkin et al. [21] developed 'KLAN', which was utilised for dosimetric reconnaissance, decontamination and rubble clearing at the Chernobyl zone. The 'Pioneer' robot was developed to assess the structural integrity of the sacrophagus in the Chernobyl power plant and generate a 3D map of the nuclear zone [22][23][24]. 'JAEA-3' robot [25] was developed for the Fukushima Daiichi zone, where the robot can take gamma ray imaging on various floors of the reactor buildings. 'Quince' robot developed by Nagatani et al. [26] for the Fukushima Daiichi zone and was used for surveillance missions, explore the inside and outside of the reactor buildings, perform dose measurements, and sample contaminated water. Tsitsimpelis et al. [27] provide an extensive literature review of past and current ground-based robotic systems developed for the characterisation of a range of different nuclear environments and zones.

### 3 Robotics in Industrial Applications

In proposing a pragmatic approach to industrial scale deployment of robotic systems, this section will look at the current state of robotic systems that are widely deployed in industrial settings. Figure 2 shows examples of some robotic systems used for industrial applications. Many robotic systems found applications in assembly lines and industrial handling in a more general, which includes processes such as transporting, palletizing, grasping, packaging, picking, etc. Chen et al. [28] developed a smart companion robot for the automotive assembly industry to assist human workers in lifting, transporting and manipulating heavy payloads such as batteries, car body parts, etc. Unhelkar et al. [29] designed a mobile robot system capable of operating on the moving floors of automotive assembly lines. The purpose placed dynamic floors play an integral part of the robots state estimation and path planning for task completion. Reid et al. [30] filed a patent for an automated assembly manufacturing involving robotic arms for all assembly applications in industrial manufacturing. Bischoff et al. [31] demonstrated latest trends in KUKA Lightweight Robot, showcasing its novel features and demonstrating different applications for the robot. Haddadin et al. [32] demonstrated advanced algorithms for role allocation in human-robot collaborative industrial assembly and safety re-planning. This system was commercialised by KUKA robot. Sabattini et al. [33] developed an autonomous guiding vehicle, as part of the plug and navigate robots project, for industrial logistics. The robot differs from other autonomous guiding vehicles in that it is designed to operate in environments shared with human operators, utilising advanced sensing capabilities [33].

Computer Numerically Controlled (CNC) machine tool tending is another popular industrial handling




Figure 2: Robotics in Industrial Applications. (A) KUKA lightweight robot [31] for different industrial and service applications. (B) A soft gripper [35] for handling food and lunchbox packing on a mass scale. (C) Smart companion robot [28] as a mobile lift-assist collaborative robot (corobot) to assist human workers with heavy payload transport and manipulation in automotive assembly. (D) Bin-picking of reflective steel parts by a 6-axis robot [36]. (E) Mobile robot for moving-floor assembly lines [29]. (F) Pictobot [37], a cooperative painting robot for interior finishing of industrial developments.

application that is aided with robotic solutions. Vosniakos et al. [34] developed a task-oriented offline parametric programming technique for a 6 axis industrial robot that tends to CNC lathes. Wang and Hirai [35] developed a soft gripper for food handling and lunchbox packaging on a mass scale. By using the compliance of soft materials, the gripper can overcome a wide range of uncertainties such as size, material and shape. Conversely, Dyrstad et al. [36] used a dual-resolution convolutional neural network to enable bin-picking of reflective steel parts by a 6-axis robot.

Robotic systems have also found other applications in industry including cleaning, welding and painting. Regular cleaning requirements in food, pharma and semiconductor industries make robots a very useful tool for such applications. Prabakaran et al. [38] developed a Tetris-inspired reconfigurable floor cleaning robot that solves issues with traditional fixed morphology systems. The robot can reconfigure its shape to maximise floor coverage in its surrounding environment [38]. Górká et al. [39] demonstrated the use of KUKA KR180 robot with a welding torch for assistive spot welding of DOCOL 1200M. Hu et al. [39] developed a new legged mobile robot for welding with hexapod mobility and 6 DoF manipulator. The robot can overcome obstacles in its environment and move freely on unstructured terrains [40]. Asadi et al. [37] developed Pictobot, which is a co-operative robot for interior painting of industrial developments.

## 4 Modular Robotic Systems

Field-robots performing tasks in unstructured environments need to adapt to variable constraints in their environment. Many robots to-date, have provided a single unique solution to a specific real world application, but they are usually hard to use and adapt for other applications [41]. Due to the rigid nature of conventional robot design, conventional robots do not cope well with changes in their environment. Their repair and maintenance are also costly and generally require trained personnel [41]. In contrast, modular robots (or assemblies of modular units) make it easier to repair the system, to replace modules, and to control the robot which gives the robot more robustness and capability for achieving new tasks in unstructured environments. Modular robots differ from traditional robots in that their entire body is based on a collective of individual sub-modules. A robotic module is defined as a unit that performs typical tasks of a robot, either fully or partially, and has the ability of interacting with other units or modules to create a system with new capabilities. Modular robotic systems have attracted major interest over the past years [42][43][44][45][46][47][48][49][50][51][52][53]. The interest in modular systems is due to the hypothesis that a single, advanced robot is more expensive and less robust than multiple low-cost

Category	Scale
Micro	$0 < x < 1mm$
Mini	$1mm < x < 5cm$
Macro	$5cm < x < 1m$
Mega	$1m < x$

Table 1: Classification of modular robotic systems according to form factor.

modules [41][54][55]. The ability to adapt to unknown environments makes modular robotic system very versatile, as they can be easily reconfigured for different tasks [41][42][47][54][56][57][58]. Modular robots that are able to automatically transform their size and/or shape to meet specific tasks or environments are referred to as self-configurable robots. Modular Self-Reconfigurable Robotics (MSRR) are particularly versatile, with many degrees of freedom. An MSRR is able to repeatedly transform its morphology and/or size by connection and disconnection of its constituent modules [59] which allows the optimum configuration for specific tasks to be achieved. Modular self-reconfigurable robots, unlike modular robotic designs, are able to change their morphology with minimum human involvement [41]. In unknown or challenging environments this capability is particularly advantageous, as a robotic system with fixed-morphology would not have the same level of adaptability to manage a complex or unknown environment [59][60]. The interchangeable capability of a modular system allows for self-repair, making the system robust as defective modules can be separated from the system and then replaced. This set of advantages make self-configurable robotic systems ideal for deployment in extreme environments. The first known concept of reconfigurable modular robots was suggested John Von Neumann [61] in the 1960s, where he proposed the idea of adaptable universal robots. Polybot by Yim et al. [48] was the first modular robotic system to demonstrate two sequential topologically distinct movements by self-reconfiguration [48]. In 1996, Tetrobot was designed for applications in extreme environments such as mining, space, and undersea [62]. It uses concentric multilink spherical (CMS) joints to allow several struts to connect whilst sharing a central point of rotation. Another example of a modular robotic system is the Self-assembling Modular Robot for Extreme Shape-shifting (SMORES), which was designed to be polymorphic, metaphoric and inexpensive, with an aim to improve the versatility of self-reconfigurable systems [63] [64]. By being simplistic in its construction, Alice is another modular robot that is low cost, small in size and power efficient, and is designed to improve the autonomy of modular robotic systems [65]. Superbot [50], designed for NASA space exploration, was constructed for accomplishing complicated tasks in unknown, harsh environments.




Figure 3: Modular robotic systems across different length scales (micro, mini, macro). (A) Catom [66]. (B) Electron micrograph of a MEMS micro-robot [67]. (C) Omnidirectional walking microrobot [68]. (D) Walking silicon micro-robot [69]. (E) Robot pebbles [52]. (F) M-blocks [44]. (G) Claytronics [70]. (H) Slimebot [71]. (I) Polybot [48]. (J) Superbot [50]. (K) CoSMO [72]. (L) Particle robot [42].

The current trend in modular robotics is to make robots small, but that limits their usefulness in real-world applications. Table 1 classifies modular robotic systems according to form factor. ‘Micro robotics’

describes robots with dimensions ranging from a fraction of a millimetre to one millimetre. ‘Mini robotics’ describes robots having a size range between a millimeter and five centimeters. ‘Macro robotics’ describes systems with dimensions between five centimeters and one meter. ‘Mega robotics’ describes systems that have a size larger than one meter. Many researchers develop designs in Micro to Macro sizes for addressing various scenarios in MSRR. The form factor is chosen at a trade-off between system capabilities and environmental requirements. Figure 3 gives a few examples of modular robotic systems in each of the form factor categories.

## 5 Task Planning for Extreme Environments

Task Planning is a critical part of any robotic system that aims to operate in critical environments, and due to the verification and accountability requirements of operating in critical infrastructure, most control and planning systems are heavily reliant on human input. The M-Blocks system developed by Romanishin et al [44] combines magnetic robots to create cubic structures. The focus of this work is on the hardware. Stewart et al [73] presented a distributed feedback-mechanism to construct a ‘wall’ via individual robot agents. Jennett et al. [74] proposed a MRS that constructs a 3D structure by carrying building blocks and arranging them. The authors used local control rules based on the neighbouring environment. With the strict criteria of Explainable AI, autonomous decision making structures like Task Planning for similar scaled problems are relatively few. Dutta et al. present a decentralised algorithm for self-assembly based on subgraph isomorphism, this work is intended for an unknown initial state of each robotic agent which would be unsuitable for extreme environment scenarios [75]. Tucci et al. present a decentralised self-assembly algorithm based around the abstract of a Catom [76], a virtual voxel that can be occupied or unoccupied. This is an effective algorithm but untested on real robots with more complex connection criteria.

<https://rescuesim.robocup.org/RoboCup> Rescue Virtual Robot Simulation provides a common virtual environment for researchers working on Urban Search and Rescue. In this simulation a devastated area needs to be explored by a team of robots to find survivors. Our focus is to create a structure to facilitate other robotic systems to work in inaccessible areas, e.g. a reactor, instead a whole town. There are clear parallels on both scenarios, e.g. data gathering, robot cooperation, centralized vs distributed controls, etc. <https://www.robocup.org/leagues/10RoboCup> Robot League was setup to increase awareness of the challenges involved in search and rescue applications. It requires robots to search for simulated victims in unstructured environments.

The biggest challenge for conventional planning is working in noisy environments. This requires effective data gathering, keeping a human in the loop and re-planning when necessary. Firstly, symbolic planners see the world in terms of symbolic relationships, e.g. a module is at location  $x,y,z$ . The data provided by the module sensors is translated into a PDDL problem which symbolic planners can then solve. Later in this paper we present a visualization system which allows a human operator to visualize and give the go ahead for each step in the solution plan provided by the planner. If re-planning is necessary, e.g. exogenous events, the human operator can easily modify the goal or the current state in the PDDL language to adapt to changing circumstances.

## 6 The Connect-R Modular Robotic System

As mentioned in the introduction, the Connect-R system aims to answer the question of how to maximise the time available in a target environment with a modular robotic system. The electro-hydraulic system also demonstrates an approach to nullify the problems of developing an industrial modular robotic system, namely scale and control. Here, we present the Connect-R in terms of its operational principle, physical design, control strategy, and intended usage.

The Connect-R project is a flagship project funded by Innovate UK. The partnership between industry (Barron, Ross Robotics, Tharsus, Jigsaw Structures), academia (The University of Edinburgh and




Figure 4: Module Configuration as kinematic primitives. (A) Demonstration of a key motion primitive that a module must be able to achieve -extension- which allows for translation in the world state. (B) Demonstration of the two-DOF in rotation that a module can apply to a connected module. This is a key motion primitive in the system's ability to build structures.

Royal Holloway University of London) and Government R&D (RACE) provides an excellent opportunity to disrupt the current space.

## 6.1 Providing Structure in Unstructured Environments

*Providing structure in unstructured environments* is the design principle by which the system of the Connect-R is designed. In direct answer to the question presented (how to maximise the effective working time in a nuclear environment?), the Connect-R provides both a physical and informational structure. The modular robotic system is deployed to self-assemble into cubic-like structure that other individual robots can leverage as a simplified environment in their efforts to perform useful tasks. This structure not only acts as a uniform environment where a standard and discrete form of locomotion can be utilised, it also doubles as a constant map of the environment. These two features are crucial in reducing the uncertainty that leaves single field robots spending most of their time on SLAM and obstacle avoidance in the environments. The robotic structure also provides an informational infrastructure that can be used for key points of feedback such as providing state estimation and indicators of successful movement between points in the environment.

Regarding the hard limit posed by TID, whilst the electronics of the individual robots of the Connect-R system are no more resilient to radiation hardening than other robotic solutions, the Connect-R is able to make use of its failure for the next robots that are entered into the system. By focusing its useful time in the environment on self-assembling into a structure, it will remain in a useful structure due to its hydraulic driven actuators.

Providing *structure in unstructured environments* is the key point in this approach, in contrast to innovating increasingly complex individual robots which attempt to mitigate uncertainty presented by unstructured environments. This work advocates that comparatively simple individual robots can, as a system, offer a better solution when focused on reducing the target environment to a state that is manageable by the current technologies available. This approach advocates that the technological gap between operational requirements and current robotic capability can be better bridged by deploying a simpler system that provides an advantage to a robot which cannot bridge the gap itself. Instead of deploying ever more complex systems to overcome the environment, the pragmatic approach is to deploy a simpler system which reduces the operational requirements of the environment to meet what is achievable.

## 6.2 Physical Design

The Connect-R is an electro-hydraulic robot that is designed to be larger than any other modular robotic system precisely so that it can operate effectively in industrial environments. It was also designed in tan-




Figure 5: An overview of the ROS-PLC framework. (a) A web camera takes an RGB image from the hydraulic board and passes the tag pose to the ROS interface. (b) A ROS interface uses the tag pose to determine the next operation, communicating this operation to the PLC board via a bit-stream. (c) The PLC board interprets the bit-stream from ROS and addresses the contacts for the solenoid valves on the hydraulic board. (d) The solenoid valves engage, and the hydraulic fluid flows to the hydraulic cylinder, moving the tags affixed to the ends of the cylinders.

dem with the Task Planning for to optimise it for the proposed autonomy architecture. Each individual module of our modular robotic system is defined by its capability to move in a 3D space and form orthogonal connections to other identical modules. Figure 4 shows the possible basic movements of each module of our proposed modular robotic system. Each module can extend, connect to other modules and rotate around other modules. The module also has a locomotive ability, where it can move on top of other modules. It can move by independently actuating sections of the main body. By using the correct sequence, it can move via an ‘inchworm’ like motion.

Each module has identical actuating manipulators at each end, which makes the module completely symmetrical. Each manipulator has 3 degrees of freedom, where the manipulator can be utilised to manipulate either the module itself, or another module connected to it. As the manipulators can only be deployed from the ends of the module, structural connections can only be achieved by manoeuvring each module so that the manipulator is free with adequate space to move the robot into positions. This creates a complex set of rules for valid structures and increases the importance of autonomous task planning, however the physical symmetry and relative simplicity of the manipulator capabilities are intentional such that only discrete number of actions with well defined results are possible. This is crucial for the success of the autonomy architecture.

The electro-hydraulic actuation is key to the robot being at a scale that is practically useful, each robot is 1-2m long giving the system an opportunity to occupy environments that are orders of magnitude greater than the current state of the art. Programmable logic controllers are used for hydraulics control. Whilst PLC’s dated by current standards, they remain the industry standard to operate in nuclear environments and so to enable smooth integration with the standard software frameworks, Figure 5 illustrates a ROS-PLC framework to enable inline control that has been developed specifically for the Connect-R.




Figure 6: Representation of Task Planning. (A) A graphical explanation of the action selection in Task Planning to transition between two states without a change in orientation. (B) A graphical explanation of the action selection in Task Planning to transition between the same coordinate states, but with change in module orientation also.

## 6.3 Task Planning

Autonomy architectures are key to robotic systems and are crucial to ensuring successful system performance. As mentioned previously, in the application of deploying robotic systems to work in extreme environments and critical infrastructure, there are the necessary requirements of accountability and verification in the autonomy structures. These strict constraints usually disqualify model-free ML and Deep Learning techniques due to their data heavy training periods and an inability to decompose potential failures after training, despite their obvious power and popularity in both the literature and industry. It is important then, to base the autonomy structure on a system which is model-drive, transparent and accommodates human-integration. This is crucial to the pragmatic approach suggested in this work, exemplified by the Connect-R projects autonomy structure.

In the Connect-R, the AI which plans and produces the target structures is Task Planning, currently relying on the FastDownward planner. PDDL 2.1 was chosen as the language with which to represent the world state of the target environment through the planning domains. PDDL allows for a flexible goal state that can be fully specified, e.g. from setting all robots to specific positions and orientations to being as vague as simply requesting that a certain position(s) is occupied by one part of the Connect-R system.

To aid in human interpretation so that they can be an effective part of the autonomy structure, the world state is defined by coordinates and robots. For example, a vector-based representation to signify that a robot is in a specific location with the predicate (robot-at ?x ?y ?z ?orientation). PDDL uses 'actions' to model the world-dynamics: modelling the valid transitions of objects inside the world state, e.g. (translate\_x ?x) will translate a robot in the x dimension of the world state.

Figure 6 shows a graphical explanation of this system. The coordinates of the world state are denoted by the grid space, with the corresponding dimensions. On the left, it can be seen that to transition a robot from state 1 to state 2 (?x1,?y1,?z1 to ?x2,?y2,?z2), the planner selects the action 'Translate\_x', similarly the right shows that to transition with a change of angle then the planner will choose 'Rotate\_xy\_xz'. These examples were chosen relative to Figure 4, as they demonstrate how the key kinematic primitives of each module are represented in the Task Planning. Changes are easily incorporated by non-planning experts by simply adding, removing or modifying the existing PDDL predicates in the domain file and this can be done while keeping backward compatibility with previous scenarios (PDDL problem files). Depending on the complexity of the requested task and the available time it might not be practical to guarantee a solution optimum. The Connect-R AI is compatible with both optimal and sub-optimal state of the art planners. Note that while the planner solutions are calculated without human input, we can bias the planner preferences by giving different costs to different actions, e.g. if the priority is to lengthen the life of the struts we can make it more expensive to put the struts in hazardous environments, e.g. higher radioactivity levels. The planner will try to find the cheaper solution, i.e. cost is calculated by aggregating all the action costs in the final plan from initial state to goal state. The more expensive an action is, the less frequently it will be used unless it is unavoidable to achieve a goal state.

Practically, humans interact with the AI structure by ensuring plan execution can be stopped at any time. Sensors map the current state of the world into a PDDL state. If new restrictions need to be added, this can be done by simply using the latest snapshot of the environment and modifying the goals as desired.

## 7 Discussion

Robotic systems for nuclear environments were being developed since the 1960s, but it has been only recently that the most significant technological advances in those systems took place and allowed them to perform better in such environments [27]. In 2012, Kawatsuma et al. [25] provided a study on emergency response robots following the first year of the accident at Fukushima Daiichi in 2011. The study reports that most of the robots developed and deployed after the accident were either not fit for undertaking missions due to physical constraints and lack of maintenance, or major modifications were required for the robots before they can be successfully deployed in that nuclear zone [25]. Advances in




Figure 7: Robots and machines use electric-, pneumatic-, and hydraulic-typed actuators for various application. (a) This graph shows the power-to-weight ratio versus length scale of the actuator and a metric for comparing these typed actuators. (b) Spot® from Boston Dynamics. (c) BigDog® from Boston Dynamics. (d) HyQ [77]. (e) A Kuka six-axis robot. (f) M-2000iA from FANUC. (g) An excavator.

computing performance and the improvement in the radiation resistance of electrical and mechanical components (development of new materials that can withstand higher radiation levels) has increased the reliability of robotic systems for nuclear environments. However, a major challenge still remains for robotic systems in nuclear environments, which is the informational and physical uncertainty associated with the highly unstructured nuclear zone. Although robotic systems might be advanced enough to carry out essential tasks in these environments (such as sludge removal, deploying sensors, inspecting valves, sampling, manipulation of payloads, etc.), accessing the target area is mainly limited, and most robotic systems fail before reaching their required area or are unable to navigate to that area due to the unstructured nature of the environment.

The Connect-R is proposed as a system with significant contributions to the operational requirements of nuclear decommissioning, driven by a larger contribution which is to frame the approach to such environments from different perspective. In surveying the literature, it was found that a modular robotic system at a useful scale was lacking and would be a major step forward in providing operational capability in these nuclear environments. The Connect-R is an electro-hydraulic robotic system with individual units of length 1-2m. This is a major contribution as now the Connect-R can actually affect change at an industrial scale at such sizes, see Figure 7 for a comparison of actuation mediums and the Power to Weight ratio that they can develop. In adopting electro-hydraulics, the Connect-R has also contributed a ROS-PLC module that allows for control of PLCs. This is an important step in the pragmatic application of technologies as although PLCs are dated, they are an industry standard in those environments and are a good example of working with existing technology instead of innovating over the verified hardware. The next major contribution from the Connect-R is the autonomy structure. The Task Planning system has been specifically designed to include a human operator and as such is a significantly more explainable system than other model-free techniques. The design constraints of the Task Planning have been reflected in the physical robot and has allowed for a scalable, accurate and deterministic autonomy model of the system which can be easily interpreted by the human operator. The physical symmetries in the robot design have allowed for this feature.

Perhaps the most important contribution is how the Connect-R system addresses the unavoidable fail-




Figure 8: Connect-R System Vision: Demonstrates the vision for how the Connect-R system will be deployed. The point cloud representation shows a city landscape and a structure of identical modules is built up in the environment. It can be seen that this structure could be attempting to provide access to the higher floors of the tallest house in the point cloud

ures imposed by TID's. The literature review demonstrates that the prevailing approach to operating in these environments is to innovate and further raise the technological level of the operating robots to meet the demands of the environment. It has been shown though, that the uncertainties that nuclear environments pose cause failures irregardless of the technological capabilities. This is mostly due to the time required for a robot to actually reach an area to do work, so time essentially wasted performing SLAM and obstacle avoidance routines. It is also clear that capabilities in these environments are needed today, and so solutions that work today are needed. The Connect-R demonstrates that if the problem is viewed from the perspective of reducing the environment complexity to a level that is manageable with current technologies, the time spent in the environment can be maximised and useful work achieved before TID's are encountered. The Connect-R self-assembles into a physical structure that acts as a simplified environment for mapping and obstacle avoidance purposes and in so doing also offers known hardware to provide important feedback for tasks such as state estimation. The Connect-R *provides structure in unstructured environments*, which is also to say provides a new structured environment where other can flourish. Figure 8 demonstrates how the Connect-R is intended to be deployed in target environments, in this case to access higher stories in an urban environment.

## 8 Conclusion

The call for effective and robust automation is growing and its need is becoming evermore urgent as we approach a critical time in the life cycle of many of our core industries. Couple these aging structures with the general push to become more competitive and efficient through automation, the need to deploy robotic solutions is an immediate concern.

This paper presents a survey of current robotic systems that could be deployed for critical industry services, particularly in extreme environments and, in contrast, presents the case for a new approach to the requirements of these tasks, exemplified by the Connect-R System. The Connect-R system is a self-assembling robotic structure designed to be a practical and robust step in the direction of deployed, real world systems. Its defining purpose is to provide *structure in unstructured environments*, and achieves this on two levels. Firstly, it self assembles into a physical structure for other robotic systems to use to access the environment. This feature is particularly useful in disaster zones or otherwise inaccessible areas for humans to access. Secondly, the uniformity of the structure it can become provides an inherent

structure and certainty for other robotic systems to exploit. The risks and uncertainty surrounding accurate state estimation, SLAM, and motion planning are mitigated by the safety of a repeating, discrete structure that was purposefully placed, in an otherwise uncertain environment, for a robotic system to use as a resource.

This paper demonstrates that by following the approach of providing *structure in unstructured environments*, the present need to operate in these areas can be better realised on a pragmatic timescale by deploying a relatively simple robotic units that when combined can effectively change the environment to a technical difficulty that is more approachable to current capabilities. This would constitute a major change in the standard trajectory in solving these problems which usually work to innovate the current technologies to successfully operate in the original environmental conditions.

## 9 Author Contributions

M.E.S. and J.O.R. - writing and editing the manuscript, lead authors of the work; K.D., S.T.M., F.I., B.L., S.F.A. - writing sections of the manuscript; G.M., E.T.J., M.P.N., S.B. - reviewing the manuscript; A.A.S. - lead advisor and primary editor of the manuscript.

## 10 Funding

M.E.S., K.D., S.T.M., F.I., B.L., S.F.A., G.M., E.T.J., S.B., A.A.S. acknowledge support from Innovate UK Connect-R (TS/S017623/1). J.O.R. acknowledges support from EPSRC via the Robotarium Capital Equipment, and CDT Capital Equipment Grants (EP/L016834/1) and the CDT in Robotics and Autonomous Systems at Heriot-Watt and The University of Edinburgh.

## 11 Author Disclosure Statement

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

## References

- [1] J. McCurry, "Fukushima nuclear reactor radiation at highest level since 2011 meltdown," *The Guardian*, Feb 2017.
- [2] W. Rühm, T. Azizova, S. Bouffler, H. M. Cullings, B. Grosche, M. P. Little, R. S. Shore, L. Walsh, and G. E. Woloschak, "Typical doses and dose rates in studies pertinent to radiation risk inference at low doses and low dose rates," *Journal of radiation research*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2018.
- [3] H. Kenda, "Irid annual research report 2014," , International Research Institute for Nuclear Decommissioning, 2015.
- [4] A. Griffiths, A. Dikarev, P. R. Green, B. Lennox, X. Poteau, and S. Watson, "Avexis—aqua vehicle explorer for in-situ sensing," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 282–287, 2016.
- [5] Q. Zhang, W. Zhao, S. Chu, L. Wang, J. Fu, J. Yang, and B. Gao, "Research progress of nuclear emergency response robot," *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 452, p. 042102, dec 2018.
- [6] K. Zhang, C. Hutson, J. Knighton, G. Herrmann, and T. Scott, "Radiation tolerance testing methodology of robotic manipulator prior to nuclear waste handling," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 7, p. 6, 2020.

- [7] K. Nagatani, S. Kiribayashi, Y. Okada, K. Otake, K. Yoshida, S. Tadokoro, T. Nishimura, T. Yoshida, E. Koyanagi, M. Fukushima, and S. Kawatsuma, "Gamma-ray irradiation test of electric components of rescue mobile robot quince," in *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Safety, Security, and Rescue Robotics*, pp. 56–60, 2011.
- [8] K. Nagatani, S. Kiribayashi, Y. Okada, S. Tadokoro, T. Nishimura, T. Yoshida, E. Koyanagi, and Y. Hada, "Redesign of rescue mobile robot quince," in *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Safety, Security, and Rescue Robotics*, pp. 13–18, 2011.
- [9] K. Nagatani, S. Kiribayashi, Y. Okada, K. Otake, K. Yoshida, S. Tadokoro, T. Nishimura, T. Yoshida, E. Koyanagi, M. Fukushima, and S. Kawatsuma, "Emergency response to the nuclear accident at the fukushima daiichi nuclear power plants using mobile rescue robots," *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2012.
- [10] F. E. Gelhaus and H. T. Roman, "Robot applications in nuclear power plants," *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1–33, 1990.
- [11] R. Becker, "Another robot just broke down investigating fukushima's record high radiation levels," *The Verge*, feb 2017.
- [12] M. Yamaguchi, "Cleaner robot pulled from fukushima reactor due to radiation," *Phys.org*, feb 2017.
- [13] H. Hastie, K. Lohan, M. Chantler, D. A. Robb, S. Ramamoorthy, R. Petrick, S. Vijayakumar, and D. Lane, "The orca hub: Explainable offshore robotics through intelligent interfaces," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02100*, 2018.
- [14] J. W. Griggs, "Bp gulf of mexico oil spill," *Energy LJ*, vol. 32, p. 57, 2011.
- [15] A. Loving, P. Allan, N. Sykes, S. Collins, and P. Murcutt, "Development and application of high volume remote handling systems in support of jet and iter," *Fusion Engineering and Design*, vol. 87, no. 5, pp. 880 – 884, 2012. Tenth International Symposium on Fusion Nuclear Technology (ISFNT-10).
- [16] C. Damiani, J. Palmer, N. Takeda, C. Annino, S. Balagué, P. Bates, S. Bernal, J. Cornellá, G. Dubus, S. Esqué, C. Gonzalez, T. Ilkei, M. Lewczanin, D. Locke, L. Mont, B. Perrier, A. Puiu, E. Ruiz, R. Shuff, N. Van De Ven, C. Van Hille, M. Van Uffelen, C. H. Choi, J. P. Friconneau, D. Hamilton, J. P. Martin, S. Murakami, R. Reichle, J. S. Cuevas, T. Maruyama, Y. Noguchi, and M. Saito, "Overview of the ITER remote maintenance design and of the development activities in Europe," vol. 136, pp. 1117–1124.
- [17] C. Bachmann, S. Ciattaglia, F. Cismondi, T. Eade, G. Federici, U. Fischer, T. Franke, C. Gliss, F. Hernandez, J. Keep, M. Loughlin, F. Maviglia, F. Moro, J. Morris, P. Pereslvtsev, N. Taylor, Z. Vizvary, and R. Wenninger, "Overview over DEMO design integration challenges and their impact on component design concepts,"
- [18] N. D. Authority, "Nuclear provision: the cost of cleaning up britain's historic nuclear sites," July 2020.
- [19] F. E. Gelhaus and H. T. Roman, "Robot applications in nuclear power plants," *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1990.
- [20] J. K. Reilly, T. W. McIntosh, L. Northey, J. GaTanto, T. Osterhoudt, and J. Thompson, "Processing and removal of the three mile island makeup and purification system resins," 1985.
- [21] E. Potemkin, P. Astafurov, A. Osipov, M. Malenkov, V. Mishkinyuk, and P. Sologub, "Remote-controlled robots for repair and recovery in the zones of high radiation levels," in *1992 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 1, pp. 80–82, 1992.

- [22] J. Abouaf, "Trial by fire: teleoperated robot targets chernobyl," *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 10–14, 1998.
- [23] T. Denmeade, "Pioneer's journey into the sarcophagus," *Nuclear Engineering International*, vol. 43, no. 524, pp. 18–21, 1998.
- [24] M. Maimone, L. Matthies, J. Osborn, E. Rollins, J. Teza, and S. Thayer, "A photo-realistic 3-d mapping system for extreme nuclear environments: chornobyl," in *1998 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 1109–1112, 1998.
- [25] S. Kawatsuma, M. Fukushima, and T. Okada, "Emergency response by robots to fukushima-daiichi accident: Summary and lessons learned," *Industrial Robot*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 428–435, 2012.
- [26] K. Nagatani, S. Kiribayashi, Y. Okada, S. Tadokoro, T. Nishimura, T. Yoshida, E. Koyanagi, and Y. Hada, "Redesign of rescue mobile robot quince," in *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Safety, Security, and Rescue Robotics*, pp. 13–18, 2011.
- [27] I. Tsitsimpelis, C. J. Taylor, B. Lennox, and M. J. Joyce, "A review of ground-based robotic systems for the characterization of nuclear environments," *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, vol. 111, pp. 109–124, 2019.
- [28] Y. Chen, W. Wang, Z. Abdollahi, Z. Wang, J. Schulte, V. Krovi, and Y. Jia, "A robotic lift assister: A smart companion for heavy payload transport and manipulation in automotive assembly," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 107–119, 2018.
- [29] V. V. Unhelkar, S. Dörr, A. Bubeck, P. A. Lasota, J. Perez, H. C. Siu, J. C. Boerkoel, Q. Tyroller, J. Bix, S. Bartscher, *et al.*, "Mobile robots for moving-floor assembly lines: Design, evaluation, and deployment," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 72–81, 2018.
- [30] E. M. Reid, M. R. DesJardien, E. J. Batt, and A. C. Micale, "System and method for assembly manufacturing," Sept. 27 2016. US Patent 9,452,500.
- [31] R. Bischoff, J. Kurth, G. Schreiber, R. Koeppe, A. Albu-Schäffer, A. Beyer, O. Eiberger, S. Haddadin, A. Stemmer, G. Grunwald, *et al.*, "The kuka-dlr lightweight robot arm-a new reference platform for robotics research and manufacturing," in *ISR 2010 (41st international symposium on robotics) and ROBOTIK 2010 (6th German conference on robotics)*, pp. 1–8, VDE, 2010.
- [32] S. Haddadin, S. Parusel, R. Belder, and A. Albu-Schäffer, "It is (almost) all about human safety: a novel paradigm for robot design, control, and planning," in *International Conference on Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security*, pp. 202–215, Springer, 2013.
- [33] L. Sabattini, M. Aikio, P. Beinschob, M. Boehning, E. Cardarelli, V. Digani, A. Kregel, M. Mag-nani, S. Mandici, F. Oleari, *et al.*, "The pan-robots project: Advanced automated guided vehicle systems for industrial logistics," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 55–64, 2017.
- [34] G. Vosniakos, A. Parousi, G. Leivadiotakis, L. Blein, and C. Lassime, "Task-oriented off-line parametric programming of an industrial robot serving cnc lathes," *Proceedings in Manufacturing Systems*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 9–14, 2019.
- [35] Z. Wang and S. Hirai, "A soft gripper with adjustable stiffness and variable working length for handling food material," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Real-time Computing and Robotics (RCAR)*, pp. 25–29, IEEE, 2018.
- [36] J. S. Dyrstad, M. Bakken, E. I. Grøtli, H. Schulerud, and J. R. Mathiassen, "Bin picking of reflective steel parts using a dual-resolution convolutional neural network trained in a simulated environment," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO)*, pp. 530–537, IEEE, 2018.

- [37] E. Asadi, B. Li, and I.-M. Chen, "Pictobot: a cooperative painting robot for interior finishing of industrial developments," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 82–94, 2018.
- [38] V. Prabakaran, M. R. Elara, T. Pathmakumar, and S. Nansai, "Floor cleaning robot with reconfigurable mechanism," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 91, pp. 155–165, 2018.
- [39] J. Górka, A. Ozgowicz, and K. Matusek, "Robotic spot welding of docol 1200m steel," *Welding Technology Review*, vol. 91, 2019.
- [40] Y. Hu, W. Guo, F. Gao, and H. Chen, "The design of legged mobile welding robot," in *ROMANSY 22—Robot Design, Dynamics and Control*, pp. 102–109, Springer, 2019.
- [41] S. Chennareddy, A. Agrawal, and A. Karuppiah, "Modular self-reconfigurable robotic systems: a survey on hardware architectures," *Journal of Robotics*, vol. 2017, 2017.
- [42] S. Li, R. Batra, D. Brown, H.-D. Chang, N. Ranganathan, C. Hoberman, D. Rus, and H. Lipson, "Particle robotics based on statistical mechanics of loosely coupled components," *Nature*, vol. 567, no. 7748, pp. 361–365, 2019.
- [43] D. Rus and M. Vona, "A physical implementation of the self-reconfiguring crystalline robot," in *Proceedings 2000 ICRA. Millennium Conference. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation. Symposia Proceedings (Cat. No. 00CH37065)*, vol. 2, pp. 1726–1733, IEEE, 2000.
- [44] J. W. Romanishin, K. Gilpin, and D. Rus, "M-blocks: Momentum-driven, magnetic modular robots," in *2013 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 4288–4295, IEEE, 2013.
- [45] J. Baca, S. Hossain, P. Dasgupta, C. A. Nelson, and A. Dutta, "Modred: Hardware design and reconfiguration planning for a high dexterity modular self-reconfigurable robot for extra-terrestrial exploration," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1002–1015, 2014.
- [46] X. Jia, M. Frenger, Z. Chen, W. R. Hamel, and M. Zhang, "An alligator inspired modular robot," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 1949–1954, IEEE, 2015.
- [47] S. Murata, E. Yoshida, A. Kamimura, H. Kurokawa, K. Tomita, and S. Kokaji, "M-tran: Self-reconfigurable modular robotic system," *IEEE/ASME transactions on mechatronics*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 431–441, 2002.
- [48] M. Yim, D. G. Duff, and K. D. Roufas, "Polybot: a modular reconfigurable robot," in *Proceedings 2000 ICRA. Millennium Conference. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation. Symposia Proceedings (Cat. No. 00CH37065)*, vol. 1, pp. 514–520, IEEE, 2000.
- [49] J. W. Suh, S. B. Homans, and M. Yim, "Telecubes: Mechanical design of a module for self-reconfigurable robotics," in *Proceedings 2002 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (Cat. No. 02CH37292)*, vol. 4, pp. 4095–4101, IEEE, 2002.
- [50] B. Salemi, M. Moll, and W.-M. Shen, "Superbot: A deployable, multi-functional, and modular self-reconfigurable robotic system," in *2006 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 3636–3641, IEEE, 2006.
- [51] G. G. Ryland and H. H. Cheng, "Design of imobot, an intelligent reconfigurable mobile robot with novel locomotion," in *2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 60–65, IEEE, 2010.
- [52] K. Gilpin, A. Knaian, and D. Rus, "Robot pebbles: One centimeter modules for programmable matter through self-disassembly," in *2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2485–2492, IEEE, 2010.

- [53] J. Zhao, X. Cui, Y. Zhu, and S. Tang, "A new self-reconfigurable modular robotic system ubot: Multi-mode locomotion and self-reconfiguration," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 1020–1025, IEEE, 2011.
- [54] M. Yim, W.-M. Shen, B. Salemi, D. Rus, M. Moll, H. Lipson, E. Klavins, and G. S. Chirikjian, "Modular self-reconfigurable robot systems [grand challenges of robotics]," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 43–52, 2007.
- [55] J. Clune, J.-B. Mouret, and H. Lipson, "The evolutionary origins of modularity," *Proceedings of the Royal Society b: Biological sciences*, vol. 280, no. 1755, p. 20122863, 2013.
- [56] C. H. Belke and J. Paik, "Mori: a modular origami robot," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 2153–2164, 2017.
- [57] J. Neubert, A. Rost, and H. Lipson, "Self-soldering connectors for modular robots," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1344–1357, 2014.
- [58] K. Støy, "Reconfigurable robots," in *Springer Handbook of Computational Intelligence*, pp. 1407–1421, Springer, 2015.
- [59] M. Yao, C. H. Belke, H. Cui, and J. Paik, "A reconfiguration strategy for modular robots using origami folding," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 73–89, 2019.
- [60] J. Lengiewicz, M. Kurska, and P. Hołobut, "Modular-robotic structures for scalable collective actuation," *Robotica*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 787–808, 2017.
- [61] J. von Neumann, "Theory of self-reproducing automata. university of illinois," *Urbana*, vol. 196, no. 6, 1966.
- [62] G. J. Hamlin and A. C. Sanderson, "Tetrobot: A modular approach to parallel robotics," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 42–50, 1997.
- [63] J. Davey, N. Kwok, and M. Yim, "Emulating self-reconfigurable robots-design of the smores system," in *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 4464–4469, IEEE, 2012.
- [64] C. Liu, Q. Lin, H. Kim, and M. Yim, "Parallel self-assembly with smores-ep, a modular robot,"
- [65] G. Caprari and R. Siegwart, "Mobile micro-robots ready to use: Alice," in *2005 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, pp. 3295–3300, IEEE, 2005.
- [66] M. E. Karagozler, S. C. Goldstein, and J. R. Reid, "Stress-driven mems assembly + electrostatic forces = 1mm diameter robot," in *2009 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 2763–2769, 2009.
- [67] B. R. Donald, C. G. Levey, C. D. McGray, I. Paprotny, and D. Rus, "An untethered, electrostatic, globally controllable mems micro-robot," *Journal of Microelectromechanical Systems*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2006.
- [68] M. Mohebbi, M. L. Terry, K. F. Bohringer, G. T. A. Kovacs, and J. W. Suh, "Omnidirectional walking microrobot realized by thermal microactuator arrays," in *2001 ASME International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, 2001.
- [69] T. Ebefors, J. U. Mattsson, E. Kälvesten, and G. Stemme, "A walking silicon micro-robot," in *10th International Conference on Solid-State Sensors and Actuators (Transducers'99)*, pp. 1202–1205, 1999.
- [70] S. C. Goldstein, J. D. Campbell, and T. C. Mowry, "Programmable matter," *Computer*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 99–101, 2005.

- [71] M. Shimizu, A. Ishiguro, and T. Kawakatsu, "A modular robot that exploits a spontaneous connectivity control mechanism," in *2005 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 1899–1904, 2005.
- [72] J. Liedke, R. Matthias, L. Winkler, and H. Wörn, "The collective self-reconfigurable modular organism (cosmo)," in *2013 IEEE/ASME International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Mechatronics*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2013.
- [73] R. L. Stewart and R. A. Russell, "A distributed feedback mechanism to regulate wall construction by a robotic swarm," *Adaptive Behavior*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 21–51, 2006.
- [74] B. Jenett, A. Abdel-Rahman, K. Cheung, and N. Gershenfeld, "Material–robot system for assembly of discrete cellular structures," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 4019–4026, 2019.
- [75] A. Dutta, P. Dasgupta, and C. Nelson, "Distributed configuration formation with modular robots using (sub) graph isomorphism-based approach," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 837–857, 2019.
- [76] T. K. Tucci, B. Piranda, and J. Bourgeois, "A distributed self-assembly planning algorithm for modular robots," 2018.
- [77] C. Semini, N. G. Tsagarakis, E. Guglielmino, M. Focchi, F. Cannella, and D. G. Caldwell, "Design of HyQ – a hydraulically and electrically actuated quadruped robot," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part I: Journal of Systems and Control Engineering*, vol. 225, pp. 831–849, 9 2011.