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Abstract—We present the design and implementation of a taskable reactive mobile manipulation system. Contrary to related work, we treat the arm and base degrees of freedom as a holistic structure which greatly improves the speed and fluidity of the resulting motion. At the core of this approach is a robust and reactive motion controller which can achieve a desired end-effector pose while avoiding joint position and velocity limits, and ensuring the mobile manipulator is manoeuvrable throughout the trajectory. This can support sensor-based behaviours such as closed-loop visual grasping. As no planning is involved in our approach, the robot is never stationary thinking about what to do next. We show the versatility of our holistic motion controller by implementing a pick and place system using behaviour trees and demonstrate this task on a 9-degree-of-freedom mobile manipulator. Additionally, we provide an open-source implementation of our motion controller for both non-holonomic and omnidirectional mobile manipulators.

I. INTRODUCTION

Tasking a robot to perform a task is a long-standing challenge in robotics and most systems employ some combination of planning and reactivity. Planning takes a current and desired world state and outputs a robot trajectory to effect that change. Solutions are optimal with respect to some measure but the plan is executed open-loop and its success is therefore critically reliant on the provided initial world state and the accuracy of the robot in following the plan. Planning systems today are extremely capable and can handle problems with many degrees of freedom and complex constraints, but the planning time can be a significant fraction of a second or more.

In contrast, reactive systems “close the loop” on sensory information to create a behaviour. Such systems are highly responsive and robust to changes in their environment but typically do not handle complex constraints and the resulting behaviours are typically simplistic and not suitable for most real-world tasks.

The planning-reactivity dichotomy was identified long ago \cite{1} and most robot systems today combine planning and reactive subsystems. For example, the global and local planner architecture is commonly used, and the local “planner” provides the system’s reactivity to the real world.

In this letter, we extend our earlier work on reactive control for robot manipulator arms \cite{2} to a mobile manipulator that includes a non-holonomic base. This provides the ability to command end-effector velocity in an infinitely large workspace with motion optimally partitioned between arm and base in a way that maximises arm dexterity and allows graceful and fluid motion of the whole mobile manipulator. We achieve holistic motion by considering all degrees-of-freedom simultaneously within a quadratic program.

However, there remains a significant gap between what a reactive behaviour can achieve and what is necessary to complete a useful task. A task is typically a sequence of behaviours which admits the need for detecting when a behaviour has completed, switching between behaviours according to world state and the goal, and error recovery.

To make our reactive system taskable we combine it with a behaviour tree. Behaviour trees are an alternative to state machines which originated in the computer game industry, but their use is expanding to other areas including robotics. Compared to state machines, behaviour trees are easier to express and have inherent error recovery capability. The behaviour tree orchestrates the sensor-based behaviours of the reactive subsystem to achieve useful tasks. The behaviour tree can be considered as a form of scripting language, and still requires human ingenuity to create but could, in the future, be automatically synthesised by a task-level planner. The result is a holistic system that can perform complex tasks while exhibiting fluid and continuous motion without pauses for planning.

The contributions of this letter are:

1) a novel method of incorporating a non-holonomic mobile manipulation platform into a reactive motion control framework with example code available at jhavl.github.io/holistic
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2) complete integration of a closed-loop mobile grasper using behaviour trees
3) reactive control and validation on a 9 degree of freedom non-holonomic mobile manipulation platform with comparison to prior work.

II. RELATED WORK

Many mobile manipulation systems have been designed in recent years. Most prominently, the work in [3] used visual, tactile and proprioceptive sensor data to accomplish pick and place tasks using the PR2 robot. Graspable objects and support surfaces are segmented from 3D data, known objects have meshes fitted, and point clouds represent unknown objects. Grasp poses are achieved using an OMPL motion planner [4] which generates motion for the 7 degree-of-freedom arm to follow. The approach in [5] extends this to tightly couple visual and tactile sensors to enable grasp failure detection. The tactile feedback enables some local reactivity in grasping to account for sensor error or small grasp-target perturbations. Similar approaches are used on the Intel HERB platform in [6], [7]. Additionally, [8] uses a similar approach on the ARMAR-III robot for dual-arm grasping. In each of these works, the base of the robot is moved into position before actuating the arm to complete a grasp. While this simplifies the problem, the task is completed in a slow, and discontinuous manner where the motion is not graceful. Graceful motion is defined as being safe, comfortable, fast, and intuitive [9]. Specifically, the velocity must be smooth and consistent – not stop-start or unnatural.

Each of the above-mentioned works use motion planning to find an optimal trajectory subject to the supplied criteria. Motion planners can offer collision avoidance, joint limit avoidance, among many useful features. However, the associated computation time limits them to open-loop control. In a benchmark from [10], motion planners from the OMPL library range from 0.61 s to 1.3 s to compute a trajectory on a 7 degree-of-freedom arm, and between 18.7 s to 20.3 s to compute a trajectory on an 18 degree-of-freedom PR2 robot. This look-then-move paradigm is slow and not robust to environmental change and sensor error.

The NEO controller in [2] exploits the differential kinematics of a table-top manipulator to create a motion controller which can avoid both static and dynamic obstacles while also avoiding the joint position and velocity limits of the manipulator. The controller is purely reactive and is an extension of the classical resolved-rate-rate motion control [11] which has been re-framed as a quadratic programming optimisation problem (QP). NEO’s performance was shown to be comparable to motion planners for a reaching task with obstacles – while only taking only 9.8 ms to compute a step. An alternate approach to reactive motion control is through potential fields where the robot is repelled from joint limits and obstacles while being attracted towards the goal [12]. However, the potential field approach performs poorly compared NEO [2] and becomes intractable for complex and cluttered environments. The low latency of reactive motion controllers allows for greater versatility in the operation of the robot than planning based approaches and makes tasks such as closed-loop visual grasping possible.

Reactive control of a non-holonomic mobile base is challenging as it’s not sufficiently actutable to be controlled through a time-invariant state-feedback controller [13]. This can be overcome with a switched control algorithm [14] or a dynamics-based approach [3]. The most prominent method of controlling a mobile base is with non-linear optimisation based motion planning [15].

Combining and incorporating various components into a mobile manipulation system can be just as difficult as designing the individual components [3]. A common approach is to use finite-state machines (FSM) or similar architectures [5], [16]. In recent times, behaviour trees have grown in popularity, and have been shown to be very useful for robotics where complex tasks need to be completed in a robust, reliable, and reactive manner [17]. Behaviour trees provide an alternative to FSMs and have several advantages such as readability and scalability, while also providing a greater degree of expressiveness [18]. The reactive nature of behaviour trees provides a better match for reactive motion controllers than FSMs as robot targets and state information can be updated quickly and easily based on visual/robot feedback without requiring very complicated and unreadable state flow. Additionally, these benefits extend to reactive error recovery which can be implemented simply and based on visual/robot feedback.

III. MODELLING A MOBILE MANIPULATOR

Mobile manipulators comprise a mobile base with one or more manipulators where the base is either omnidirectional or non-holonomic. Omnidirectional mobile bases are constructed using Mecanum wheels or steered castor wheels (as seen on the PR2 robot). Non-holonomic mobile bases are typically two-wheel differential drive with four unactuated castor wheels providing stability (as seen on the Fetch mobile manipulator). Four-wheel differential drive mobile robots (used on the Clearpath Husky and Jackal) are also available although typically more suited for outdoor environments and rough terrain.

A. Two-Wheel Differential Drive Mobile Manipulators

The pose of the robot’s end-effector is

\[ ^aT_e = \alpha T_b(x, y, \theta) \alpha^a T_a(\kappa_a, q_a) \] (1)

where \( \{0\} \) is the world reference frame, \( ^bT_b \) is the relative pose of the mobile base \( \{b\} \), \( ^aT_a \) is a constant relative pose from the mobile base frame to the base of the manipulator arm \( \{a\} \), \( ^aT_c \) is the forward kinematics of the arm where the end-effector frame is \( \{e\} \), \( \kappa_a \) is the arm kinematic parameters and \( q_a \) are the arm’s joint coordinates.

Our approach is based on differential kinematics and we wish to determine a relationship between base velocity and joint angles \( \dot{q}_a \) and the end-effector spatial velocity \( \nu_e \). To facilitate this we introduce an infinitesimal transform into
the kinematic chain (1) to represent instantaneous motion of the base
\[ a^0T_e = a^0T_b \cdot a^0T_{\nu} (\delta_b, 0, \delta_b) \cdot J_a \cdot a^0T_e (\kappa_a, q_a) \]  
(2)
where \( \delta_b \) and \( \delta_d \) are respectively infinitesimal rotation and forward translation of the non-holonomic base. We could consider this as a simple revolute-prismatic robot with virtual joint coordinates \( q_b \in \mathbb{R}^2, \|q_b\| \to 0 \) and \( q_{b,0} = \delta_b \) and \( q_{b,1} = \delta_d \). The resulting expression is now similar to the forward kinematics of a higher-order serial-link manipulator and using the approach of [19] we can now write the differential kinematics as
\[ \dot{\nu}_e = a^0J_e (x, y, \theta, q) \begin{pmatrix} \dot{q}_b \\ \dot{q}_a \end{pmatrix} \]  
(3)
which maps the velocity of all axes of the mobile manipulation system to the end-effector spatial velocity where \( q = (0_2, q_a) \). The holistic manipulator Jacobian \( ^aJ_e (\cdot) \) is expressed in the world frame, and its parameters are known from the mobile base’s localisation system and arm encoders. The velocity of the virtual base joints are related to the wheel angular velocities by
\[ \dot{q}_{b,0} = \frac{R}{2} (\varpi_R - \varpi_L), \dot{q}_{b,1} = \frac{R}{2} (\varpi_R + \varpi_L) \]  
(4)
where \( R \) is the wheel radius, \( \varpi_R, \varpi_L \) are the robot’s right and left wheel velocities respectively, and \( W \) is the distance between the two wheels.

For some control behaviours it is useful to express velocity in different frames. For navigating to a distant landmark we frame, and for grasping we are interested in velocity \( \dot{\nu}_e \) with respect to the mobile base frame, and for grasping we are interested in velocity \( \dot{\nu}_e \) with respect to the end-effector frame – the corresponding Jacobians \( ^bJ_e (q) \) and \( ^cJ_e (q) \) can be similarly derived.

Using the holistic manipulator Jacobian, we can construct a resolved rate motion controller
\[ \dot{q}^* = {^bJ}_e (q)^+ \cdot \dot{\nu}_e, \]  
(5)
where \((\cdot)^+\) denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. This function calculates the required joint velocities \( \dot{q}^* \) for the mobile manipulators end-effector to experience a desired spatial velocity \( ^b\nu_e(t) = (v_x, v_y, \omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z)^T \). This controller represents the most basic form of reactive and holistic control of a mobile manipulator.

The demanded joint velocity \( \dot{q}^* \) is partitioned into the base virtual joint velocities \( \dot{q}_b \), which are transformed to the left and right wheel velocities using the unicycle kinematic model using (4), and \( \dot{q}_a \) corresponds to the arm’s joint velocities.

B. Omnidirectional Mobile Manipulators

Omnidirectional robots can instantaneously translate and rotate in the plane and using the virtual joint approach from above we define \( q_b = (\delta_x, \delta_y, \delta_\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \). Sect. IV extends this controller.

IV. Motion Controller

We extend the NEO motion controller from [2] which in turn extends (5), to enable reliable holistic operation of a mobile manipulator. This controller is wrapped into a QP
\[ \min \quad f_o (x) = \frac{1}{2} x^\top Q x + C^\top x, \]  
(6)
subject to \( \mathcal{J} x = \nu, \quad Ax \leq B, \quad \mathcal{X}^- \leq x \leq \mathcal{X}^+ \)
where changes from [2] are explained below.

A. Velocity Control

The end-effector has a spatial velocity
\[ ^b\nu_e(t) = ^b\nu_e^*(t) - \delta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \]  
(7)
where \( ^b\nu_e^*(t) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \) is the desired end-effector spatial velocity. \( \delta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \) is the slack velocity which allows for the end-effector to stray from the desired motion in order to satisfy constraints. This motion is created from the equality constraint in (6) with
\[ \mathcal{J} = (^bJ_e (q) \mathbf{1}_{6 \times 6}) \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times (n+6)} \]  
(8)
\[ x = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{q} \\ \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+6} \]  
(9)
where \( \mathbf{1} \) is the identity matrix.

B. The Objective Function

The optimisation will minimise \( x \) in the objective function subject to the equality and inequality constraints. The objective function in (6) seeks to minimise the joint velocity norm, minimise the slack norm, and maximise the manipulability of the robot according to the measure from [20]. More information on manipulability maximisation is available in [2], [21], [22]. The objective function is defined by
\[ Q = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\lambda_q) & 0_{6 \times 6} \\ 0_{n \times 6} & \text{diag}(\lambda_s) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+6) \times (n+6)}, \]  
(10)
\[ C = \begin{pmatrix} ^Jm + \epsilon \\ 0_{6 \times 1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+6)} \]  
(11)
where \( \lambda_q \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a gain which adjusts between minimising the joint velocity norm and maximising manipulability, \( \lambda_s \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a gain which adjusts the cost of adding slack, \( ^Jm \) is the manipulability Jacobian, and \( \epsilon \) is the base to end-effector angle.

Manipulability \( ^Jm \): The manipulability metric \( m(q) \) describes how easily a manipulator can achieve an arbitrary end-effector velocity. The base is capable of providing 2 (or 3 for a holonomic platform) degrees-of-freedom to contribute towards the end-effector velocity with an infinite workspace. On the contrary, the arm will typically have more degrees-of-freedom but a finite workspace. To ensure the arm is capable of exploiting the extra degrees-of-freedom to provide any arbitrary end-effector velocity at a given time, we calculate
We use the equation \( \lambda \) where \( \theta \) is the end-effector angle so we choose the joint velocity cost in the QP

\[
\lambda = \left( \begin{array}{c}
0_b \\
J^*_{mn}(q_{b})
\end{array} \right)
\]

(12)

before being used in (11), where \( 0_b \) is a zero vector corresponding to the base joints.

**Base Orientation \( \theta_b \):** Figure 2 shows the base to end-effector angle \( \theta_b \). When \( \theta_b \approx 0^\circ \) the platform has infinite reach in the forward direction but when \( \theta_b \approx \pm 90^\circ \), the platform’s reach is limited to that of the arm. In our approach, the end-effector leads towards the goal, therefore, maximum reach is achieved when \( \theta_b \approx 0^\circ \). The \( \epsilon \) in the linear component of the cost function causes the optimiser to choose joint velocities which orient the mobile base towards the end-effector as described by Figure 2. This cost is

\[
\epsilon = (-k_\epsilon \theta_b, \ 0_{n-1})
\]

(13)

where \( k_\epsilon = \text{atan2} \left( ^bT_{e1,3}, ^bT_{e0,3} \right) \), \( k_\epsilon \) is a gain which adjusts how aggressively the base will be oriented towards the end-effector.

**Slack Cost \( \lambda_\delta \):** The slack cost determines the size of the slack vector in the output of the optimiser. A gain too large limits the slack possible and associated benefits, while a gain too small leads to the possibility that the slack will cancel out the desired velocity, leaving a steady-state error. We use the equation \( \lambda_\delta = \frac{1}{||e||} ||e|| \) to determine the slack gain where \( ||e|| \) is the Euclidean distance error between the end-effector and the desired end-effector pose. Through this setting, the optimiser has freedom to avoid operational limits and maximise manipulability at the beginning of the trajectory while the increasing restriction ensures the end-effector continues to approach the goal.

**Joint Velocity Cost \( \lambda_v \):** Robot arms have a finite reach and a limited joint range in which they are highly manipulable, so we choose the joint velocity cost in the QP

\[
\lambda_v = \left( \frac{1}{||e||} \right) b \ 001_a
\]

(14)

where the variable gain applies to the mobile base joints, and the constant 0.01 is applied to the arm joints. This causes the optimiser to favour the mobile-base degrees of freedom when the error is large and the arm degrees of freedom when the error is small.

**C. Joint Position Limit Avoidance**

Joint position limit avoidance is implemented using velocity dampers. The velocity damper will restrict joint velocities of the robot to reduce or stop the rate at which it is approaching a joint limit. Note that we do not perform joint position limit avoidance on the virtual base joints. The joint position limit avoidance velocity damper is defined as

\[
\mathcal{A} = (1_{n \times n+6}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(n \times n+6)}
\]

\[
\mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix}
0_b \\
\eta \frac{\rho_0 - \rho_s}{\rho_1 - \rho_s} \\
\vdots \\
\eta \frac{\rho_0 - \rho_s}{\rho_1 - \rho_s}
\end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n
\]

(15)

(16)

where \( \rho \) represents the distance to the nearest joint limit, \( \rho_1 \) represents the influence distance in which to operate the damper, and \( \rho_s \) represents the minimum distance for a joint to its limit.

**D. Joint Velocity Limit Avoidance**

The final inequality constraint in (6) limits the joint velocities and the total amount of slack allowable according to

\[
\lambda^{-} = \begin{pmatrix}
q^{-} \\
\delta^{-} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+6}.
\]

(17)

**E. Position-Based Servoing**

We use the motion controller within a position-based servoing (PBS) scheme. This controller seeks to drive the robot’s end-effector from its current pose to a desired pose. PBS is formulated as

\[
b_{\nu} = \beta \psi^{-1} (b_{Te}) \in SE(3)
\]

(18)

where \( \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) is a gain term, \( b_{Te} \in SE(3) \) is the desired end-effector pose in the robot’s base frame, and \( \psi(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^6 \) is a function which converts a homogeneous transformation matrix to a spatial displacement.

**V. Behaviour Tree**

**A. Behaviour Tree Description**

To make our system taskable and responsive to many competing goals and states, we use behaviour trees. A behaviour tree is a directed acyclic graph with a single root vertex. Vertices represent behaviours and edges represent the flow of control. The vertices fall into three categories:

1) **leaves** (have no children) and perform some tangible action like actuating a robot or sensing the environment.
2) **composites** (have at least one child) and govern which branches are selected to be executed.
3) **decorators** (have only one child) and augment the output of the child node.
TABLE I: Node Symbol and Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>sequence composite - has one or more children in an ordered list. All children must return success for the sequence to return success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→*</td>
<td>memory sequence composite - a sequence node but does not re-tick children which have previously returned success, until the sequence has returned success or failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>selector composite - has one or more children in an ordered list. Will return success if any child returns success, or failure if every child returns failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S = R</td>
<td>success is running decorator - has one child. This decorator returns running when its child returns success, otherwise returns the unmodified status of the child. This decorator will cause a branch of the tree repeat on success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = R</td>
<td>failure is running decorator - has one child. This decorator returns running when its child returns failure, otherwise returns the unmodified status of the child. This decorator will cause a branch of the tree to repeat on failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>inverter decorator - has one child. This decorator returns success if the child returns failure and vice versa. The running status is unmodified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vertex execution is governed by ticks which are an activation signal. The ticks are propagated through the tree at a defined frequency. Upon receiving a tick, the vertex returns running if it is still executing, success if the goal was achieved, or otherwise failure. This process makes behaviour trees highly reactive, as the tree gets processed through composite vertices on every tick. Composite vertices define the flow of ticks throughout the tree (i.e. they choose which vertices get ticked depending on the result of previous ticks) and are vital in constructing a behaviour tree. The composite and decorator vertices used in this letter are outlined in Table I.

In practice, we implement behaviour leaves using the Robot Operating System (ROS) as nodes, services, and action services. Each leaf individually defines its own state of running, success, or failure depending on its purpose. We use the software package from github.com/qcr/ros_trees to implement the Behaviour Tree in Python.

B. Behaviour Leaves

Several behaviour leaves are required to complete a mobile pick and place task.

1) Basic Leaves: Base to Pose plans and executes a path for the mobile base to some goal pose in the map frame. While not a part of our motion controller, this behaviour is useful for initialising the robot’s location before starting a task. Arm to Config moves the arm to a pre-defined set of joint coordinates. Open Gripper opens the gripper to maximum width. Close Gripper closes the grippers with a constant force. Gripper Closed returns success if the gripper width is equal to 0 and otherwise returns failure. Arm Error returns success if the arm has encountered an operational failure. Recover Arm will recover the arm from operational limit errors to enable continued operation. Load Pose loads a pre-defined pose for the next leaf to use. Publish Pose publishes the pose from the previous leaf on the goal ROS message topic. Distance to Goal consumes the goal ROS messages and calculates the Euclidean distance between the end-effector and the pose represented by the goal message. If the distance is less than a defined value, the node returns success.

2) Advanced Leaves: Motion Control is an action server leaf implementing the motion controller from Section III. The action server takes an input pose and subscribes to the goal message topic to provide the end-effector goal pose which the motion controller tracks towards. The controller is running in a closed-loop manner while the goal message is being published, and otherwise will track towards the last received pose. The action server publishes joint velocities to the robot arm and velocities to the mobile base at 200 Hz.

Subscribe to Grasp Pose gets the output of the GG-CNN grasp point synthesiser [23] to provide a pose for the next leaf to use. GG-CNN consumes depth image messages provided by a RealSense D435 RGB-D camera and outputs the best grasp as a pose in the end-effector frame.

VI. Experiments

We first validate our motion controller by demonstrating how a mobile manipulator travels between various poses, before showing the value of our proposed architecture by implementing and testing a pick and place behaviour tree.

A. Platform Description

We use our in-house developed mobile manipulation platform Frankie displayed in Figure 4 for the following experiments. Frankie comprises an Omron LD-60 two-wheel differential-drive base and a 7 degree-of-freedom Franka-Emika Panda manipulator. A model of Frankie is provided as part of the Robotics Toolbox for Python [24]. We use an Intel RealSense D435 RGB-D camera attached to the end-effector for visual feedback to support visual grasping. The Omron LD-60 mobile base performs localisation and mapping on an embedded computer using an in-built LiDAR. We control the platform using the software package from github.com/qcr/ros_drivers. Frankie contains an Intel i5 NUC and an Nvidia Xavier to perform image processing.

B. Experiment 1: Holistic Motion Controller Validation

In this experiment, we first show how our proposed motion controller responds to various desired end-effector poses. Starting from the same initial pose, the end-effector must move to a pose:

- a) 4 m in front of the robot.
- b) 4 m to the left of the robot.
- c) -4 m behind the robot.

Just as for planning-based approaches there are cases where our holistic controller will fail. In [2] we compare the success rate of this controllers predecessor, NEO, with a number of well-known planners for a standard benchmark. This experiment additionally measures the success rate of the controller as it attempts to reach 1000 randomly generated valid end-effector poses, located within a 4 m radius of 0, while adjusting $k_r$ and $J_m$ introduced in Section IV.
C. Experiment 2: Repetitive Pick and Place Task

We evaluate the merits of our approach in a repetitive pick-and-place task. In this experiment the mobile manipulator must pick common household objects from a container and place them on a table located 3 m across the room from the original container. The robot is localised within a two-dimensional map of the environment, and the container/table locations within this map are known. All objects used are previously unseen by the grasp point synthesiser.

We have assembled the leaves defined in Section V into a behaviour tree which controls a mobile manipulator to pick and place objects. The tree is displayed in Figure 3. The first branch of the tree recovers the arm from any errors (encountered by user e-stop or joint position, velocity, force limits etc.) and moves the arm into the ready pose and the base to the init pose. Any unhandled failure will cause the tree to return to this branch where errors are recovered and the platform is re-initialised.

The success is running decorator of the second branch causes the memory sequence to repeat on success. This means that the pick and place task will repeat unless there is a failure.

The failure is running decorator causes the subsequent memory sequence to repeat on failure. This branch corresponds to a grasp attempt. A failure is detected by the gripper being fully closed (i.e. the hand is empty), or the arm encounters an error. The tree first opens the grippers if they are closed, and then moves the platform to the defined pickup pose. The container holding the objects is visible to the eye-in-hand camera from this pose. Subsequently, the Move to Grasp Pose branch runs. When the distance to the desired grasp pose from GG-CNN is greater than 0.25 m, the desired grasp pose from GG-CNN is continuously published to the Motion Controller. Due to the minimum sensing distance of the RealSense D-435 camera, the grasp pose is locked in when it is 0.25 m away from the camera. After a grasp attempt, the arm retreats to the ready configuration where grasp success is detected.

Upon a successful grasp, the platform moves to the dropoff pose where the object is placed, and the arm resets to the ready configuration. The pickup and dropoff locations are separated by approximately 3 m. The pick and place sequence is then repeated.

VII. Results

The average execution time of the holistic motion controller during the experiments was 4.8 ms using an Intel i5 NUC with 4 cores at 2.3GHz in a single threaded process – a control rate just above 200 Hz. We use the following values for the controller parameters: \( \eta = 1 \), \( \rho_i = 50^\circ \), and \( \rho_s = 2^\circ \) in (16), \( k_\epsilon = 0.5 \) in (13), and \( \beta = 1 \) in (18). In practice we found that performance is sound within 50% to 200% of the chosen gain values.

A. Experiment 1 Results

We display the robot motion from Experiment 1 in Figure 5 using the Swift Simulator [24], however we refer readers to the supplementary video which shows motion of the robot with a comparison to the non-holistic planning-based approach.
Fig. 5: The Frankie mobile manipulator moving from a starting pose to a desired pose using our proposed motion controller where robot opacity increases with time. (a) Goal is directly in front of the robot. (b) Goal is to the side of the robot. (c) Goal is directly behind the robot. (d) The manipulability of the arm throughout each trajectory using our proposed controller.
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**TABLE II: Effect of $k_c$ on Performance over 1000 Trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k_c$</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failures</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Final $\theta_b$</td>
<td>22.91°</td>
<td>10.31°</td>
<td>4.58°</td>
<td>3.43°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III: Effect of $\hat{J}_m$ on Performance over 1000 Trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\hat{J}_m$</th>
<th>$(0_b, 0_a)$</th>
<th>$\hat{J}_m^{\text{ba}}(q_a)$</th>
<th>$(0_b, \hat{J}_m^{\text{ba}}(q_a))$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failures</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Final $m(\hat{q}_a)$</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by Figure 5, the mobile manipulator achieves all three poses set out by the experiment. These motions took 5.42, 6.17, and 6.17 seconds to complete respectively. We repeated Experiment 1 using a method representative of the non-holistic planning based approach from [3]. Using this approach, the robot took 14.32, 16.17, and 16.45 seconds to complete the motion respectively which is far slower than the holistic reactive approach.

Figure 5a shows the simplest of the motions, and the base and arm cooperate so the arm remains well-conditioned and not overly stretched out. Figure 5b shows a slightly more complicated motion as the base must rotate and translate in cooperation with the arm to reach the goal. The base rotates in cooperation with the arm motion preventing the arm from approaching its joint limits. Figure 5c shows a very complex task requiring close cooperation between base and arm. The base rotates and translates to ensure the arm does not encounter joint limits in the motion. Notably, these motions are not the result of a computed trajectory, it is an emergent behaviour of the reactive holistic motion controller. Figure 5d shows that in all three motions, the robot arm remains well-conditioned throughout when using our proposed controller.

Figure 6 shows the cumulative end-effector jerk in each motion when using our proposed holistic controller, and the non-holistic planning based approach from [3] where the jerk from the initial robot motion has been ignored. Lower cumulative jerk indicates smoother overall motion and we see that the holistic approach generates quantitatively smoother motion than previous work which involves disjointed stop-start motion.

Table II shows the effect of $k_c$ (13) on system performance. To maximise the ability for the robot to complete follow-on tasks, including grasping, it is important to minimise the base to end-effector angle $\theta_b$. Making $k_c$ large will minimise $\theta_b$ but leads to more controller failures. These failures are caused by ill-conditioned arm configurations leading to local minima. Table II shows that $k_c = 0.1 \sim 0.5$ provides best results.

Table III shows the effect which $\hat{J}_m$ has in (12) on system performance. These results show that low arm manipulability $m(\hat{q}_a)$ leads to operational failures which is consistent with [2]. When manipulability is not optimised with $\hat{J}_m = (0_b, 0_a)$ and when manipulability of the whole platform is optimised with $\hat{J}_m(\hat{q})$ the average final arm manipulability is low which leads to increased failures. From Table III, it is important to maximise the arm’s ability to exploit its limited workspace with $\hat{J}_m = (0_b, \hat{J}_m^{\text{ba}}(\hat{q}_a))$.

**B. Experiment 2 Results**

We repeated Experiment 2 ten times for a total of 100 objects picked and placed. The robot successfully picked and placed all 100 objects with 113 grasp attempts. Failed grasp attempts were caught by the behaviour tree and caused the
TABLE IV: Pick and Place Timing Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Mean Grasp Time</th>
<th>Mean Pick and Place Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ours</td>
<td>5.2 s</td>
<td>16.8 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>15.4 s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>30 s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

grasp to be re-attempted. A full run of Experiment 2 is shown in our supplementary video.

This experiment is similar to those performed in [3], [6], [7], however different objects, environments and robotic platforms were used, so grasp success rates are not comparable. Robot motion time offers perhaps a more reliable comparison and we display a comparison of timing results in Table IV. Grasp time is defined as the time spent in the grasp motion which results in the object being grasped (including repeat grasp attempts where applicable), and pick and place time is defined as grasp time plus travelling to the drop off point and placing the object.

The approaches in [3], [6], [7] all offered good grasp success rates of around 90% but took much longer for the complete task. As shown in Table IV, our mean grasp time is 3 times faster than [3] and 6 times faster than [7], while our average pick and place time is 3 times faster than [6]. These timings are consistent with the timing comparison in Experiment 1. Results from Experiment 1 and 2 suggest that our holistic and reactive motion controller can significantly improve task execution time on a mobile manipulator while also being reliable and robust to task completion. The motion is shown to be graceful: where the motion is intuitive, smooth and fast [9], while the time spent with the robot stationary has been completely eliminated.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed a novel motion controller which provides reactive and holistic control of both non-holonomic and holonomic mobile manipulation platforms. We show the benefits of our controller by incorporating it into a behaviour tree which completes a mobile pick and place task. Our experiments demonstrate that our purely reactive and holistic approach performs faster and more efficiently than related work, while the behaviour tree allows for robust and reliable robot operation. Additionally, the motion has been shown to be graceful, where the motion is smooth, intuitive and fast.

Thanks to the versatility of behaviour trees, extending our behaviour tree to perform more complicated tasks is trivial. In the future, we would like to implement perception related behaviours which makes a wider range of tasks solvable. Additionally, with more perception we can incorporate the reactive collision avoidance from [2] into the holistic motion controller.

We have provided a full example of our motion controller running on the Frankie mobile manipulator, and a holonomic mobile manipulator at jhavl.github.io/holistic.
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