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Abstract:

In pursuit of the time-optimal motion of a robot manipulator along a preset path, a previously identified dynamic model is typically used to calculate the required optimal trajectory for perfect tracking. However, due to the inevitable model-plant mismatch, there may be a big error between the calculated torque of the planned trajectory and the actually measured torque, which causes the obtained trajectory to be suboptimal or even be infeasible by exceeding given limits. This paper presents a two-step improved SARSA approach for finding the time-optimal motion and ensuring the feasibility: Firstly, using the improved SARSA algorithm to find a safe trajectory that satisfies the kinematic constraints through the interaction between reinforcement agent and kinematic model. Secondly, using the improved SARSA algorithm to find the optimal trajectory that the actually measured torque satisfied the given constraints through the interaction between the agent and the real world. Simulations and experiments on a 6-DOF robot manipulator verify the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.
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1. Introduction

The research of the time-optimal path tracking for robotic manipulators can be dated back as far as the early 1970s [1]. Given the preset path, the goal is to find a feasible optimal trajectory which satisfied the constraint conditions. The optimal objective may be minimal consumed energy or execution time. The solution to this problem is a mapping of the geometric path to a time-dependent trajectory, where the required feasibility implies that the given constraint bounds such as torque or joint velocity/acceleration bound must be met. Since the propose of the time-optimal path tracking problem, a variety of approaches to find the optimal solution for the robot manipulators have been proposed, such as dynamic trajectory scaling [2], integrating the maximum acceleration in order to obtain bang-bang acceleration profiles [3-7], using the dynamic programming to find a trajectory that minimizes cost [8-10], using a probabilistic method to solve the problem with linear programming[11], formulating the time-optimal path tracking problem as a convex optimization problem and subsequent solving it. [12-14].

In all of the researches as mentioned above, the optimal trajectory is all obtained by maximizing the calculated torque within the torque constraints. And the calculated torque is obtained from the robot dynamic model. However, the dynamic model can not reflect the real situation as there is an inevitable model-plant mismatch, the calculated torque has a large difference from the actually measured torque. In most of the cases, although the calculated torque is within the torque constraint limit, the actually measured torque may also exceed the torque constraint limit, causing the servo motor to operate under overload conditions, reducing the life of the motor and even causing downtime. In order to solve the problem of model-plant mismatch, the solutions of most of the researches are to increase the complexity of the dynamic model to make the calculated torques closer to the actually measured torques: reaching from considering friction effects[13] to adding the iterative compensation to compensate the model error[14-15]. But even so, there is still no dynamic model which can completely reflect the real situation. Therefore, it is necessary to jump out of traditional thinking to find a new method where we can obtain the optimal trajectory without considering the robot dynamic model.

Inspired by the idea of using reinforcement learning (RL) for vehicle time-optimal velocity control in [16], reinforcement learning seems to be an effective method in solving robotic time-optimal path tracking problem. Reinforcement learning is a computational approach to understanding and automating goal-directed learning and decision-making [17]. It is inspired by the trial-and-error learning process related to the dopaminergic system [18]. R is distinguished from other computational approaches by its emphasis on learning by an RL agent from direct interaction with its environment, without relying on exemplary supervision or complete models of the
environment. Through the experience obtained from the interaction between the RL agent and environment, the RL model aims to maximize rewards and minimize punishments.

Since the concept of reinforcement learning was first proposed in the engineering literature in the 1960s [19], a variety of reinforcement learning approaches have been proposed. Reinforcement learning was originally used in the disciplines of game theory, information theory, control theory and operation research. Through time, it has been adopted in the field of robotic control, with a large number and variety of applications, ranging from, e.g., path planning of mobile robot [20-22], gait generation for robots [23-24], obstacle avoidance of robot manipulator [25-26] and robotic assembly [27-29]. Although exists model-based reinforcement learning algorithms, most of the above-mentioned reinforcement learning algorithms for robots are model-free.

SARSA algorithm is a typical model-free reinforcement learning algorithm. Due to its simplicity and requiring less computational power [17], it has been widely used in the field of robotics [30-33]. By using the SARSA algorithm, it is not necessary to know the robot dynamic model, but to directly interact with the real world to obtain the time-optimal trajectory, which has important research significance. The SARSA algorithm uses the idea of exploration and exploitation. At the beginning of the RL process, the exploration is used to acquire RL experience. At the end of the RL process, the exploitation is used to obtain a policy which maximizes the long term return.

Although both subjects—SARSA algorithm and time-optimal path tracking for robot manipulators—attracted wide attention in the past and are still actively researched, their combination remains rare due to their inherently unlike nature: SARSA is mostly used to find the optimal policy of minimum steps for the agent to reach the target state, such as Windy Gridworld and pole-balancing task[17]. However, time-optimal path tracking problem aims to find a trajectory which has the greatest velocity on each point in the path.

The goal of this research is to construct a time-optimal path tracking problem into a reinforcement learning problem that can be solved by using SARSA and obtain a time-optimal trajectory that maximizes the actually measured torque within the torque constraints. The rest of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews the used RL algorithm and further explains how it is applied to the time-optimal path tracking problem. Section 3 presents the simulation and experimental evaluation of our method in solving traditional dynamic model based time-optimal path tracking problem. Section 4 presents the experimental evaluation of our methods on a 6-DOF robot manipulator. Finally, Section 5 concludes this research and addresses future works.

2. Methodology

2.1. Overview of the SARSA algorithm

State-action-reward-state-action (SARSA) is an algorithm for learning a Markov decision process policy, used in the reinforcement learning area of machine learning. It was proposed by Rummery and Niranjan in a technical note with the name “Modified Connectionist Q-Learning” (MCQ-L)[34]. The alternative name SARSA (as is known to us), was proposed by Rich Sutton [17]. In the SARSA algorithm, a state is a position where the agent defines its location in the environment, whereas an action is the movement that agent takes to move from one state to another state. A reward is a positive value given to increase the Q-value for the correct action taken by the agent, while sometimes a reward might be a negative value if the agent takes the wrong action, and for this case, we usually named the reward as a penalty. The acronym SARSA reflects the learning process of the algorithm, i.e., the agent takes an action in a state and receive a reward from the environment then move to the next state and takes the next action. And the combination of such an alternating sequence of states and state-action pairs is called the episode, as shown in Fig.1. SARSA is a model-free reinforcement learning algorithm, while in SARSA, it is not necessary to have the complete environment modelling such that the transition probabilities matrix of all the states and actions to be known initially. And the optimal policy is obtained through the interaction between the agent and the environment.

The general form of the SARSA algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1, where the action-value function is as follows:

\[ Q(S_k, A_k) \leftarrow Q(S_k, A_k) + \alpha [R_{k+1} + \gamma Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) - Q(S_k, A_k)] \]  

(1)

where:

- \( S_k \) is the current state;
- \( A_k \) is the action performed in the \( S_k \);
- \( \alpha \) is the learning rate;
- \( \gamma \) is the discount factor;
- \( R_{k+1} \) is the reward received in the next state.

The RL model aims to find the optimal value function \( Q(S_k, A_k) \) by iteratively updating the value function based on the experience obtained from the interaction between the agent and environment.
$S_{k+1}$ is the next state;
$R_{k+1}$ is the reward or penalty received from the environment when the agent takes the action $A_k$ in state $S_k$;
$A_{k+1}$ is the action performed in the $S_{k+1}$ state;
$γ$ is the discount factor ($0 \leq γ < 1$);
$α$ is the learning coefficient ($0 < α < 1$);

Algorithm 1: Classical SARSA algorithm

```
Initialize $Q(S,A)$. ∀$S \in S$. $A \in A(S)$, arbitrarily , and $Q(terminal-state) = 0$

while (iteration<Max iteration)
Select a starting state, $Q(S_1,A_1)$

$k = 1$

while goal is not achieved
Choose $A_k$ from $S_k$ using policy derived from $Q$ (e.g., $ε$-greedy)
Take action $A_k$, observe $R_{k+1}$, $S_{k+1}$

Choose $A_{k+1}$ from $S_{k+1}$ using policy derived from $Q$ (e.g., $ε$-greedy)
$Q(S_k,A_k) ← Q(S_k,A_k) + α[R_{k+1} + γQ(S_{k+1},A_{k+1}) - Q(S_k,A_k)]$
$S_k ← S_{k+1}; A_k ← A_{k+1}; k ← k + 1$

end while
end while
```

![Fig.1 The composition of an episode](image)

2.2 Application and improvement of the SARSA algorithm in time-optimal path tracking problem

2.2.1 Application of the SARSA algorithm in time-optimal path tracking problem

Since the time-optimal control method was introduced in the early 1970s, most of the time-optimal path tracking control methods are aimed to optimize the scalar function $t → s(t)$ [3-7, 10, 12-14, 35-42]. Where $s \in [0,1]$ is the pseudo-displacement, which represents the “position” on the path at each time instant.

The optimization goal of the time-optimal path tracking problem is to minimize the trajectory execution time. Thus, the optimization objective function can be expressed as

$$\min T = \int_0^T 1 dt$$

(2)

By changing the integration variable from $t$ to $s$, the objective function (2) is rewritten as

$$\min T = \int_0^T 1 dt = \int_{s(0)}^{s(T)} \frac{1}{s'} ds = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{ds}$$

(3)

where $s' = ds/dt$ is the pseudo-velocity.

Therefore, the time-optimal trajectory planning problem can be transformed into the planning problem of the pseudo-velocity $s'$ in the phase plane $s - s'$.

Most of the time-optimal trajectory planning methods are seeking an optimal trajectory in the phase plane $s – s'$ which starts from the initial state (0,0), ends at the terminate state (1,0), has the maximum pseudo-velocity $s'$ without exceeding torque constraint limits [3-7, 10, 12-14, 35-42]. This is like playing an Atari game [43] as shown in Fig. 2. In the feasible area, heading to the upper area means more fortune while the chances of meeting risks are getting higher as you are moving closer to the skull at the same time.

To construct such a reinforcement learning environment, the phase plane $s – s'$ needs to be divided into a grid: in this grid, a grid
point \((s_k, \dot{s}_k)\) is a state \(S_k\) and a movement between the current state \(S_k\) and the next state \(S_{k+1}\) is an action (an action equals to the next state \((s_{k+1}, \dot{s}_{k+1})\)). The entire phase plane \(s - \dot{s}\) is the RL environment, which gives the corresponding reward and penalty to the agent by judging whether the agent is reaching a feasible state. To obtain such a grid, the pseudo-displacement \(s\) and pseudo-velocity \(\dot{s}\) need to be discretized, which concerns path discretization. The treatment to discretize path before solving the time-optimal path tracking problem has been applied in [10, 12-15, 40, 44] and the motion between adjacent discrete points is assumed to be uniformly acceleration motion. The path discretization method is proposed in [44]. Moreover, by using the method in [44], the phase plane \(s - \dot{s}\) can be divided into \(N \times M\) grid points, where \(N\) is the discrete point number of \(s\) and \(M\) is the discrete point number of \(\dot{s}\). The specific discrete method is: As for the discretization in the \(s\)-axis direction which is equal to the discretization of the path. By setting the threshold value of the variation of the pseudo curvature \(\Delta q(s)\) and the pseudo curvature change rate \(\Delta q''(s)\) respectively, the path can be discretized into a discrete path with little discrete points and avoid the abrupt change of acceleration and torque. As for the discretization of the \(\dot{s}\)-axis direction, the uniform discrete method is chosen, where the upper limit of the grid point is the maximum pseudo-velocity \(\dot{s}_{\text{max}}\) which is obtained based on the maximum velocity limit of the servo motor and the discrete step length of \(\dot{s}\)-axis direction is \(\dot{s}_{\text{max}}/M\). The optimal policy learned by SARSA is the trajectory that consisted of a series of discrete grid points. However, the optimal trajectory is only the optimal trajectory of the current grid, rather than the actually optimal trajectory as the actually optimal trajectory may not on the discrete point. In the above discrete method, the discrete number \(N\) in the \(s\)-axis direction remains unchanged but increase the discrete number \(M\) in the \(\dot{s}\)-axis to make the optimal policy closer to the actually optimal trajectory. By the way, the increase in the discrete number \(M\) will lead to an increasing of computation time.

Different from many other RL implemental cases, in the time-optimal path tracking problem, the movement of the agent in the environment is not random, it is limited by constraints (such as dynamic constraints, see section 3). Therefore, in the state \(S_k\), the number of actions that can be chosen is not \(M\), but in the range determined by the constraint conditions. Moreover, for a state, the closer to the maximum velocity curve (MVC, see [6]), the fewer feasible actions can be selected. Especially, when a state is on the MVC, the feasible action is only one as the maximum pseudo-acceleration is equal to minimum pseudo-acceleration. When a state is in the infeasible area in the upper of MVC, the state is an infeasible state as the minimum pseudo-acceleration is greater than the maximum pseudo-acceleration [5]. For a better understanding, Fig.3 shows an example of the action selection range of a trajectory in phase plane \(s - \dot{s}\), where the green line segment is the trajectory obtained by maximum pseudo-acceleration, the purple line segment is the trajectory obtained by minimum pseudo-acceleration, the grey triangle is the feasible action range and the red triangle is the action range that is physically infeasible.

To improve computational efficiency, all actions with a Q value less than 0 within the action range should not be considered, as an action with Q value less than 0 will lead the agent to an infeasible state. As shown in the left diagram of Fig.4, for an agent, the closer to the constraint boundary, the smaller the range of action. Although some states are within the feasible area that satisfies constraint conditions, when the agent moves forward with the minimum acceleration, it will inevitably reach the infeasible area, resulting in a failed episode, these states are named as critical states. The initial Q value of these critical states is greater than 0, but as the learning process goes on, the Q value will gradually decrease and eventually become less than 0 by the update of the action-value function. As shown in the diagram on the right in Fig.4, when avoiding these critical states, the agent will learn a trajectory that does not violate the constraints and is optimal. In addition, when the agent is in a special state, in this state, the Q value of all feasible actions of the state is less than 0 which means the agent is directed to the critical state and finally reaches to the infeasible area. Therefore, for this special state, it should also be regarded as a critical state and give the agent a penalty.

The reward and penalty of RL should reflect the optimization goal of the time-optimal path tracking problem, i.e., to maximize the pseudo-velocity \(\dot{s}\) without exceeding the constraint limits. Therefore, the reward and penalty of RL are set to relate to pseudo-velocity, as follow

\[
R_{k+1} = \begin{cases} 
\dot{s}_k + \dot{s}_{k+1} & \text{reward} \\
-(\dot{s}_k + \dot{s}_{k+1}) & \text{penalty}
\end{cases}
\] (4)

By dividing the phase plane into an \(N \times M\) grid and calculating the action range at each state by constraint conditions, the SARSA algorithm can now be set to solve such time-optimal path tracking reinforcement learning problems. The algorithm is shown in Algorithm 2, where the end condition of an episode is set to be when all discrete points are traversed (i.e. a successful episode) or when the agent reaches an infeasible state (i.e., a failed episode).
Algorithm 2: SARSA algorithm for time-optimal path tracking

Discrete the phase plane $s - \dot{s}$ into a $N \times M$ grid
Initialize $Q(S, A), \forall S \in \mathcal{S}, A \in \mathcal{A}(S)$, arbitrarily, and $Q(\text{terminal - state}) = 0$

while (iteration < Max iteration)

Select a starting state $(0,0)$

$k = 1$

Calculate the range of action $\mathcal{A}(S_k)$

Choose $A_k \in \mathcal{A}(S_k)$ from $S_k$ using policy derived from $Q$ (e.g., $\epsilon$-greedy)

while $k \leq N$ or $R_{k+1} \geq 0$

Take action $A_k$, observe $R_{k+1}, S_{k+1}$

Calculate the range of action $\mathcal{A}(S_{k+1})$

If is empty($\mathcal{A}(S_{k+1})$)

$Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) = 0$

Choose $A_{k+1} \in \mathcal{A}(S_{k+1})$ from $S_{k+1}$ using policy derived from $Q$ (e.g., $\epsilon$-greedy)

$Q(S_k, A_k) \leftarrow Q(S_k, A_k) + \alpha[R_{k+1} + \gamma Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) - Q(S_k, A_k)]$

$S_k \leftarrow S_{k+1}; A_k \leftarrow A_{k+1}; k \leftarrow k + 1$

end while

end while

2.2.2 Improvement of the SARSA algorithm in time-optimal path tracking

Although the SARSA algorithm can be used to solve the robotic time-optimal path tracking problem, it has some limitations that affect the efficiency of the solution.

The $\epsilon$-greedy algorithm is expressed as [17]

$$A_{k+1} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \arg \max_{A_k} Q(S_{k+1}, A_k), & \text{with probability } 1 - \epsilon \text{ (exploitation)} \\ \text{a random action}, & \text{with probability } \epsilon \text{ (exploration)} \end{cases}$$

When selecting an action, the Q value of an action is related to the number of times it is selected: by using the $\epsilon$-greedy algorithm, the action with the greatest Q value has the most probability to be selected, and after the selected action is taken, if there is no accident, after interacting with the environment, the action’s Q value will be greater. This creates a loop: On the one hand, for an action, a greater Q value will make it more likely to be selected than other actions, which may result in an increase in the number of times it is selected. On the other hand, the increase in the number of times will increase the action’s Q value. Such loop will make the program get stuck in local optima and leads to an increase in computation time and an impact on the quality of the solution. To avoid such limitation, in the exploitation mode of the $\epsilon$-greedy algorithm, the selected action should be the action with the greatest pseudo-velocity instead of greatest Q value in the action range. In addition, when the agent reaching the previous state of the termination state, if the termination state $(1,0)$ is within the feasible action range of the last action, the termination state $(1,0)$ should be selected (as there is only one termination state, the other states are redundant). The improved $\epsilon$-greedy algorithm is expressed as

$$A_{k+1} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \arg \max_{A_k, A_{k+1}} Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}), & \text{with probability } 1 - \epsilon \text{ (exploitation)} \\ \text{a random action}, & \text{with probability } \epsilon \text{ (exploration)} \end{cases} \quad (1,0), \text{ if } (1,0) \in \text{last action range}$$

Since SARSA is a one-step update algorithm, when an agent reaches an infeasible area and got a penalty, it can only pass this penalty to the previous states through a single-step update. Therefore, it takes significant time to update so that the Q value of the critical states is less than 0 to let the agent avoid reaching these states. To speed up this process, by adding a penalty term in the action-value function, all the states of a failed episode can learn the experience of failure, thus accelerating the process. The improved action-value function is as follow

$$Q(S_k, A_k) \leftarrow Q(S_k, A_k) + \alpha[R_{k+1} + \gamma Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) - Q(S_k, A_k)] + \rho^{K-k} R_{k+1} \quad (7)$$

where $K$ is the total number of steps in a failed episode, $R_{k+1}$ is the penalty that the agent got when reaches an infeasible state. $\rho (0 < \rho < 1)$ is a penalty discount factor, which is greater for the state closer to the boundary.
To improve computational efficiency, after a successful episode, set the greed factor $\varepsilon$ to 0 to exploit the learning experience to obtain the optimal policy, save the optimal policy, and then re-set the greed factor $0<\varepsilon<1$ to explore again. After another successful episode, re-set the greed factor $\varepsilon$ to 0 to exploit the learning experience and obtain another optimal policy. If the new obtained policy is equal to the previous optimal policy, which means the agent may have traversed all possible situations and the algorithm converges to the optimal policy.

The improved SARSA algorithm is given in Algorithm 3.

---

**Algorithm 3: Improved SARSA algorithm for time-optimal path tracking**

Discrete the phase plane $s - \dot{s}$ into a $N \times M$ grid

Initialize $Q(S, A)$, $\forall S \in S$, $A \in A(S)$, arbitrarily, and $Q(\text{terminal state}) = 0$

while (iteration $<$ Max iteration)

Select a starting state $(0, 0)$

$k = 1$

Calculate the range of action $A(S_k)$

Choose $A_k \in A(S_k)$ from $S_k$ using policy derived from $Q$ (e.g., improved $\varepsilon$-greedy)

while $k \leq N$ or $R_{k+1} \geq 0$

Take action $A_k$, observe $R_{k+1}, S_{k+1}$

Calculate the range of action $A(S_{k+1})$

If $R_{k+1} < 0$ or is empty ($A(S_{k+1})$)

If is empty ($A(S_{k+1})$)

$Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) = 0$

$Q(S_k, A_k) \leftarrow Q(S_k, A_k) + \alpha [R_{k+1} + \gamma Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) - Q(S_k, A_k)]$

For $i = 1, \ldots, k$ do

$Q(S_k, A_k) \leftarrow Q(S_k, A_k) + \rho^{k-i} R_{k+1}$

break

Else

Choose $A_{k+1} \in A(S_{k+1})$ from $S_{k+1}$ using policy derived from $Q$ (e.g., improved $\varepsilon$-greedy)

$Q(S_k, A_k) \leftarrow Q(S_k, A_k) + \alpha [R_{k+1} + \gamma Q(S_{k+1}, A_{k+1}) - Q(S_k, A_k)]$

$S_k \leftarrow S_{k+1}; A_k \leftarrow A_{k+1}; k \leftarrow k + 1$

end while

If $k = N$

If $\varepsilon > 0$

let $\varepsilon = 0$ to exploitation and obtained the optimal policy

else

If the optimal policy is updated

Save the optimal policy and initialize $\varepsilon$ to explore

else

break

end while

end
Fig. 2. Constructs the time-optimal path tracking problem like an Atari game, where MVC is the maximum velocity curve (see [6]), the area below the MVC is the feasible area, the area above the MVC is the infeasible area. To end the trajectory in the terminate state \((1,0)\), in the phase plane \(s - \dot{s}\), on the line \(s = 1\), all the states except \((1,0)\) are set to the infeasible states, which is the terminate bound in the figure.

Fig. 3. An example of the action selection range of a trajectory in phase plane \(s - \dot{s}\)

- Green: Trajectory using maximum acceleration
- Purple: Trajectory using minimum acceleration
- Purple circle: Feasible state
- Purple cross: Infeasible state
- Red circle: Critical state
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Fig. 4. Analysis
3. Apply the SARSA algorithm in solving time-optimal path tracking problem based on dynamic model

3.1. General formulation of the time-optimal path tracking problem

Consider the dynamic model of an n-DOF (degree of freedom) serial robot

\[ \mathbf{\tau} = \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} + \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}) [\dot{\mathbf{q}}] + \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{q}) [\ddot{\mathbf{q}}] + \mathbf{F}_r \dot{\mathbf{q}} + \mathbf{F}_v \text{sgn}(\mathbf{q}) + \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{q}) \]  
(8)

where \( \mathbf{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the joint torque of the robot, \( \mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is a \( n \times n \) positive definite mass matrix, \( \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)/2} \) is a matrix of dimension of \( n \times n(n - 1)/2 \) of Coriolis coefficients, \( [\dot{\mathbf{q}}] \) is an \( n(n - 1)/2 \times 1 \) vector of joint velocity products given by \( [\dot{\mathbf{q}}] = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_1; \dot{q}_2; \ldots; \dot{q}_{n-1}; \dot{q}_n \end{bmatrix}^T \), \( \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is an \( n \times n \) matrix of centrifugal coefficients, and \( [\ddot{\mathbf{q}}] \) is an \( n \times 1 \) vector given by \( [\ddot{q}_1; \ddot{q}_2; \ldots; \ddot{q}_n]^T \). \( \mathbf{F}_r \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a vector of viscous friction parameter, \( \mathbf{F}_v \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a vector of viscous friction parameter. \( \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the gravitational force vector, \( \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a vector of the joint angle, \( \dot{\mathbf{q}}, \ddot{\mathbf{q}} \) is used to denote the first and second derivative of the joint angles with respect to time.

Assume that the displacement of each joint is a path \( \mathbf{q}(s) \) which is a function of the pseudo-displacement \( s \), whereas the pseudo-displacement \( s = s(t) \) is a scalar function of time \( t \). Without loss of generality, it is assumed that the trajectory starts at \( t = 0 \), ends at \( t = T \) and that \( s(0) = 0 \leq s(t) \leq 1 = s(T) \). Differentiating \( \mathbf{q}(s(t)) \) with respect to \( t \) yields

\[ \dot{\mathbf{q}}(s) = \mathbf{q}'(s) \dot{s} \]
(9)

\[ \ddot{\mathbf{q}}(s) = \mathbf{q}''(s) \dot{s}^2 + \mathbf{q}'(s) \ddot{s} \]
(10)

where \( \dot{s} = ds/dt \) is named the pseudo-velocity, \( \ddot{s} = d^2s/dt^2 \) is named the pseudo-acceleration, \( \mathbf{q}'(s) = \partial \mathbf{q}(s)/\partial s \) is named the pseudo-curvature, which can be used to indicate the smoothness of the path, and \( \mathbf{q}''(s) = \partial^2 \mathbf{q}(s)/\partial \dot{s}^2 \) is named the change rate of the pseudo-curvature. The dynamics in joint space are transformed into the dynamics in parameter space by substituting equations (2) and (3) into equation (1), resulting in the following expression:

\[ \mathbf{\tau}(s) = \mathbf{m}(\dot{s}) \ddot{s} + \mathbf{c}(s) \dot{s}^2 + \mathbf{f}(s) \dot{s} + \mathbf{g}(s) \]
(11)

where

\[ \mathbf{m}(s) = \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}(s)) \mathbf{q}'(s) \]
(12)

\[ \mathbf{c}(s) = \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{q}(s)) \mathbf{q}''(s) + \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}(s), \mathbf{q}'(s)) \mathbf{q}'(s) + \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{q}(s)) (\mathbf{q}'(s))^2 \]
(13)

\[ \mathbf{f}(s) = \mathbf{F}_r(\mathbf{q}(s)) \mathbf{q}'(s) \]
(14)

\[ \mathbf{g}(s) = \mathbf{F}_v(\mathbf{q}(s)) \text{sgn}(\mathbf{q}'(s)) + \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{q}(s)) \]
(15)

where \( \text{sgn}(\mathbf{q}'(s)) \) is replaced by \( \text{sgn}(\mathbf{q}'(s)) \) using equation (9). Each row i of (11) is of the form

\[ \tau_i(s) = m_i(s) \ddot{s} + c_i(s) \dot{s}^2 + f_i(s) \dot{s} + g_i(s) \]
(16)

Assume that each joint of the robot is limited by the maximum/minimum joint torque \( \tau_{i,\text{max}}(s), \tau_{i,\text{min}}(s) \), and substituting the limit into equation (16), the inequality can be obtained

\[ \tau_{i,\text{min}}(s) \leq \tau_i(s) \leq \tau_{i,\text{max}}(s) \]
(17)

Thus, the maximum/minimum pseudo-acceleration can be obtained as

\[ \ddot{s}_{\text{max},k} = \max_i(\tau_{i,\text{max}}(s_k) - c_i(s_k) \dot{s}_k^2 - f_i(s_k) \dot{s}_k - g_i(s_k)/m_i(s_k)) \]
(18)

\[ \ddot{s}_{\text{min},k} = \min_i(\tau_{i,\text{min}}(s_k) - c_i(s_k) \dot{s}_k^2 - f_i(s_k) \dot{s}_k - g_i(s_k)/m_i(s_k)) \]
(19)

The feasible action range of the agent in the state \( s_k = (s_k, \dot{s}_k) \) is \( A_k \in (\ddot{s}_{\text{min},k}, \ddot{s}_{\text{max},k}) \). When the minimum pseudo-acceleration \( \ddot{s}_{\text{min},k} \) of a certain state is greater than the maximum pseudo-acceleration \( \ddot{s}_{\text{max},k} \), the state is infeasible, and when the agent is in this state, it should be got a penalty.

3.2. Simulation experiment

3.2.1. Simulation experiment conditions

To verify the feasibility of the algorithm, the sequential convex programming (SCP) algorithm [13] and the numerical integration-like (NI-like) algorithm [15] are used as comparative experiments. All the algorithms are implemented in MATLAB R2018b on an Intel Core i3 CPU running at 3.40GHZ on a Windows machine. The object used in the simulation experiment is a 6-DOF robot manipulator and the dynamic model of the manipulator is derived by the method in [45]. To make the simulation conditions closer to the experimental conditions, the SARS algorithm is applied experiment.
the real world, a set of dynamic parameters identified by the 6-DOF GSK-RB03A1 robot of Guangzhou CNC Equipment Co., Ltd is used as the dynamic parameter of the simulation experiment.

3.22. Reinforcement learning parameter setting

The discount factor $\gamma$, learning coefficient $\alpha$ and penalty discount factor $\rho$ for SARSA are all set to 0.8. The greed factor $\epsilon$ of the greedy algorithm used for exploration is set to 0.4. The maximum number of episodes is set to 100000.

3.23. Simulation result

A line path and a curved path are used to verify the feasibility of the algorithm, where the line path is a straight line with starting point (166.8, -464.7, 132.3)(mm) and ending point (259.5, 420.1, 132.3)(mm), and the curved path is a cosine curve with expression $x = 350 + 150 \cos(16y), y \in [-300, 300], z = 40$(mm). By using the grid setting method in [44], in the example of the line path, the phase plane $s - \dot{s}$ is divided into a grid of $348 \times 500$, $348 \times 1000$, $348 \times 1500$ and $348 \times 2000$. In the example of the cosine curve path, the phase plane is divided into grids of $556 \times 500$, $556 \times 1000$, $556 \times 1500$ and $556 \times 2000$. The joint actuator torque constraint is set to $\tau_{\text{max/min}} = [103.9653; 102.8263; 34.5671; 8.1148; 6.4402; 6.3154](N \cdot m)$.

Figure 5. The end effector paths of the robot for simulation

Fig.6 and Fig.7 show the planning results of the four algorithms in the line path and the curved path. Fig.8 and 9 show the calculated torques for the optimal trajectory obtained by the proposed Improved SARSA algorithm. Table 1 gives a comparison of the performance of the four algorithms, in which all simulation results were calculated 10 times and averaged.

It can be seen from the results of Fig. 6, 7 and Table 1, the planning result of the proposed improved SARSA algorithm is close to the result of direct planning method SCP and NI-like. Moreover, as the grid dimension increases, the planning result is closer to the result of the direct planning method. Moreover, as the grid dimension increases, the planning result is closer to the result of the direct planning method. Especially for the line path case, in the case of dividing the grid into 348x2000 grid points, the planned trajectory execution time by using improved SARSA algorithm can achieve 101.4% of the SCP algorithm and 101.5% of the NI-like algorithm. For the cosine curve path case, in the case of dividing the grid into 556x2000 grid points, the planned trajectory execution time by using improved SARSA algorithm can achieve 102.7% of the SCP algorithm and 103.0% of the NI-like algorithm (The reason for the difference between the performance of the proposed algorithm and the performance of the direct planning method is that the calculated maximum pseudo-velocity is approximated to the pseudo-velocity of the grid point). Combined with the calculated torques of the six joint do not exceed the constraint limits as shown in Fig.8 and Fig.9, the feasibility of the proposed algorithm is verified.
In addition, in order to illustrate that the improved SARSA algorithm has an improved effect relative to the SARSA algorithm, the comparison of the trajectory execution time after exploiting the RL experience of every successful episode is showed in Fig.10 and Fig.11. To avoid the influence of irrelevant variables, the improved SARSA algorithm does not stop early but continue until the episode number reach the maximum limit. It can be seen from Fig.10 and Fig.11 that by using the improved SARSA algorithm, we can obtain the optimal trajectory after the first successful episode whereas by using the SARSA algorithm, the policy still not converges to the optimal policy after 100000 episodes. Moreover, for each case, the trajectory execution time obtained by using improved SARSA algorithm is significantly less than that obtained by using SARSA. Combine with the results of Table 1, the proposed improved SARSA algorithm can improve the computational efficiency and performance compared with the SARSA algorithm, with an average 73% reduced of the computation time and an average 2.1% reduced of the trajectory execution time. The reason for the significant reduction in computation time by using improved SARSA is that by using the improved SARSA, the program end when the optimal trajectory is no longer change (usually end after the first successful episode), whereas by using SARSA, the algorithm end after the episode number reaches the maximum limit.
Figure 6. Planned results of the line path by using the four algorithms, where (a) is the case of a 348 × 500 grid, (b) is the case of a 348 × 1000 grid, (c) is the case of a 348 × 1500 grid and (d) is the case of a 348 × 2000 grid.
Figure 7. Planned results of the cosine curve path by using the four algorithms, where (a) is the case of a $556 \times 500$ grid, (b) is the case of a $556 \times 1000$ grid, (c) is the case of a $556 \times 1500$ grid and (d) is the case of a $556 \times 2000$ grid.

Figure 8. Calculated torque of the optimal trajectory of a line path obtained by improved SARSA in the case of a $348 \times 2000$ grid, where (a) is the torque of joint 1,2,3 and (b) is the torque of joint 4,5,6.
Figure 9. Calculated torque of the optimal trajectory of a cosine curve path obtained by improved SARSA in the case of a 556 × 2000 grid, where (a) is the torque of joint 1,2,3 and (b) is the torque of joint 4,5,6.
Figure 10. Execution time of the optimal trajectory obtained by exploiting the RL experience of the successful episodes, where (a) is the case of a $348 \times 500$ grid of the line path, (b) is the case of a $348 \times 1000$ grid of the line path, (c) is the case of a $348 \times 1500$ grid of the line path and (d) is the case of a $348 \times 2000$ grid of the line path.
Figure 11. Execution time of the optimal trajectory obtained by exploitation the RL experience of the successful episodes, where (a) is the case of a $556 \times 500$ grid of the cosine curve path, (b) is the case of a $556 \times 1000$ grid of the cosine curve path, (c) is the case of a $556 \times 1500$ grid of the cosine curve path and (d) is the case of a $556 \times 2000$ grid of the cosine curve path.

Table 1. Performance comparison of NI-like, SCP, SARSA and improved SARSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Total episode number</th>
<th>Computation time (s)</th>
<th>Trajectory execution time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curve</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>NI-like</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>0.7759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 500</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.653</td>
<td>0.7751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>232.322</td>
<td>0.8242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>10406.5</td>
<td>16.121</td>
<td>0.8114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>NI-like</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>0.7759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.653</td>
<td>0.7751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 1000</td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>230.135</td>
<td>0.8130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>20787.5</td>
<td>32.745</td>
<td>0.7948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.653</td>
<td>0.7751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 1500</td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>227.825</td>
<td>0.8083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>31359.3</td>
<td>50.137</td>
<td>0.7895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.653</td>
<td>0.7751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 2000</td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>219.731</td>
<td>0.8031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>41726.1</td>
<td>68.532</td>
<td>0.7865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>NI-like</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>1.2730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 500</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>1.2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>336.105</td>
<td>1.4384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>19397.3</td>
<td>37.121</td>
<td>1.4158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>NI-like</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>1.2730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 1000</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>1.2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>305.347</td>
<td>1.3725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>38529.5</td>
<td>70.093</td>
<td>1.3433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>NI-like</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>1.2730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× 1500</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.720</td>
<td>1.2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SARSA</td>
<td>100000.0</td>
<td>270.452</td>
<td>1.3486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved SARSA</td>
<td>57003.6</td>
<td>105.335</td>
<td>1.3181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Apply the improved SARSA algorithm in solving the time-optimal path tracking problem without using dynamic model

The feasibility of improving the SARSA algorithm in solving the time-optimal path tracking problem of a robot manipulator based on dynamic model has been verified in Section 3. However, although the proposed algorithm can obtain an optimal trajectory that the calculated torques satisfy the torque constraints, the actually measured torques are not always within the torque constraints. In this section, by using the two-step improved SARSA algorithm, the dynamic model of the robot manipulator is no longer considered but interacts directly with the real environment to avoid the limitations brought by the model-plant mismatch.

4.1. Interact with the kinematic model to obtain the initial trajectory

Since running a randomly generated trajectory may result in damage to the servo motor when the Q value has not been specialized. In order to avoid this, the acceleration should be limited to avoid placing an excessive load on the motor. Considering the given acceleration limits $\ddot{q}_{\min}$ and $\ddot{q}_{\max}$, combined with equation (10), yields

$$\frac{(\ddot{q}_{\min} - q''(s)\dot{s}^2) / q'(s)}{q'(s)} \leq \ddot{s} \leq \frac{(\ddot{q}_{\max} - q''(s)\dot{s}^2) / q'(s)}{q'(s)}$$

Each row i of (20) is of the form

$$\frac{(\ddot{q}_{i,\min} - q_i''(s)\dot{s}^2) / q_i'(s)}{q_i'(s)} \leq \ddot{s}_i \leq \frac{(\ddot{q}_{i,\max} - q_i''(s)\dot{s}^2) / q_i'(s)}{q_i'(s)}$$

Thus, the maximum/minimum pseudo-acceleration can be obtained as

$$\ddot{s}_{\max,k} = \min_i((\ddot{q}_{i,\max} - q_i''(s)\dot{s}^2) / q_i'(s))$$

$$\ddot{s}_{\min,k} = \max_i((\ddot{q}_{i,\min} - q_i''(s)\dot{s}^2) / q_i'(s))$$

The feasible action range of the agent in the state $s_k = (s_k, \dot{s}_k)$ is $A_k \in (\ddot{s}_{\min,k}, \ddot{s}_{\max,k})$. When the minimum pseudo-acceleration $\ddot{s}_{\min,k}$ of a certain state is greater than the maximum pseudo-acceleration $\ddot{s}_{\max,k}$, the state is infeasible, and when the agent reach this state, it should be got a penalty.

By setting the feasible action range and the infeasible state, using the improved SARSA algorithm for learning, the initial trajectory for interaction and the specialized initial Q value can be obtained. Since Q value is specialized, it will not take a lot of time to explore in subsequent learning.

4.2. Interact with the real world environment

Using the improved SARSA algorithm to interact with the real world environment mainly includes the following three steps:

Step 1. Run the obtained initial trajectory (or the optimal trajectory obtained from subsequent learning) on the robot manipulator and obtain the actually measured torque.

Step 2. The state $(s_k, \dot{s}_k)$ of the discrete point of the trajectory corresponding to the measured torque exceeding the constraint limit is set to an infeasible state, and the agent will not pass through these states at the next exploration. By setting the infeasible state, re-learning, updating the specialized Q-value, obtaining a new optimal trajectory, and going to step 1 to run the optimal trajectory.

Repeat steps 1 and 2 until the actually measured torque does not exceed the torque constraint limit.

4.3. Experiment

4.3.1. Experiment condition

Experiment setting

The experimental setup is shown in Figure 9. It consists of 4 parts: 1. Industrial robot. All experiments are implemented in the GSK-RB03A1 6-DOF industrial robot of Guangzhou CNC Equipment Co., Ltd. 2. Servo drivers. The robot is driven by CoolDrive R series
alternating current (AC) servo drivers, which receive the control commands from the industrial control personal computer (PC) and send them to the servo motor in addition to receiving the encoder values and current values returned by the servo motor in real time and sending them to the industrial control PC to calculate the measured torque. 3. Industrial control PC. The industrial control PC used in this paper is a DT-610P-ZQ170MA industrial PC with an Intel Core i7-4770 3.4 GHz eight-core processor, 8 GB memory, and Windows 7 64-bit system, which is used to plan the trajectory in MATLAB R2018b and execute the trajectory in the control software platform. 4. Control software platform. The control software platform is mainly constructed based on a Windows 7 64-bit system and a real-time kernel control system. The EtherCAT Industrial Ethernet bus protocol is adopted for communication between the control platform and the servo drivers, with a 1-ms control cycle.

Reinforcement learning parameters setting
The same as in Section 3.22.

Experiment path
The same as in Section 3.23. As shown in Fig. 13.

Grid division
Using the case of 348×500 grid of the line path and 556×500 grid of the cosine curve path in Section 3.23 for analysis.

Comparative experiment
To verify the effectiveness of the algorithm, the direct planning method NI-like based on the dynamic model is chosen as the comparative algorithm as it also considers the case of acceleration constraints.

Constraint conditions
The joint acceleration constraints are set to $A_{\text{max/min}} = \pm [50; 42; 70; 80; 80; 80](rad/s^2)$. The torque constraints are the same as in Section 3.23.
4.32 Experiment result

**Case 1 Line**

*Computational time:* the computational time for learning the initial trajectory is 14.537s. After the learning of the initial trajectory, since the Q value has been specialized, the computational time for each learning is less than 0.1s.

*Trajectory execution time:* For the improved SARSA algorithm, the trajectory execution time of the initial trajectory is 0.7192s, while the actually measured torques exceed the torque constraint limits. After 55 interactions, the trajectory execution time is 0.7806s, while the actually measured torques are no longer exceed the torque constraint limits. For the NI-like algorithm, the trajectory execution time is 0.8004s, while the actually measured torques exceed the torque constraint limits, as shown in Figure 10, which verifies the effectiveness of the algorithm.
Figure 10. Measured torque of a line path of three selected situations on all six joints of the manipulator, where (a) is the measured torque of joint 1, 2, (b) is torque of joint 3, 4 and (c) is torque of joint 5, 6.

**Case 2 Cosine curve**

*Computational time:* the computational time for learning the initial trajectory is 18.322s. After the learning of the initial trajectory, since the Q value has been specialized, the computational time for each learning is less than 0.1s.

*Trajectory execution time:* For the improved SARSA algorithm, the trajectory execution time of the initial trajectory is 1.2930s, while the actually measured torques exceed the torque constraint limits. After 8 interactions, the trajectory execution time is 1.3065s, while the actually measured torques are no longer exceed the torque constraint limits. For the NI-like algorithm, the trajectory execution time is 1.3648s, while the actually measured torques exceed the torque constraint limits, as shown in Figure 11, which verifies the effectiveness of the algorithm.
Figure 11. Measured torque of a cosine curve path of three selected situations on all six joints of the manipulator, where (a) is the measured torque of joint 1, 2, (b) is torque of joint 3, 4 and (c) is torque of joint 5, 6.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we devote to solving the problem of the model-plant mismatch caused by the modelling error of the dynamic model in the time-optimal path tracking problem. Different from most of the relevant researches which hope to improve the model accuracy to avoid the mismatch phenomenon, we provide a new idea: without considering the robotic dynamic model but obtain the time-optimal trajectory only by interacting with the real world. In order to realize this idea, we construct the time-optimal path tracking problem into
a reinforcement learning problem, thus the two different fields are connected. We propose an improved SARSA for solving the above reinforcement learning problem. Simulation experiments show that the proposed method is feasible to solve the time-optimal path tracking problem based on the dynamic model. Moreover, by applying the improved SARSA algorithm to the actual robot control through a two-step method, the experiment result shows better performance compared to the case of using dynamic model-based direct planning method. By directly interacting with the real world, the model-plant mismatch phenomenon is avoided, and the trajectory execution time is less than that obtained by using model-based direct planning method. Furthermore, the actually measured torque obtained by using improved SARSA does not exceed the torque constraint limit whereas the actually measured torque obtained by model-based direct planning method exceeds the limit.

There are several further developments which the authors intend to pursue:
1. Due to the limitation of grid, the proposed algorithms are just near optimal methods. In future work, some other reinforcement learning algorithms can be considered to avoid approximation.
2. There is significant computational time for reinforcement learning, in the future, some other methods that can improve the computational efficiency can be considered.
3. Develop complex industrial scenarios for further testing of the proposed solution.
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