Development and Design Optimization of 2Y Hexarotor with Robustness against Rotor Failure
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Abstract: This paper presents a novel hexarotor unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) with robustness against an arbitrary rotor-failure, called full robustness, and a design method to maximize its manipulability while ensuring the full robustness. First, the dynamical model of a hexarotor UAV and the novel structure with 2Y shape and twisted angles are presented. A hexarotor with this structure is named as 2Y hexarotor. The 2Y hexarotor has higher flight efficiency than other existing hexarotor structures with full robustness. Second, the full robustness of the 2Y hexarotor is proved, and a quantitative measure to evaluate the full robustness is introduced. Then, the quantitative measure for the full robustness is used to calculate the optimal twisted angles. Finally, the dynamic manipulability measure (DMM) is introduced to evaluate the maneuverability. A design method is defined as the maximization of the DMM under constraints regarding the quantitative measure for the full robustness and the condition to avoid overlapping rotors. The design method is applied to the 2Y hexarotor with the optimal twisted angles.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Task automation with a multirotor unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) is one of the hot topics in robotics. It has been studied actively to automate tasks such as building inspection (Vazquez-Nicolas et al. (2018)), load transportation (Liang et al. (2017)), and work with a robotic arm (Kim et al. (2013)). A multirotor UAV can move to an arbitrary position in the air with at least four rotors, and thus a quadrotor UAV is one of the typical structures (Bouabdallah et al. (2004); Tayebi and McGilvray (2006)). Furthermore, a hexarotor UAV is also a common structure with redundancy (Kirsch et al. (2016)). The standard quadrotor and hexarotor are shown in Fig. 1. In the standard structure, each rotor is upward oriented and placed on a vertex of the regular polygon so that its rotational direction is opposite to that of adjacent rotors.

A multirotor UAV is required to have the ability to achieve static hovering, called hoverability in this paper, to perform its task. Moreover, we focus on the property that maintains the hoverability even after an arbitrary rotor is failed. This property is called full robustness and required for safe work in a field. A hexarotor UAV is expected to be robust against a rotor failure because of its redundancy. However, it is revealed that the standard hexarotor loses the hoverability after any one rotor is failed in some studies (Giribet et al. (2016); Michieletto et al. (2018); Schneider et al. (2012); Vey and Lunze (2015)). The standard hexarotor with one failed rotor is uncontrollable because it cannot output the roll, pitch, and yaw moments independently. Kamel et al. (2015) proposed fault tolerant control for the standard hexarotor. It is a control scheme that makes the standard hexarotor stay in the air by sacrificing the control of the yaw angle. Then, the vehicle flies while rotating around the yaw axis. This motion might be inappropriate for some tasks because it might damage equipment on the vehicle or surroundings.

Some researchers proposed the hexarotor structures with robustness against a rotor-failure. Schneider et al. (2012) and Vey and Lunze (2015) showed that the hexarotor UAV with rotational directions of some rotors inverted from the standard hexarotor is robust against a failure of certain rotors. It is a simple structure and achieves the static
hovering even after the certain rotor is failed. However, it is not fully robust, and thus it becomes "uncontrollable" after another rotor is failed. Giribet et al. (2016) and Michieletto et al. (2018) presented that a hexarotor UAV with all rotors tilted to outside or inside of the vehicle is fully robust. Michieletto et al. (2018) also proposed a fully robust structure that is developed by rotating the position of some rotors around the yaw axis from the standard hexarotor, e.g., Y-shaped hexarotor with three pairs of overlapped two rotors. However, a hexarotor UAV with tilted rotors causes lower flight efficiency than that with all the rotor oriented in the same direction because each rotor generates the thrust force in different directions. On the other hand, in Y-shaped hexarotor, the overlapped rotors degrade the thrust force of the lower rotor (Otsuka and Nagatani (2016)).

This paper presents a novel hexarotor UAV with full robustness. Furthermore, it keeps the flight efficiency by placing each rotor in the same direction and without any overlap. This hexarotor UAV is named as 2Y hexarotor. The full robustness of the 2Y hexarotor is presented from hoverability analysis with the Equilibrium existence region (EER) proposed in our previous work (Matsuda et al. (2018)). Furthermore, we propose a design scheme of its physical parameters. Two quantitative measures are introduced to design the parameters. One is the dynamic manipulability measure (DMM) to evaluate the manipulability (Yoshikawa (1985)), and the other is the distance between the center of mass (CoM) and the boundary of the EER, called hoverability margin, to evaluate the robustness of the hoverability. The DMM was introduced for evaluation of manipulator performance in Yoshikawa (1985) at first. In recent studies, Tadokoro et al. (2017) and Anzai et al. (2018) applied the DMM to structure optimization for a fully actuated multirotor UAV. In this paper, we apply it to structure optimization for an underactuated hexarotor UAV. We optimize the parameters to maximize the DMM under the constraint that the hoverability margin is larger than a specific value even after a rotor-failure. This optimization finds the UAV structure with both high manipulability and sufficient robustness against a rotor-failure to perform the task safely.

2. 2Y HEXAROTOR MODEL

In this paper, we ignore the aerodynamic disturbance and dynamics of each rotor. The main symbols used in this paper are listed in Table 1, and $O_{k\times l} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times l}$ and $I_k \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ indicate the $k \times l$ zero matrix and $k \times k$ identity matrix, respectively.

2.1 Dynamical Model

We first consider a hexarotor UAV model with a planar structure. Figure 2 shows the dynamical model in the case of the 2Y hexarotor.

Each rotor is oriented in the positive $z$-axis in $\Sigma_c$. Then, the $i$-th rotor, located at $p_{oc,i} = [x_i, y_i, 0]^T$ in $\Sigma_c$, generates the rotor thrust force $f_{i} \geq 0$ in the rotational axis direction and the counter torque $\kappa_i f_{i}$ around its rotational axis. The sign of $\kappa_i$ depends on the rotational direction of the $i$-th rotor. The rotational direction of each rotor plays an important role in our hoverability analysis. Therefore, we call a rotor which rotates in the clockwise direction $P$ rotor, and that which rotates in the counterclockwise direction $N$ rotor in this paper. The counter torque constant of the $P$ rotor is positive ($\kappa_i > 0$), and the counter torque of the $N$ rotor is generated in the counterclockwise direction. On the other hand, the counter torque constant of the $N$ rotor is negative ($\kappa_i < 0$), and the counter torque is generated in the clockwise direction.

The total wrench of the six rotors applied at the CoM is

$$F_c = \begin{bmatrix} O_{3 \times 6} & f_1 \cdots f_6 \\ y_1 & \cdots & y_6 \\ -x_1 & \cdots & -x_6 \\ \kappa_1 & \cdots & \kappa_6 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} O_{3 \times 6} & f_1 \cdots f_6 \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} u_c,$$

where $u_c = [f_1 \cdots f_6]^T \in \mathbb{R}^6$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 6}$ is a matrix which maps the rotor thrust forces to the moments of the vehicle. Therefore, the Newton-Euler equation of motion in $\Sigma_c$ is described by

$$m I_3 \dot{O}_{3 \times 3}^T J \dot{\omega} + \left[ \omega \times m v \right] + \left[ \omega \times J \omega \right] = F_c + \left[ -mg R_{3 \times 6}^{c3} e_3 \right] C \tau,$$

where $g > 0$ is the gravity acceleration and $e_3 := [0 0 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Note that a structure of a hexarotor UAV affects only $C \tau$ in (1).

2.2 State Equation

First, we represent $R_{oc}$ by the ZYX Euler angles with the roll, pitch, and yaw angles $r_{oc} := [\phi \ \theta \ \psi]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$ as follows:

$$R_{oc} = R_z(\psi) R_y(\theta) R_x(\phi).$$

Here $R_x(\cdot), R_y(\cdot), R_z(\cdot) \in SO(3)$ indicate the rotation matrices around $x, y, z$-axes, respectively.
From (1) and (2), the nonlinear state equation of the hexarotor UAV in $\Sigma_o$ is described by
$$\dot{\xi} = f(\xi, u),$$
where $\xi := [x, y, \theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z, \phi]^T$ is the state vector. The system (3) has a steady-state input $u_{ss}$ that can maintain equilibrium at a state $\xi_{ss}$. In our hoverability analysis, we consider the linearized system of (3) around $(\xi_{ss}, u_{ss})$. We can rewrite (3) as $\dot{\xi} = f_3(\xi_{ss}, u_{ss})$ with $\xi := \xi - \xi_{ss} \in \mathbb{R}^{12}$ and $u := u - u_{ss} \in \mathbb{R}^6$. Then, the linearized system is described by
$$\dot{\xi}_s = A\xi_s + Bu_s$$
with
$$A := \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial \xi}(0, 0), \quad B := \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial u}(0, 0).$$
All the rotors of a hexarotor UAV with a planar structure are oriented in the upward direction. Therefore, the vehicle orientation at the equilibrium point $\xi_{ss}$ is only the positive direction of the $z$-axis in $\Sigma_o$.

2.3 Structure of 2Y Hexarotor

A structure of a hexarotor UAV is represented by specifying elements of $C_r$. We first introduce the structure of the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor based on Michieletto et al. (2018).

**Definition 1. Yaw-Twisted hexarotor** is a hexarotor UAV whose structure is described by

$$\begin{align*}
x_i &= r \cos \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \alpha \right), \\
y_i &= r \sin \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \alpha \right), \\
\kappa_i &= \kappa, \\
x_i &= r \cos \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \beta \right), \\
y_i &= r \sin \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \beta \right), \\
\kappa_i &= -\kappa,
\end{align*}$$

where $r > 0$ is the length of each rotor arm and $\alpha, \beta \in (-\pi/3, \pi/3)$ are the twisted angles.

Figure 3(a) shows the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor. The Yaw-Twisted hexarotor is obtained by rotating all the P rotors by $\alpha$ and all the N rotors by $\beta$ around the yaw axis from the standard hexarotor. The Yaw-Twisted hexarotor with $|\alpha - \beta| = \pi/3$ is called Y-shaped hexarotor.

The structure of 2Y Hexarotor is newly presented as follows:

**Definition 2. 2Y hexarotor** is a hexarotor UAV whose structure is described by

$$\begin{align*}
x_i &= l + r \cos \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \alpha \right), \\
y_i &= r \sin \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \alpha \right), \\
\kappa_i &= \kappa, \\
x_i &= -l + r \cos \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \beta \right), \\
y_i &= r \sin \left( \frac{i-1}{3} \pi + \beta \right), \\
\kappa_i &= -\kappa,
\end{align*}$$

where $l > 0$ is the length between the center of P (N) rotors and the CoM.

Figure 3(b) illustrates the 2Y hexarotor. This structure is developed by respectively translating all the P rotors and all the N rotors by $l$ and $-l$ along the $z$-axis of $\Sigma_c$ from the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor. The Yaw-Twisted hexarotor, especially Y-shaped hexarotor, is prone to have an overlap of two rotors. Thus, adding the translation, we obtain the structure without any overlap.

3. ROTOR-FAILURE ROBUSTNESS ANALYSIS

This section shows that the 2Y hexarotor is fully robust against a rotor-failure, and gives optimal twisted angles in the sense of the full robustness.

3.1 Geometric Hoverability Analysis Method

We briefly review the hoverability analysis with the EER proposed in our previous work (Matsuda et al. (2018)). First, we consider the condition for a hexarotor UAV to achieve static hovering. We need to analyze the controllability of the UAV system with input constraint $f_i \geq 0$. Matsuda et al. (2018) introduced the matrix $B_p$ by removing the columns which correspond to zero elements in $u_{ss}$ from $B$, and defined $(A, B_p)$ controllability as follows:

**Definition 3.** $(A, B_p)$ controllability. The linearized system (4) is said to be $(A, B_p)$ controllable if the following equation holds for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{12 \times 12}$, $B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{12 \times (n-q)}$. ($q$ is the number of zeros in $u_{ss}$)

$$\text{rank}[B_p \ \hat{A}B_p \ \hat{A}^2B_p \ \cdots \ \hat{A}^{n-1}B_p] = 12.$$ (6)

If the linearized system (3) is $(A, B_p)$ controllable, the original system (3) can be locally stabilized by linear state feedback. We now provide the definition of the hoverability.

**Definition 4.** (Hoverability (Matsuda et al. (2018)))). A hexarotor UAV is said to be hoverable if the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) The original system (3) has at least one equilibrium such that each element of $u_{ss}$ is greater than or equal to zero.

(ii) The linearized system (4) around the equilibrium is $(A, B_p)$ controllable.

Hoverable multirotor UAVs can control their attitude and position without killing the yaw control. The condition (i) can be analyzed using the geometric method as follows:

**Fact 5.** (Matsuda et al. (2018)). A hexarotor UAV with $|\kappa_i| = \kappa > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$ has equilibria if and only if the CoM exists in the convex hull composed of the midpoints between an arbitrary P rotor and N rotor on $(x, y)$-plane in $\Sigma_c$. 9471
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Fig. 4. EER of hexarotor UAV: The green dots indicate the midpoints between each P rotor and N rotor, and the cyan regions indicate the EERs.

Fact 5 enables us to analyze the existence of equilibria with the simple geometric way. The convex hull in Fact 5 is called Equilibrium existence region (EER). The cyan area of Figure 4(a) shows the EER of the standard hexarotor. Note that \( u_{ss} \) such that each element is greater than zero exists if the CoM is included in the interior of the EER by properties of linear transformation between two convex sets (Schneider et al. (2012)). From Fact 5, we find the following property about the EER:

**Lemma 6.** The EER of a hexarotor UAV is invariant under the pair of the translation of all the P rotors by \([x \ y \ 0]^T\) and that of all the N rotors by \([-x \ -y \ 0]^T\) in \( \Sigma_c \).

**Proof.** It is trivial because EER is composed of the midpoints between an arbitrary P rotor and N rotor.

Figure 4(b) indicates the EER of the 2Y hexarotor which is obtained by adding the translation of all the P rotors by \([l \ 0 \ 0]^T\) and that of all the N rotors by \([-l \ 0 \ 0]^T\) from the standard hexarotor in Figure 4(a). The EER of the 2Y hexarotor is the same as that of the standard hexarotor. Lemma 6 is used to prove the full robustness of the 2Y hexarotor in the next section.

A multirotor UAV is required to be able to keep the static hovering even after any one rotor is failed. We next introduce the definitions to investigate the full robustness, which are initially defined in Michieletto et al. (2018).

**Definition 7.** (Rotor-failure (Michieletto et al. (2018))). The i-th rotor is failed if it cannot generate any force, i.e., \( f_i = 0 \).

**Definition 8.** (Full robustness (Michieletto et al. (2018))). A hexarotor UAV is said to be fully robust if it is still hoverable after the i-th rotor is failed for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\} \).

The full robustness of a hexarotor UAV can be examined by analyzing the hoverability of each structure obtained by removing an arbitrary rotor from the hexarotor UAV.

Finally, we provide a quantitative measure for the hoverability. This quantitative measure can be used to design an optimal structure for the hoverability or the full robustness.

**Definition 9.** For a hoverable hexarotor UAV, the shortest distance between the CoM and the boundary of the EER is called hoverability margin.

A hoverable hexarotor UAV is still hoverable if the perturbation of the CoM position is within the hoverability margin. This implies that a hexarotor UAV with a larger hoverability margin can perform its task more safely. The minimum hoverability margin among all the hoverability margins of a hexarotor UAV with an arbitrary rotor-failure can be used to evaluate the full robustness.

For analysis examples of the geometric hoverability method, refer to Matsuda et al. (2018).

### 3.2 Rotor-Failure Robustness of 2Y Hexarotor

We introduce the following fact about the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor proved in Michieletto et al. (2018).

**Fact 10.** The Yaw-Twisted hexarotor with \( |\alpha - \beta| \in (0, \pi/3) \) is fully robust.

Fact 10 is also confirmed by checking whether the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor with the i-th rotor-failure for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\} \) satisfies conditions (i), (ii) in Definition 4. We now show the full robustness of the 2Y hexarotor.

**Theorem 11.** The 2Y hexarotor with \( |\alpha - \beta| \in (0, \pi/3) \) is fully robust.

**Proof.** Fact 10 implies that all the EERs composed of any five rotors of the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor with \( |\alpha - \beta| \in (0, \pi/3) \) include the CoM. The 2Y hexarotor is obtained by translating all the P rotors and the N rotors by \( l \) and \(-l\) along the x-axis of \( \Sigma_c \) from the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor, respectively. Applying Lemma 6, we find that all the EERs composed of any five rotors of the 2Y hexarotor also include the CoM since each EER shape is the same as that of the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor. From Fact 5, the 2Y hexarotor with \( |\alpha - \beta| \in (0, \pi/3) \) has an equilibrium such that each element of \( u_{ss} \) is greater than zero. We obtain that the 2Y hexarotor with one rotor-failure is \((A, B_p)\) controllable by confirming (6). Therefore, the 2Y hexarotor with \( |\alpha - \beta| \in (0, \pi/3) \) is fully robust.

From the geometric hoverability analysis, we find that the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor and the 2Y hexarotor with the same \( \alpha, \beta \) have the same EER. Figure 5 shows the EER of the 2Y hexarotor with \((r, l, \alpha, \beta) = (0.09 \text{ m}, 0.15 \text{ m}, \pi/6, 0)\) in the case of the i-th rotor-failure for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\} \). In all the cases, the CoM is included in the EER.

### 3.3 Optimization of Twisted Angles

The 2Y hexarotor has four design parameters: \( r > 0; \ l > 0; \) and \( \alpha, \beta \in (-\pi/3, \pi/3) \). The hoverability margin is in proportion to \( r \) and independent of \( l \). In this section, we show the relationship between the twisted angles and the hoverability margin, and provide the optimal twisted...
Fig. 6. Relationship between hoverability margin and $\alpha$: The calculation is conducted under $(r, l, \beta) = (0.09 \, \text{m}, 0.15 \, \text{m}, 0)$ and (b) shows the EER of the 2Y hexarotor with the 1st rotor-failure at $\alpha = \pi/3$. We assume that the translational and angular velocity are controllable. Thus, the 2Y hexarotor with $\alpha = \pi/3$ is the optimal structure.

Generally, twisted angles such that $|\alpha - \beta| = \pi/3$ are the optimal angles for the 2Y hexarotor. The same statement holds in the case of the Yaw-Twisted hexarotor, which means the Y-shaped hexarotor is the optimal structure. However, the Y-shaped hexarotor has the overlap of two rotors, which causes the degradation of the rotor thrust force. The proposed 2Y hexarotor avoids the degradation by adjusting the value of $l$ while keeping the EER.

4. DESIGN OPTIMIZATION FOR MANEUVERABILITY AND HOVERABILITY

In this section, we provide a design scheme for a hexarotor UAV to maximize its manipulability while ensuring the full robustness for both task performance and safety. Then, the application example for the 2Y hexarotor is presented.

4.1 Optimization Method

We assume that the translational and angular velocity are zeros at the initial state of the vehicle. The translational and angular acceleration of the vehicle is described by

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\mathbf{v}} \\
\mathbf{\omega}
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
O_{3 \times 3} & 0_{2 \times 3} \\
O_{3 \times 3} & J
\end{bmatrix}^{-1}
\begin{bmatrix}
0_{2 \times 6} \\
1 & \cdots & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Omega_{2 \times 1} \\
C_r
\end{bmatrix}
\mathbf{u} + 
\begin{bmatrix}
O_{2 \times 1} \\
O_{3 \times 1}
\end{bmatrix}
\mathbf{g}. \tag{7}
$$

We now show the optimization (10) in the case of the 2Y hexarotor. Let $(\alpha, \beta) = (\gamma, \pi - \gamma)$ with $\gamma \in (0, \pi/3)$. Since $(\alpha, \beta)$ satisfies $|\alpha - \beta| = \pi/3$, the structure is optimal in the sense of the margin for the full robustness as shown in Section 3.3. For the 2Y hexarotor, $C_r$ is specified from (5) and $J$ is calculated by assuming that the 2Y hexarotor is composed of some parts as follows: the base body; the six rotors; the six rotor arms with length $r$; and the two frames with length $l$ between the base body and the center of the rotor arms. Then, we design the three parameters: $r > 0$, $l > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \pi/3)$.

We solve two optimization problems. One is the optimization (10) without (8), and the other is that with (8). Here, we set the parameters as follows: $S = 0.05 \, \text{m}$, $D_p = 0.152 \, \text{m}$, and $\varepsilon = 0.01 \, \text{m}$. Note that the DMM $w_d$ tends to be larger as $r$ and $l$ become smaller in the feasible solution set under these parameters. The optimization problems are solved by the “fmincon” function from MATLAB.
Fig. 7. Optimization results (a) without the constraint on the full robustness, and (b) with the constraint on the full robustness. The diameter of each red (blue) circle indicates the diameter of each rotor.

The result of the optimization without (8) is \((r, l, \gamma) = (0.1624\, \text{m}, 0.0812\, \text{m}, 1.0472\, \text{rad})\). Each parameter is chosen by making \(r, l\) smaller to maximize \(w_d\) under the constraints for non-overlap. We can find that \(\gamma = \pi/3\) is suitable to maximize \(w_d\) without the full robustness margin constraint. On the other hand, the result of the optimization with (8) is \((r, l, \gamma) = (0.200\, \text{m}, 0.0812\, \text{m}, 0.2175\, \text{rad})\). The structure is shown in Fig. 7(b). Each parameter is chosen to maximize \(w_d\) while satisfying the constraint on the margin for the full robustness. Under the full robustness margin constraint, \(r\) should be greater than or equal to 4\(S\). However, the optimization cannot make \(r\) larger than 4\(S\) with small \(l\) at \(\gamma = \pi/3\) due to the non-overlap constraint. As a result, the optimization makes \(r\) larger and not to change \(l\) by varying \(\gamma\), which does not affect \(w_d\).

The design scheme provides the optimal solution in the sense of the manipulability of the vehicle while ensuring the requirement of safety performance.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed the novel structure of hexarotor UAVs, called 2Y hexarotor. The structure is fully robust against a rotor-failure and reduces the degradation of the thrust force. For this structure, our contributions are as follows: (i) the full robustness is proved using the geometric hoverability analysis; (ii) the optimal twisted angles in the sense of the full robustness are presented by evaluating the hoverability margin; and (iii) the design scheme for the physical parameters of the UAV is proposed based on the DMM and the hoverability margin. Finally, we showed the example of design optimization.

For future work, we will perform the experimental validation of the 2Y hexarotor and consider fault tolerant control in a task such as transportation. The experimental investigations will clarify differences between the standard hexarotor and the 2Y hexarotor in practical applications.
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