International Journal of Research
Available at https://edupediapublications.org/journals

e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 05 Issue 04
February 2018

Enhancements in Multi-Robot Systems

K.Vijay Kumar
Research Scholar, Dept of Mechanical Engineering, SSSUTMS, Bhopal, MP, India.
mech.vjy11@rocketmail.com

Abstract **:** *As research progresses, an expanding number of parts of multi-robot systems are being examined. This extraordinary issue on Multi-Robot Systems gives an expansive examining of the exploration that is at present continuous in the field of distributed versatile robot systems. To help arrange this examination, we have recognized seven essential research points inside multi-robot systems natural motivations, correspondence, models, limitation/mapping/investigation, protest transport and control, movement coordination, and reconfigurable robots. This publication inspects these examination regions and talks about the uncommon issue articles in this specific situation. We close by distinguishing a few extra open research issues in distributed portable robotic systems.*

Index Terms— Distributed robotics, survey, cooperative robotics, multi-robot systems

I. INTRODUCTION

THE field of distributed robotics has its beginnings in the late 1980s, when a few scientists started examining issues in multiple portable robot systems. Before this time, examine had focused on either single robot systems or distributed critical thinking systems that did not include robotic parts. Since this early research in distributed versatile robotics, the field has developed significantly, with a considerably more extensive assortment of points being tended to. Accumulations of research around there incorporate the altered volumes by Balch and Parker [15] and Schultz and Parker [59], and additionally the arrangement of procedures from the Symposia on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS) [8], [10], [11], [40], [54], [9]. Also, past exceptional diary issues have tended to the subject of multi-robot systems; two quite compelling have been distributed by the diary Autonomous Robots – an extraordinary issue on Robot Colonies [4], and another on Heterogeneous Multi-Robot Systems [14]. However, a lot of new research has been accomplished since these past exceptional issues, and accordingly this ebb and flow extraordinary issue examines numerous new improvements in the field since these prior distributions.

benefit robotics in both open and private areas, the excitement field, et cetera, can profit by the utilization of multi-robot systems. In these testing application spaces, multi-robot systems can regularly manage undertakings that are troublesome, if certainly feasible, to be expert by an individual robot. A group of robots may give excess and contribute cooperatively to tackle the alloted undertaking, or they may play out the appointed errand in a more solid, quicker, or less expensive path past what is conceivable with single robots.

The field of cooperative independent portable robotics is still sufficiently new that no point zone inside this area can be viewed as develop. A few zones have been investigated all the more widely, be that as it may, and the group is starting to see how to create and control certain parts of multi-robot groups. For instance, the issue of adjusting reactivity and social thought has been considered for both mimicked and genuine multi-operator systems in the accumulation of papers altered by Hannebauer, Wendler, and Pagello [33]. As opposed to endeavor to abridge the examination articles in this extraordinary issue into a scientific categorization of cooperative systems (see Dudek [29] and Cao [23] for past related rundowns), we rather sort out this exploration by the essential theme regions that have produced noteworthy levels of study, to the degree conceivable in a restricted space. The seven guideline theme territories of Multi-Robot Systems that we have distinguished are:

Natural Inspirations;

Correspondence;

Models, assignment designation, and control;

Confinement, mapping, and investigation;

Question transport and control;

Movement coordination; and

Reconfigurable robots.

A significant number of the articles in this unique issue address more than one of these foundational issues in multi-robot systems. We consequently depict parts of these articles as they apply to each of these key research zones. For setting, we additionally talk about other key references and cases of earlier research in each of these guideline point territories as we present this unique issue. Notwithstanding, space does not permit a comprehensive treatment of each of these essential research zones, and hence we can't throughly audit all the past writing germane to this subject. We close this article by proposing extra research issues that have not yet been broadly considered, but rather seem, by all accounts, to be of developing interest and need in distributed self-governing multi-robot systems.

II. BIOLOGICAL INSPIRATIONS

About the greater part of the work in cooperative versatile robotics started after the presentation of the new robotics worldview of conduct based control [20], [3]. This conduct based worldview has had a solid impact in a significant part of the cooperative versatile robotics inquire about. Since the conduct based worldview for portable robotics is established in organic motivations, numerous cooperative robotics specialists have likewise thought that it was enlightening to look at the social attributes of creepy crawlies and creatures, and to apply these discoveries to the plan of multi-robot systems.

The most well-known use of this information is in the utilization of the straightforward neighborhood control standards of different natural social orders especially ants, honey bees, and fowls to the advancement of comparable practices in cooperative robot systems. Work in this vein has shown the capacity for multirobot groups to run, scatter, total, rummage, and take after trails (e.g., [44], [26], [28]). The use of the elements of ecosystems has additionally been connected to the improvement of multi-robot groups that show developing collaboration because of following up on self-interests [46]. To some degree, collaboration in higher animals, for example, wolf packs, has produced propels in cooperative control. Critical investigation in predator-prey systems has happened, albeit fundamentally in reenactment [17], [34]. They assess different interest strategies relaing anticipated that catch times would the speed and insight of the dodgers and the detecting capabilties of the followers. Rivalry in multi-robot systems, for example, that found in higher creatures including people, is being contemplated in areas, for example, multi-robot soccer. A past exceptional diary issue in Artificial Intelligence on RoboCup talks about huge numbers of the advances here; see [6] for a general review of the field, and [49], [7], [61], [64], [5] for some specific cases of this examination. Another arrangement of books seems yearly in the Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence arrangement on the theme of multi-robot soccer, starting with [38]. Two articles in this exceptional issue address multi-robot control issues in the multi-robot soccer space. All the more as of late distinguished, less surely knew, natural subjects of importance incorporate the utilization of impersonation in higher creatures to learn new practices, and the physical interconnectivity showed by creepy crawlies, for example, ants to empower aggregate route over testing landscapes. One progress around there is introduced in the article in this issue entitled "Hormone-Inspired Adaptive Communication and Distributed control for CONRO Self-Reconfigurable Robots", by Shen, Salemi, and Will. This article analyzes both the physical interconnectivity of particular robots, and in addition organic motivations for how to keep up correspondence and cooperation in a distributed multi-robot organize.

III. COMMUNICATION

The issue of correspondence in multi-robot groups has been broadly considered since the origin of distributed robotics inquire about. Qualifications amongst understood and express communcation are normally made, in which verifiable correspondence happens as a reaction of different activities, or "through the world" (see, for instance [51]), while unequivocal correspondence is a particular demonstration planned exclusively to pass on data to different robots on the group. A few scientists have contemplated the impact of correspondence on the execution of multi-robot groups in an assortment of errands, and have presumed that correspondence gives certain advantage to specific kinds of assignments (e.g., [43], [16]). Furthermore, these specialists have discovered that, as a rule, correspondence of even a little measure of data can prompt extraordinary advantage (e.g., [16]).

Later work in multi-robot correspondence has concentrated on portrayals of dialects and the establishing of these portrayals in the physical world [35], [36]. Furthermore, work has reached out to accomplishing adaptation to internal failure in multi-robot correspondence, for example, setting up and keeping up distributed interchanges systems [68] and guaranteeing unwavering quality in multi-robot interchanges [48]. The test in these systems is to keep up correspondence notwithstanding when associations between robots may change progressively and surprisingly. This article exhibits one part of the current advance that is being made in empowering multi-robot groups to work dependably occasion in the midst of defective correspondence conditions.

IV. ARCHITECTURES, TASK ALLOCATION, AND CONTROL

A lot of research in distributed robotics has concentrated on the advancement of designs, assignment arranging abilities, and control. This examination zone tends to the issues of activity choice, appointment of expert and control, the correspondence structure, heterogeneity versus homogeneity of robots, accomplishing intelligibility in the midst of neighborhood activities, determination of contentions, and other related issues. Every design that has been created for multi-robot groups tends to center around giving a particular kind of ability to the distributed robot group. Abilities that have been of specific accentuation incorporate errand arranging [1], adaptation to internal failure [52], swarm control [45], human outline of mission designs [42], part task [62], [22], [50], et cetera.

The article entitled "Execution of a Distributed Robotic Systems Using Shared Communications Channels", by Rybski, Stoeter, Gini, Hougen, and Papanikolopoulos, presents a delicate product engineering for the control of an arrangement of small scale robots, called Scouts. The engineering for this framework is obliged by the restricted computational capacities of the smaller than normal robots, prompting an intermediary handling plan empowering robots to utilize remote PCs for their registering needs. They show a re-source distribution framework that powerfully relegates assets to every robot to expand the usage of assets while additionally keeping up given conduct needs. They show exploratory aftereffects of their approach utilizing their Scout robot group.

The engineering configuration challenge is additionally tended to in this uncommon issue in the article by Nakamura, Ota, and Arai, entitled "Human-Supervised Multiple Mobile Robot System". This article displays an adaptable summon and observing structure that empowers a human administrator to work with a group of portable robots. Four levels of control are characterized, including the robot control level, the gathering level, the protest control level, and the errand control level. The viability of their approach is outlined in a transportation assignment utilizing a few versatile robots.

Another article in this unique issue, entitled "Feeling Based Control of Cooperating Heterogeneous Mobile Robots", by Murphy, Lisetti, Irish, Tardif, and Gage, displays a cross breed deliberative/receptive design that uses a computational model of feelings to alter dynamic practices at the tactile engine level and change the arrangement of dynamic practices at the schematic level. The feeling based control empowers the group to exhibit the coveted societal conduct with no brought together arranging and with negligible correspondence. They outline their outcomes on physical robots working out in the open settings.

The errand assignment issue is likewise tended to in the article en-titled "Sold!: Market Methods for Multi-Robot Control", by Gerkey and Mataric. This article introduces an approach for dynamic undertaking allotment utilizing an asset driven transaction procedure to create a distributed estimate to a worldwide ideal of asset utilization. They introduce approvals of their approach in physical robot explores in protest pushing and in inexactly coupled undertaking choice. The engineering manages multiple assignments that must be refined continuously, in applications that comprise of a substantial number of undertakings in respect to the quantity of accessible robots. They exhibit an approach that includes two constant organizers: a need based errand task designer and a movement organizer. They show their approach in a cooperative transport undertaking in reproduction.

Vidal, Shakernia, Kim, Shim, and Sastry address multi-specialist control structures for groups of ground and airborne vehicles in their article entitled "Multi-Agent Probabilistic Pursuit-Evasion Games with Unmanned Ground and Aerial Vehicles". The objective of their examination is the reconciliation of multiple self-governing heterogeneous robots into an organized framework that is measured, versatile, blame tolerant, versatile, and proficient. They introduce a crossover progressive framework design that sections the control of every specialist into various layers of reflection. These layers of deliberation permit interoperability in heterogeneous robot groups. They outline the viability of this approach in an interest avoidance application.

The engineering, assignment portion, and control issue is tended to by the article entitled "CS Freiburg: Coordinating Robots for Successful Soccer Playing", by Weigel, Gutmann, Dietl, Kleiner, and Nebel. This article displays a multiagent coordination design to empower robot groups to play RoboCup soccer. They utilize part assignments and an activity determination module in light of stretched out conduct systems to empower robots to coordinate in this area. They exhibit consequences of their approach from their RoboCup soccer encounters.

V. LOCALIZATION, MAPPING, AND EXPLORATION

A broad measure of research has been completed in the zone of confinement, mapping, and investigation for single autonomous robots. Just reasonably as of late has a lot of this work been connected to multi-robot groups. All of the work has been gone for 2D conditions. At first, the greater part of this examination took a current calculation produced for single robot mapping, confinement, or investigation, and extended it to multiple robots. All the more as of late, analysts have grown new calculations that are in a general sense distributed. One case of this work is given in [31], which exploits multiple robots to enhance situating precision past what is conceivable with single robots. Another illustration is an article in this uncommon issue en-titled

"Distributed Multi-Robot Localization", by Roumeliotis and Bekey. This article exhibits a decentralized Kalman-channel based way to deal with empower a gathering of versatile robots to at the same time confine by detecting their partners and consolidating situating data from all the colleagues. They outline the viability of their approach through application on a group of three physical robots.

Similar to the case with single robot ways to deal with restriction, mapping, and investigation, explore into the multi-robot adaptation can be portrayed utilizing the natural classifications in view of the utilization of points of interest [25], examine coordinating [21], or potentially charts [56], and which utilize either go sensors, (for example, sonar or laser) or vision sensors. The article entitled "LOST: Localization-Space Trails for Robot Teams", by Vaughan, Stoy, Sukhatme, and Mataric, presents a calculation empowering a robot group to explore between spots of enthusiasm for an at first obscure condition by utilizing a trail of waypoint milestones. They outline that their approach adapts to aggregating odometry mistake, is powerful to the disappointment of individual robots, and focalizes to the best course found by any robot on the group.

VI. OBJECT TRANSPORT AND MANIPULATION

Empowering multiple robots to cooperatively convey, push, or control regular articles has been a long-standing, yet troublesome, objective of multi-robot systems. Numerous examination ventures have managed this subject zone; less of these undertakings have been shown on physical robot systems. This examination zone has various functional applications that make it exceptionally compelling for ponder.

Various minor departure from this undertaking region have been contemplated, including obliged and unconstrained movements, two-robot groups versus "swarm"- type groups, consistent versus resistant getting a handle on components, jumbled versus uncluttered conditions, worldwide framework models versus distributed models, et cetera. Maybe the most showed assignment including cooperative transport is the pushing of items by multi-robot groups [57], [60]. This errand appears to be innately less demanding than the convey assignment, in which multiple robots must grasp basic objects and explore to a goal in a planned manner [67], [37]. A novel type of multi-robot transportation that has been exhibited is the utilization of ropes wrapped around items to move them along wanted directions [27].

An article in this extraordinary issue, entitled "Cooperative Transport by Multiple Mobile Robots in Unknown Static Environments Associated with Real-time Task-Assignment", by Miyata, Ota, Arai, and Asama, investigates the cooperative transport undertaking by multiple versatile robots in an obscure static condition. Their approach empowers robot colleagues to uproot objects that are meddling with the vehicle undertaking, and to cooperatively push items to a goal. They delineate their outcomes both in recreation and utilizing a group of two physical robots.

VII. MOTION COORDINATION

Another mainstream theme of concentrate in multi-robot groups is that of movement coordination. Research topics in this space have been especially all around contemplated incorporate multi-robot way arranging [63], [41], [30], [69], activity control [55], arrangement age [2], and development keeping [13], [66]. The greater part of these issues are presently genuinely surely knew, in spite of the fact that exhibition of these procedures in physical multi-robot groups (instead of in reenactment) has been constrained. Later issues contemplated inside the movement coordination setting are target following [53], target seek [39], and multi-robot docking [47] practices. The movement coordination issue as way getting ready for multiple robots is tended to in this extraordinary issue by Saptharishi, Oliver, Diehl, Bhat, Dolan, Trebi Ollennu, and Khosla in the article entitled "Distributed Surveillance and Reconnaissance Using Multiple Autonomous ATVs: CyberScout". In this paper, an approach is introduced that performs way arranging by means of checkpoint and dynamic need task utilizing factual evaluations of nature's movement structure. Furthermore, they investigate the issue of vision-based observation to track multiple moving items in a jumbled scene. The aftereffects of their methodologies are represented utilizing an assortment of examinations.

Development control has been a prominent point of multi-robot systems for a long time. The article by Fredslund and Mataric in this exceptional issue, entitled "A General Algorithm for Robot Formation Using Local Sensing and Minimal Communication", addresses the issue of accomplishing development controls utilizing just nearby detecting and connection. Their key thought is to have every robot keep up another particular robot, called a companion, inside its field of view, at a coveted survey edge. They illustrate the capacity of this way to deal with create an assortment of developments, including jewel, triangle, sharpened stone, wwedge, and hexagon. Their outcomes are delineated through analyses on physical and reenacted robot groups.

VIII. RECONFIGURABLE

International Journal of Research
Available at https://edupediapublications.org/journals
e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 05 Issue 04
February 2018

ROBOTICS

Despite the fact that a portion of the soonest inquire about in distributed robotics concentrated on ideas for reconfigurable distributed systems [32], [18], generally little work has continued here until the most recent couple of years. Later work has brought about various genuine physical robot systems that can recon-figure. The inspiration of this work is to accomplish work from shape, permitting singular modules, or robots, to associate and re-interface in different approaches to produce a coveted shape to serve a required capacity. These systems have the hypothetical ability of indicating incredible vigor, flexibility, and even self-repair.

The greater part of the work around there includes indistinguishable modules with interconnection systems that permit either manual or programmed reconfiguration. These systems have been exhibited to frame into different route arrangements, including a moving track movement [70], a night crawler or snake movement [70], [24], and a bug or hexapod movement [70], [24]. A few systems utilize a shape write plan, with modules ready to interface in different approaches to frame frameworks or cross sections for particular capacities [19], [71], [58], [65].

Research here is still extremely youthful, and the vast majority of the systems created are not yet ready to perform past lab tests. While the capability of expansive quantities of robot modules has been exhibited in reenactment, it is as yet exceptional to have usage including more than twelve or so physical modules. The down to earth use of these systems is yet to be illustrated, despite the fact that advance is being made toward that path. Obviously, this is a rich zone for proceeding with progresses in multi-robot systems.

IX. Conclusion

Obviously since the beginning of the field of distributed independent versatile robotics under two decades prior, huge advance has been made on various vital issues. The field has a decent comprehension of the organic parallels that can be drawn, the utilization of correspondence in multi-robot groups, and the outline of models for multi-robot control. Significant advance has been made in multi-robot limitation/mapping/investigation, cooperative protest transport, and movement coordination. Late advance is starting to propel the regions of reconfigurable robotics and multi-robot learning. Obviously, these territories have not yet been completely considered.

X. Future Work

A few other research challenges still remain, including:

- How would we recognize and evaluate the crucial points of interest and qualities of multi-robot systems?
- How would we effortlessly empower people to control multi-robot groups?
- Would we be able to scale up to showings including more than twelve or so robots?
- Is detached activity acknowledgment in multi-robot groups conceivable?
- How might we empower physical multi-robot systems to work under hard ongoing requirements?
- How does the multifaceted nature of the assignment and of the earth influence the plan of multi-robot systems?

These and different issues in multi-robot participation should keep the examination group occupied for a long time to come.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Alami, S. Fleury, M. Herrb, F. Ingrand, and F. Robert. Multi-robot cooperation in the Martha project. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Mag- azine*, 1997.
[2] T. Arai, H. Ogata, and T. Suzuki. Collision avoidance among multiple robots using virtual impedance. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/RSJ Inter- national Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 479–485, 1989.
[3] R. C. Arkin. Integrating behavioral, perceptual, and world knowledge in reactive navigation. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 6:105–122, 1990.
[4] R. C. Arkin and G. A. Bekey (guest editors). Special issue on Robot Colonies. *Autonomous Robots*, 4(1):1–153, March 1997.
[5] M. Asada, R. D'Andrea, A. Birk, H. Kitano, and M. Veloso. Robotics in edutainment. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA-2000)*, pages 795–800, San Francisco, 2000.
[6] M. Asada, H. Kitano, I. Noda, and M. Veloso. RoboCup: Today and tomorrow – what we have learned. *Artificial Intelligence*, 110(2):193– 214, June 1999.
[7] M. Asada, E. Uchibe, and K. Hosoda. Cooperative behavior acquisi- tion for mobile robots in dynamically changing real worlds via vision- based reinforcement learning and development. *Artificial Intelligence*, 110(2):275–292, June 1999.
[8] H. Asama, editor. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Dis- tributed Autonomous Robotic Systems*, Wako, Saitama, Japan, September 1992.
[9] H. Asama, T. Arai, T. Fukuda, and T. Hasegawa, editors. *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems 6*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
[10] H. Asama, T. Fukuda, T. Arai, and I. Endo, editors. *Distributed Au- tonomous Robotic Systems*. Springer-Verlag, 1994.
[11] H. Asama, T. Fukuda, T. Arai, and I. Endo, editors. *Distributed Au- tonomous Robotic Systems 2*. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
[12] H. Asama, A. Matsumoto, and Y. Ishida. Design of an autonomous and distributed robot system: ACTRESS. In *Proceedings of*

IEEE/RSJ Inter- national Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, pages 283–290, Tsukuba, Japan, 1989.

[13] T. Balch and R. Arkin. Behavior-based formation control for multi-robot teams. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, December 1998.

[14] T. Balch and L. E. Parker (guest editors). Special issue on Heterogeneous Multi-Robot Systems. *Autonomous Robots*, 8(3):207–383, June 2000.

[15] T. Balch and L. E. Parker, editors. *Robot Teams: From Polymorphism to Diversity*. A K Peters, 2002.

[16] T. R. Balch and R. C. Arkin. Communication in reactive multiagent robotic systems. *Autonomous Robots*, 1(1):1–25, 1994.

[17] M. Benda, V. Jagannathan, and R. Dodhiawalla. On optimal coopera- tion of knowledge sources. Technical Report BCS-G2010-28, Boeing AI Center, August 1985.

[18] G. Beni. The concept of cellular robot. In *Proceedings of Third IEEE Symposium on Intelligent Control*, pages 57–61, Arlington, Virginia, 1988.

[19] H. Bojinov, A. Casal, and T. Hogg. Emergent structures in moduluar self- reconfigurable robots. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Confer- ence on Robotics and Automation*, pages 1734–1741, 2000.

[20] R. A. Brooks. A robust layered control system for a mobile robot. *IEEE Journal of Robotics and Automation*, RA-2(1):14–23, March 1986.

[21] W. Burgard, M. Moors, D. Fox, R. Simmons, and S. Thrun. Collabora- tive multi-robot exploration. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 476–481, 2000.

[22] C. Candea, H. Hu, L. Iocchi, D. Nardi, and M. Piaggio. Coordinating in multi-agent robocup teams. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 36(2- 3):67–86, August 2001.

[23] Y. Cao, A. Fukunaga, and A. Kahng. Cooperative Mobile Robotics: An- tecedents and Directions. *Autonomous Robots*, 4:1–23, 1997.

[24] A. Castano, R. Chokkalingam, and P. Will. Autonomous and self-sufficient CONRO modules for reconfigurable robots. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 155–164, 2000.

[25] G. Dedeoglu and G. Sukhatme. Landmark-based matching algorithm for cooperative mapping by autonomous robots. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Sys- tems (DARS 2000)*, pages 251–260, 2000.

[26] J. Deneubourg, S. Goss, G. Sandini, F. Ferrari, and P. Dario. Self-organizing collection and transport of objects in unpredictable environ- ments. In *Japan-U.S.A. Symposium on Flexible Automation*, pages 1093– 1098, Kyoto, Japan, 1990.

[27] B. Donald, L. Gariepy, and D. Rus. Distributed manipulation of multiple objects using ropes. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 450–457, 2000.

[28] A. Drogoul and J. Ferber. From Tom Thumb to the Dockers: Some exper- iments with foraging robots. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior*, pages 451–459, Hon- olulu, Hawaii, 1992.

[29] G. Dudek, M. Jenkin, E. Milios, and D. Wilkes. A taxonomy for multi- agent robotics. *Autonomous Robots*, 3:375–397, 1996.

[30] C. Ferrari, E. Pagello, J. Ota, and T. Arai. Multirobot motion coordination in space and time. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 25:219–229, 1998.

[31] D. Fox, W. Burgard, H. Kruppa, and S. Thrun. Collaborative multi-robot exploration. *Autonomous Robots*, 8(3):325–344, 2000.

[32] T. Fukuda and S. Nakagawa. A dynamically reconfigurable robotic sys- tem (concept of a system and optimal configurations). In *Proceedings of IECON*, pages 588–595, 1987.

[33] M. Hannebauer, J. Wendler, and E. Pagello, editors. *Balancing Reactivity and Social Deliberation in Multi-Agent Systems: From RoboCup to Real- World Applications*, volume LNAI No. 2103. Springer, 2001.

[34] T. Haynes and S. Sen. Evolving behavioral strategies in predators and prey. In Gerard Weiss and Sandip Sen, editors, *Adaptation and Learning in Multi-Agent Systems*, pages 113–126. Springer, 1986.

[35] L. Hugues. Collective grounded representations for robots. In *Pro- ceedings of Fifth International Conference on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 79–88, 2000.

[36] D. Jung and A. Zelinsky. Grounded symbolic communication between heterogeneous cooperating robots. *Autonomous Robots*, 8(3):269–292, July 2000.

[37] O. Khatib, K. Yokoi, K. Chang, D. Ruspini, R. Holmberg, and A. Casal. Vehicle/arm coordination and mobile manipulator decentralized cooper- ation. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 546–553, 1996.

[38] H. Kitano, editor. *RoboCup-97: Robot Soccer World Cup I*, volume Lec- ture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 1395. Springer, September 1998.

[39] S. M. LaValle, D. Lin, L. J. Guibas, J-C. Latombe, and R. Motwani. Find- ing an unpredictable target in a workspace with obstacles. In *Proceedings of the 1997 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA-97)*, pages 737–742, 1997.

[40] T. Leuth, editor. *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems 3*. Springer- Verlag, 1998.

[41] V. J. Lumelsky and K. R. Harinarayan. Decentralized motion planning for multiple mobile robots: The cocktail party model. *Autonomous Robots*, 4(1):121–136, 1997.

[42] D. MacKenzie, R. Arkin, and J. Cameron. Multiagent mission specifica- tion and execution. *Autonomous Robots*, 4(1):29–52, 1997.

[43] B. MacLennan. Synthetic ethology: An approach to the study of commu- nication. In *Proceedings of the 2nd interdisciplinary workshop on synthe- sis and simulation of living systems*, pages 631–658, 1991.

[44] M. J. Mataric. Designing emergent behaviors: From local interactions to collective intelligence. In J. Meyer, H. Roitblat, and S. Wilson, editors, *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior*, pages 432–441, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1992. MIT Press.

[45] M. J. Mataric. *Interaction and Intelligent Behavior*. PhD thesis, Mas- sachusetts Institute of Technology, 1994.

[46] D. McFarland. Towards robot cooperation. In D. Cliff, P. Husbands, J.-A. Meyer, and S. Wilson, editors, *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior*, pages 440–444. MIT Press, 1994.

[47] B. Minten, R. Murphy, J. Hyams, and M. Micire. A communication-free behavior for docking mobile robots. In *Proceedings of Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 357–367, 2000.

[48] P. Molnar and J. Starke. Communication fault tolerance in distributed robotic systems. In *Proceedings of Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 99–108, 2000.

[49] I. Noda, S. Suzuki, H. Matsubara, M. Asada, and H. Kitano. RoboCup-97: The first robot world cup soccer games and conferences. *AI Magazine*, 19(3):49–59, Fall 1998.

[50] E. Pagello, A. D'Angelo, C. Ferrari, R. Polesel, R. Rosati, and A. Sper- anzon. Emergent behaviors of a robot team performing cooperative tasks. *Advanced Robotics*, 2002 (to appear).

[51] E. Pagello, A. D'Angelo, F. Montesello, F. Garelli, and C. Ferrari. Coop- erative behaviors in multi-robot systems through implicit communication. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 29(1):65–77, 1999.

[52] L. E. Parker. ALLIANCE: An architecture for fault-tolerant multi-robot cooperation. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 14(2):220– 240, 1998.

[53] L. E. Parker and C. Touzet. Multi-robot learning in a cooperative observa- tion task. In *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems 4*, pages 391–401. Springer, 2000.

[54] L.E. Parker, G. Bekey, and J. Barhen, editors. *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems 4*. Springer-Verlag, 2002.

[55] S. Premvuti and S. Yuta. Consideration on the cooperation of multiple au- tonomous mobile robots. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Work- shop of Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages

e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 05 Issue 04
February 2018

59–63, Tsuchiura, Japan, 1990.

[56] I. Rekleitis, G. Dudek, and E. Milios. Graph-based exploration using multiple robots. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 241–250, 2000.

[57] D. Rus, B. Donald, and J. Jennings. Moving furniture with teams of au- tonomous robots. In *Proceedings of IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 235–242, 1995.

[58] D. Rus and M. Vona. A physical implementation of the self-reconfiguring crystalline robot. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 1726–1733, 2000.

[59] A. Schultz and L. E. Parker, editors. *Multi-Robot Systems: From Swarms to Intelligent Automata*. Kluwer, 2002.

[60] D. Stilwell and J. Bay. Toward the development of a material transport system using swarms of ant-like robots. In *Proceedings of IEEE Interna- tional Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 766–771, Atlanta, GA, 1993.

[61] P. Stone and M. Veloso. A layered approach to learning client behaviors in the robocup soccer server. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 12:165–188, 1998.

[62] P. Stone and M. Veloso. Task decomposition, dynamic role assignment, and low-bandwidth communication for real-time strategic teamwork. *Ar- tificial Intelligence*, 110(2):241–273, June 1999.

[63] P. Svestka and M. H. Overmars. Coordinated path planning for multiple robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 23(3):125–152, 1998.

[64] M. Tambe, M. Adibi, Y. Al-Onaizan, A. Erdem, G. A. Kaminka, S. Marsella, and I. Muslea. Building agent teams using an explicit team- work model and learning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 110(2):215–239, June 1999.

[65] C. Unsal and P. K. Khosla. Mechatronic design of a modular self-reconfiguring robotic system. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 1742–1747, 2000.

[66] P. K. C. Wang. Navigation strategies for multiple autonomous mobile robots. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/RSJ International Conference on In- telligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 486–493, 1989.

[67] Z. Wang, Y. Kimura, T. Takahashi, and E. Nakano. A control method of a multiple non-holonomic robot system for cooperative object transporta- tion. In *Proceedings of Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 447–456, 2000.

[68] A. Winfield. Distributed sensing and data collection via broken ad hoc wireless connected networks of mobile robots. In *Proceedings of Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 273–282, 2000.

[69] A. Yamashita, M. Fukuchi, J. Ota, T. Arai, and H. Asama. Motion plan- ning for cooperative transportation of a large object by multiple mobile robots in a 3D environment. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Con- ference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 3144–3151, 2000.

[70] M. Yim, D. G. Duff, and K. D. Roufas. Polybot: a modular reconfigurable robot. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 514–520, 2000.

[71] E. Yoshida, S. Murata, S. Kokaji, and K. Tomita dn H. Kurokawa. Micro self-reconfigurable robotic system using shape memory alloy. In *Proceed- ings of the Fifth International Symposium on Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems (DARS 2000)*, pages 145–154, 2000.

About Author

K. Vijay Kumar
Research Scholar
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Sri Satya Sai University of Technology and Medical Sciences
Bhopal MP (India)