

MASTER'S THESIS

LIDAR Based Cooperative Mapping for Multiple Robots with Efficient Rendezvous Point Detection

ZHANG, Xinyi

Date of Award:
2021

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent URL assigned to the publication

ABSTRACT

In the past few years, intelligent robot has been widely studied and applied in various fields, and has a broad development prospect. The problem of studying the robot's autonomous localization in an unknown environment and constructing a map of the environment is called SLAM(Simultaneous Localization and Mapping). Compared with single robot mapping, multi robots cooperative mapping can save running time, improve work efficiency, and increase the robustness of mapping. It has important research significance in SAR (Search and Rescue), military investigation, automatic chemical plant and other tasks which require accuracy and time constraints. In the problem of multi robots cooperative mapping, the key point is how to recognize the rendezvous signals efficiently and robustly from multiple robots and so that a globally consistent map can be constructed by matching and merging maps from individual robots. This paper studies this problem and proposes a novel solution.

More specifically, an online multi-robot cooperative mapping method based on LIDAR (Light Detection And Ranging) is studied. We explore rendezvous detection algorithms with and without GPS information respectively based on the fact that although GPS information can serve as a very straightforward initial indication of robot meeting each other, there are many occasions and scenarios where GPS information are non-reliable or simply unavailable. Point cloud data obtained from LIDAR sensor is the main focus of this work. Critical tasks in cooperative mapping such as robot odometry, place recognition, map matching and optimization are all done based on point cloud processing algorithms. We integrate the state of the art components as well as proposed new algorithms such as point cloud segment based rendezvous detection to facilitate robust and efficient cooperative mapping among robots. Extensive experiments are done to test the efficacy of the proposed system.

Keywords: LIDAR, SLAM, GPS, Cooperative Mapping

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	x
List of Symbols	xi
List of Abbreviation	xiii
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Related work	3
2.1 Single robot Mapping.....	3
2.2 Multi-robot Mapping.....	5
3 LIDAR based SLAM: Theory and implementation	6
3.1 Sensors.....	7
3.1.1 IMU	7
3.1.2 GPS	8
3.1.3 LIDAR.....	9
3.2 Front-end	14
3.2.1 Rigid transformation matrix.....	15
3.2.2 Parameter estimation of rigid transformation matrix	17
3.2.3 ICP algorithm	17
3.2.4 NDT algorithm	19
3.3 Loop closure detection	21
3.4 Optimization.....	23
3.5 Mapping.....	26

4	Cooperative Mapping with GPS.....	27
4.1	System Overview	27
4.2	Single robot mapping	29
4.2.1	Odometry.....	30
4.2.2	Mapping	32
4.3	Communication Model and Rendezvous Peer Detection.....	33
4.4	Coarse-to-fine matching.....	34
4.4.1	Feature extraction.....	35
4.4.2	Coarse Matching	38
4.4.3	Fine matching.....	39
4.5	Map Merging.....	40
4.6	Experimental Results.....	40
4.6.1	Scenario 1	41
4.6.2	Scenario 2.....	42
5	Cooperative mapping without GPS	45
5.1	System overview	45
5.2	Single robot mapping	46
5.3	Communication Model.....	47
5.4	Rendezvous point detection.....	47
5.4.1	Segmentation.....	48
5.4.2	Feature extraction.....	50
5.4.3	Segment matching.....	50
5.5	Optimization.....	53
5.6	Experimental Results.....	54
5.6.1	Scenario 1	55
5.6.2	Scenario 2.....	58
5.6.3	Scenario 3.....	68
5.6.4	Scenario 4.....	71
5.6.5	Comparison with other work.....	79
6	Conclusion and future work	81

6.1	Conclusion.....	81
6.2	Future work	81
	Appendix A	83
	Reference.....	86
	PUBLICATION.....	89
	CURRICULUM VITAE	90

List of Figures

Fig 3.1: Flow chart of SLAM.....	6
Fig 3.2: GPS consists of 24 satellites	8
Fig 3.3: LIDAR-16 Laser channels and vertical angles	10
Fig 3.4: LIDAR scanning cross-section line illustration. The cone is the scanning surface formed by a laser beam. The left figure shows the section line between conical surface and the surface of objects. The middle figure shows the section line when scanning floor. The right figure is generated when scanning a vertical wall.....	11
Fig 3.5: The section lines of the conical surfaces on x, z coordinates.....	11
Fig 3.6: LIDAR coordinate	12
Fig 3.7: LIDAR point clouds	13
Fig 3.8: components of a point cloud.....	13
Fig 3.9: 6DoF in different directions.....	16
Fig 3.10: Factor graph of SLAM.....	24
Fig 4.1: Block diagram of cooperative mapping with GPS	28
Fig 4.2: The process of cooperative mapping with GPS. (a)Robot A and Robot B start from different positions. Before they detect rendezvous, they broadcast GPS signals continuously. (b) They calculate the Eulerian distance from received GPS signals. When the distance is less than a threshold, a peer rendezvous is considered to be detected. (c) The pose transformation between peer points is calculated by the coarse-to-fine matching algorithm. (d) Using this pose transformation, the maps of the two robots are merged together	29
Fig 4.3: The coarse-to-fine matching algorithm.....	35
Fig 4.4: Influence area of PFH calculation of query point p_q	37
Fig 4.5: Coordinate system of p_1 and p_2	38
Fig 4.6: Smart robot platform.....	41
Fig 4.7: Area of Scenario 1.(a) The blue line represents the trajectory of A. (b) The red line represents the trajectory of B.	42
Fig 4.8: The merged global map of Scenario 1	42
Fig 4.9: Area of Scenario 2. (a) The blue line represents the single robot route. (b)The blue dotted line represents the trajectory of robot A and the red dotted line represents the trajectory of robot B.	43
Fig 4.10: Results of Scenario 2. (a) The result of single robot mapping. (b)The result of cooperative mapping.	43
Fig 5.1: Block diagram of cooperative mapping without GPS	46
Fig 5.2: Examples of segmentation [15]	48
Fig 5.3: A schematic diagram of the process of prefiltering a geometric consistency graph G . (a) the G before prefiltering. (b) G after pre filtration. [40]	52

Fig 5.4: Factor graph optimization. (a) The pose graph before optimization. (b) The pose graph after optimization.	54
Fig 5.5: EV patrol robot with RS-LIDAR-16	55
Fig 5.6: Scenario 1 environment: UIC campus	56
Fig 5.7: Result of cooperative mapping	57
Fig 5.8: Result of single robot mapping.....	59
Fig 5.9: A top view of the single robot’s map near the ending point. The part in the red circle shows the inconsistencies in the map.....	60
Fig 5.10: Comparison between the trajectory of single robot mapping and the ground truth of sequence 00. Where the dotted line represents the ground truth of sequence 00, and the blue solid line represents the result of single robot mapping.....	61
Fig 5.11: Mapping route of robot A	62
Fig 5.12: Mapping route of robot B	62
Fig 5.13: Results of cooperative mapping. The red line represents the trajectory of robot A and the blue line represents the trajectory of robot B.	63
Fig 5.14: Scenarios that matches are detected. Segments in the voxel grid are in colors and segments in the global map are white. Segment matches are connected by green lines.	64
Fig 5.15: Comparison between the trajectory of cooperative mapping and ground truth. The dotted line records the ground truth. And the blue and green solid line represent the trajectory A and B respectively.	65
Fig 5.16: Comparison of coordinates between cooperative mapping and ground truth. The horizontal ordinate is time t . The dotted line records the x, y, z coordinates of ground truth. And the blue and green solid line represent the coordinates of trajectory A and B respectively.....	66
Fig 5.17: APE of cooperative mapping is represented by different forms of charts	66
Fig 5.18: Coordinates of single robot mapping on the x, y, z axes. The dotted line records the x, y, z coordinates of ground truth. And the blue solid line represents the coordinates of the trajectory of the single robot.	67
Fig 5.19: Mapping route of robot A	69
Fig 5.20: Mapping route of robot B	69
Fig 5.21: Results of cooperative mapping.....	70
Fig 5.22: Comparison of coordinates between single robot mapping and ground truth on the x, y, z axes	70
Fig 5.23: APE is represented by different forms of charts	71
Fig 5.24: Result of single robot mapping.....	72
Fig 5.25: The single robot’s map from different perspectives.	73
Fig 5.26: Comparison between the trajectory of single robot mapping and the ground truth of sequence 05	74
Fig 5.27: Comparison of coordinates between single robot mapping and ground truth on the x, y, z axes	75
Fig 5.28: Mapping route of robot A	76

Fig 5.29: Mapping route of robot B	76
Fig 5.30: Results of cooperative mapping.....	77
Fig 5.31: Comparison between the trajectory of cooperative mapping and ground truth.....	77
Fig 5.32: Comparison of coordinates changes with time between cooperative mapping and ground truth on the x, y, z axes	78
Fig 5.33: APE is represented by different forms of charts	78
Fig 5.34: Framework of Multi-Segmatch [22].....	79
Fig 5.35: Mapping result of Multi-Segmatch.....	80

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Time consumption and mapping length deviation	44
Table 5.1: Parameters in Scenario 1	57
Table 5.2: Time in each module	57
Table 5.3: Various parameters of APE(m).....	67
Table 5.4: Various parameters of APE(m).....	71
Table 5.5: Various parameters of APE(m).....	78
Table 5.6: Comparison with Multi-Segmatch	80