Collision-free optimal motion planing algorithms

Cesar A. Ipanaque Zapata[†] ICMC-USP, Brasil and CINVESTAV-IPN, Mexico (Joint work with Jesús González).

Florida/November 02, 2019

[†]cesarzapata@usp.br

Outline

- 1. Motivation
- 2. Notations
- 3. Principal results: Topological complexity

4. Algorithms

On product of odd-dimensional spheres On product of 3-dimensional projective spaces On the configuration space $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ On the product $(\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)$ and $(\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)$



Figure: Asimo-http://robohub.org/morphological - computation - the -hidden - superpower - of - soft - bodied - robots/



Figure: $https: //www.drones.org/wp - content/uploads/Drones_vehicle_flight_aircraft_minimal_drone_flying_fly$



0

Figure: https: //www.lsec.icmc.usp.br/images/wireless20communication_fanet.png



Figure: *k* robots (Asimos).



We present optimal algorithms which can be used in designing practical systems controlling motion of many rigid bodies moving in space without collisions.

 C. A. I. Zapata and J. González, 'Multitasking collision-free motion planning algorithms in Euclidean spaces', arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03239 (2019).

- C. A. I. Zapata and J. González, 'Multitasking collision-free motion planning algorithms in Euclidean spaces', arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03239 (2019).
- T. Bajd, M. Mihelj, J. Lenarcic, A. Stanovnik and M. Munih, *'Robotics'*, International Series on Intelligent Systems, Control, and Automation: Science and Engineering, **43** (2010).

0 0



Consider a multi-robot system consisting of k mobile robots R_1, \ldots, R_k , which are rigid bodies and we consider them as compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^d ($d \ge 2$), moving in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d without collisions.

Consider a multi-robot system consisting of k mobile robots R_1, \ldots, R_k , which are rigid bodies and we consider them as compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^d ($d \ge 2$), moving in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d without collisions.

We will suppose that the diameters of all robots are equal to r > 0, i.e., diam $(R_i) = r > 0$, for any i = 1, ..., k.

0 0

Consider a multi-robot system consisting of k mobile robots R_1, \ldots, R_k , which are rigid bodies and we consider them as compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^d ($d \ge 2$), moving in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d without collisions.

We will suppose that the diameters of all robots are equal to r > 0, i.e., diam $(R_i) = r > 0$, for any i = 1, ..., k.

The orientation-position determines the pose of a rigid object. The orientation of the local frame of the object and the position of the object are respect to the world frame.



Recall that in general the *configuration space* or *state space* of a system S is defined as the space of all possible states of S.

Recall that in general the *configuration space* or *state space* of a system S is defined as the space of all possible states of S.

A more common task for mobile robots is to request them to navigate in an indoor environment, as shown in Figure above.

0 0

Recall that in general the *configuration space* or *state space* of a system S is defined as the space of all possible states of S.

A more common task for mobile robots is to request them to navigate in an indoor environment, as shown in Figure above.

In this work the task of each robot consists of the point that can be reached by the pose of the robot, that is, a robot might be asked to perform tasks such as arriving at a particular place with a particular orientation. Thus, the workspace of this *k* robots coincides with the configuration space $(SO(d))^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ and the work map is the identity map.

The configuration space to the multi-robot system is the product $(SO(d))^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$,

 $\{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k; p_1, \dots, p_k) \mid (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \in (SO(d))^k$ and $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)\}$

where $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k) = \{(p_1, \ldots, p_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k \mid || p_i - p_j || > 2r \text{ for } i \neq j\}$ is the configuration space of all possible arrangements of knonoverlapping disks of radius r in \mathbb{R}^d , equipped with subspace topology of the Cartesian power $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$. To give collision-free optimal algorithms we need to know the smallest possible number of regions of continuity for any collision-free motion planning algorithm, that is, the value of the *topological complexity* a la Farber $TC((SO(d))^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k))$.

Section 3

Principal results: Topological complexity

In this paper we compute the value of $TC((SO(d))^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k))$ for d = 2, 3.

Theorem (Principal theorem)

Let $k \geq 2$, we have

1. $TC((\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)) = 3k - 2.$

2. $TC((\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)) = 5k - 1.$

In this paper we compute the value of $TC((SO(d))^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k))$ for d = 2, 3.

Theorem (Principal theorem)

Let $k \geq 2$, we have

1. $\mathsf{TC}((\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)) = 3k - 2.$

2. $\mathsf{TC}((\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)) = 5k - 1.$

Furthermore, we present optimal tame motion planning algorithms in $(SO(d))^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ with 3k - 2 (for d = 2) and 5k - 1 (for d = 3) regions of continuity, respectively. These algorithms work for any $k \ge 2$ and they are easily implementable in practice.

0 0 0

In general, to get a motion planning algorithm in the product $X \times Y$ requires partitions of unity subordinate to covers from motion planning algorithms to X and Y, respectively (M. Farber, 2003). However, we will recall here (see M. Farber, 2004) a simple explicit construction of a tame motion planning algorithm in $X \times Y$ with TC(X) + TC(Y) - 1 domains of continuity, under an additional assumption. This of course suits best our implementation-oriented objectives.

Let $s := \{s_i : F_i \to PX\}_{i=1}^n$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Xand let $\sigma := \{\sigma_j : G_j \to PY\}_{j=1}^m$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Y. Assume that the motion planner s, satisfies the following condition:

Let $s := \{s_i : F_i \to PX\}_{i=1}^n$ be an optimal tame motion planner in X and let $\sigma := \{\sigma_j : G_j \to PY\}_{j=1}^m$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Y. Assume that the motion planner s, satisfies the following condition:

'*Topologically disjoint condition*'- the closure of each set F_i is contained in the union $F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_i$, in other words, it require that all sets of the form $F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_i$ be closed.

0 0

Let $s := \{s_i : F_i \to PX\}_{i=1}^n$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Xand let $\sigma := \{\sigma_j : G_j \to PY\}_{j=1}^m$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Y. Assume that the motion planner s, satisfies the following condition:

Topologically disjoint condition'- the closure of each set F_i is contained in the union $F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_i$, in other words, it require that all sets of the form $F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_i$ be closed.

Similarly, we will assume that σ is a tame motion planner in *Y* such that all sets of the form $G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_j$ are closed.

Let $s := \{s_i : F_i \to PX\}_{i=1}^n$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Xand let $\sigma := \{\sigma_j : G_j \to PY\}_{j=1}^m$ be an optimal tame motion planner in Y. Assume that the motion planner s, satisfies the following condition:

Topologically disjoint condition'- the closure of each set F_i is contained in the union $F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_i$, in other words, it require that all sets of the form $F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_i$ be closed.

Similarly, we will assume that σ is a tame motion planner in *Y* such that all sets of the form $G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_j$ are closed.

Then we will set

$$W_{\ell} = \bigsqcup_{i+j=\ell} F_i \times G_j, \ \ell = 2, \dots, n+m.$$

(1)

The sets W_{ℓ} are ENRs and form a partition of $(X \times X) \times (Y \times Y) = (X \times Y) \times (X \times Y)$. Our assumptions guarantee that each product $F_i \times G_j$ is closed in W_{ℓ} , where l = i + j. Since different products in the union 1 are disjoint, we see that the maps $s_i \times \sigma_j$, where $i + j = \ell$, determine a continuous motion planning strategy over each set W_{ℓ} .

The sets W_{ℓ} are ENRs and form a partition of $(X \times X) \times (Y \times Y) = (X \times Y) \times (X \times Y)$. Our assumptions guarantee that each product $F_i \times G_j$ is closed in W_{ℓ} , where l = i + j. Since different products in the union 1 are disjoint, we see that the maps $s_i \times \sigma_j$, where $i + j = \ell$, determine a continuous motion planning strategy over each set W_{ℓ} .

Furthermore, we note that the motion planner in $X \times Y$ as above also satisfies the 'Topologically disjoint condition', i.e., all sets of the form $W_2 \cup \cdots \cup W_\ell$ be closed.

Lemma (TC for products)

Let \mathbb{K} be a field and X and Y be any path-connected finite CW complexes. If $TC(X) = zcl_{\mathbb{K}}(X) + 1$ and $TC(Y) = zcl_{\mathbb{K}}(Y) + 1$, then

 $\mathsf{TC}(X \times Y) = \mathsf{TC}(X) + \mathsf{TC}(Y) - 1.$

Furthermore, $\mathsf{TC}(X \times Y) = zcl_{\mathbb{K}}(X \times Y) + 1$. In particular, for any $k \ge 2$, $\mathsf{TC}(X \times \cdots \times X) = k\mathsf{TC}(X) - (k-1)$.

k times

Spheres

By [M. Farber, 2003], we have

$$\mathsf{TC}(\mathbb{S}^n) = zcl_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(\mathbb{S}^n) + 1 = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{for } n \text{ odd;} \\ 3, & \text{for } n \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, it is easy to see $TC(\mathbb{RP}^3) = zcl_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(\mathbb{RP}^3) + 1 = 4$. Hence, we have the following statement.



Lemma (Homotopy type of $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$) For any r > 0 and $k \ge 2$, one has $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ and $F(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ are homotopy equivalent.

We recall that TC is a homotopy invariant, so by Lemma 4, it is sufficient to calculate the topological complexity $TC((SO(d))^k \times F(\mathbb{R}^d, k))$. By [M. Farber and S. Yuzvinsky, 2004], we have

$$\mathsf{TC}(F(\mathbb{R}^d, k)) = zcl_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(F(\mathbb{R}^d, k)) + 1 = \begin{cases} 2k - 2, & \text{if } d = 2; \\ 2k - 1, & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases}$$

Then by Lemmas 2 and 3 we obtain our principal theorem. \Box

Section 4 Algorithms 0 0 0 0 0 4. Algorithms 26/47

In this section, we present optimal tame motion planning algorithms in:

- (1) product of odd-dimensional spheres,
- (2) product of 3-dimensional real projective spaces,
- (3) the configuration space F_r(R^d, k). Here, the algorithms will be induce from the algorithms given by [C. A. I. Zapata and J. González, 2019],
- (4) the product $(\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)$ and $(\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)$.

All the algorithms are easily implementable in practice.

0 0

Let v denote a fixed unitary tangent vector field on S^m , say $v(x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_\ell, y_\ell) = (-y_1, x_1, \ldots, -y_\ell, x_\ell)$ with $m + 1 = 2\ell$.



Let v denote a fixed unitary tangent vector field on S^m , say $v(x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_\ell, y_\ell) = (-y_1, x_1, \ldots, -y_\ell, x_\ell)$ with $m + 1 = 2\ell$.

A tame motion planning algorithm to S^m is given by $s := \{s_i : U_i \to PS^m\}_{i=1}^2$, where

$$F_{1} = \{ (\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}) \in S^{m} \times S^{m} \mid \theta_{1} = -\theta_{2} \}, F_{2} = \{ (\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}) \in S^{m} \times S^{m} \mid \theta_{1} \neq -\theta_{2} \},$$

0 0

For all $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in F_1$,

$$s_1(\theta_1, \theta_2)(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-2t)\theta_1 + 2tv(\theta_1)}{\|(1-2t)\theta_1 + 2tv(\theta_1)\|}, & 0 \le t \le \frac{1}{2};\\ \frac{(2-2t)v(\theta_1) + (2t-1)\theta_2}{\|(2-2t)v(\theta_1) + (2t-1)\theta_2\|}, & \frac{1}{2} \le t \le 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$s_2(\theta_1, \theta_2)(t) = \frac{(1-t)\theta_1 + t\theta_2}{\parallel (1-t)\theta_1 + t\theta_2 \parallel} \text{ for all } (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in F_2.$$

We note that

$$F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset, \overline{F_1} = F_1 \text{ and } \overline{F_2} = S^m.$$

0 0 0 0 0

(2)

Let $k \ge 2$ and for each $\ell = k, ..., 2k$ define a tame optimal motion planning algorithm $\rho = \{\rho_{\ell} : W_{\ell} \to P(S^m)^k\}$ where

$$W_{\ell} = \bigsqcup_{i_1 + \dots + i_k = l} F_{i_1} \times \dots \times F_{i_k}.$$

We recall that the topological complexity $TC(\mathbb{R}P^3) = 4$ and for any $k \ge 2$, $TC(\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}P^3) = 3k + 1$.

k times

We recall that the topological complexity $TC(\mathbb{R}P^3) = 4$ and for any $k \ge 2$, $TC(\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}P^3) = 3k + 1$.

k times

Will give an optimal tame motion planning algorithm on $\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}P^3$ having 3k + 1 domains of continuity X_k, \ldots, X_{4k}

such that each X_{ℓ} satisfies the 'Topological disjoint condition', i.e., $\overline{X_{\ell}} \subset \bigcup_{j \leq \ell} X_j$.

For our purposes, using the idea from [M. Farber, 2004], we give an optimal tame motion planning algorithm on $\mathbb{R}P^3$ having 4 domains of continuity E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4 such that each E_i satisfies the 'Topological disjoint condition'.

Here we consider the real projective space $\mathbb{R}P^d = \frac{S^d}{x \sim -x}$ as the quotient space from S^d under the antipodal action.

Here we consider the real projective space $\mathbb{R}P^d = \frac{S^d}{x \sim -x}$ as the quotient space from S^d under the antipodal action.

Consider the open covering

 $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{d+1} = \mathbb{R}P^d,$

where for each $i = 1, ..., d+1, U_i = \{ [x_1, ..., x_{d+1}] \in \mathbb{R}P^d : x_i \neq 0 \}.$

Here we consider the real projective space $\mathbb{R}P^d = \frac{S^d}{x \sim -x}$ as the quotient space from S^d under the antipodal action.

Consider the open covering

 $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_{d+1} = \mathbb{R}P^d,$

where for each i = 1, ..., d+1, $U_i = \{ [x_1, ..., x_{d+1}] \in \mathbb{R}P^d : x_i \neq 0 \}.$

For each $i = 1, \dots, d+1$ define a map $\varphi_i : U_i \to \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\varphi_i[x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}] = \left(\frac{x_1}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_{i-1}}{x_i}, \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_{d+1}}{x_i}\right)$

One has φ_i is a homeomorphism, because it has a continuous inverse given by

$$\psi_i(x_1,\ldots,x_d) = \left[\frac{1}{\left(x_1^2 + \cdots + x_d^2 + 1\right)^{1/2}}(x_1,\ldots,x_{i-1},1,x_i,\ldots,x_d)\right].$$

Consider the linear homotopy $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ given by

H(x,t) = (1-t)x.

Consider the linear homotopy $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$H(x,t) = (1-t)x.$$

Now, for each i = 1, ..., d + 1, U_i is contractible. In fact, we can define the homotopy $H^i : U_i \times [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}P^d$ by

 $H^{i}([x_{1},\ldots,x_{d+1}],t)=\psi_{i}\left(H\left(\overline{\varphi_{i}[x_{1},\ldots,x_{d+1}],t)}\right).$

0 0 0

On the other hand, for each $i = 1, \ldots, d + 1$, set

$$f_i : \mathbb{R}P^d \to [0, 1], \ f_i([x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}]) = x_i^2.$$

On has f_i are well-defined smooth functions.

On the other hand, for each $i = 1, \ldots, d + 1$, set

$$f_i : \mathbb{R}P^d \to [0, 1], \ f_i([x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}]) = x_i^2.$$

On has f_i are well-defined smooth functions.

The support of f_i being the closure of U_i . Indeed the set $\{[x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}] \in \mathbb{R}P^d : f_i([x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}]) \neq 0\}$ is the subset U_i . Moreover, for any $[x] \in \mathbb{R}P^d$,

$$f_1[x] + \dots + f_{d+1}[x] = 1.$$

0 0

Let a subset $V_i \subset \mathbb{R}P^d$, where i = 1, ..., d + 1, be defined by the following system of inequalities

$$\begin{cases} f_j[x] < \frac{2j}{(d+1)(d+2)}, & \text{ for all } j < i, \\ f_i[x] \ge \frac{2i}{(d+1)(d+2)}. \end{cases}$$

Note that each $\frac{i}{(d+1)(d+2)}$ is a regular value of the function f_i , so each V_i is a manifold with boundary and hence an ENR.

0 0

Furthermore, one easily checks that:

- V_i is contained in U_i ; therefore, the homotopy $H^i: U_i \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}P^d$ restricts onto V_i and defines a homotopy H^i over V_i ;
- the sets V_i are pairwise disjoint, $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$;
- $\circ V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_{d+1} = \mathbb{R}P^d.$

• each V_i satisfies the 'Topological disjoint condition', i.e., $\overline{V_i} \subset \bigcup_{j \le i} V_j$.

0 0 0

Now, recall that $\mathbb{R}P^3$ is a Lie group under the quaternionic product

$$\begin{split} [x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4] \cdot [y_i, y_2, y_3, y_4] &= & [\langle x, (y_1, -y_2, -y_3, -y_4) \rangle, \\ && \langle x, (y_2, y_1, y_4, -y_3) \rangle, \\ && \langle x, (y_3, -y_4, y_1, y_2) \rangle, \\ && \langle x, (y_4, y_3, -y_2, y_1) \rangle], \end{split}$$

with unit [1, 0, 0, 0] and inverse (given by the quaternionic conjugation) $[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]^{-1} = [x_1, -x_2, -x_3, -x_4].$

For i = 1, 2, 3, 4 set

 $E_i = \{([x], [y]) \in \mathbb{R}P^3 \times \mathbb{R}P^3 : [x][y]^{-1} \in V_i\}.$

It is clear that $\overline{E}_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup E_4 = \mathbb{R}P^3 \times \mathbb{R}P^3$, the sets E_i are pairwise disjoint, each E_i is an ENR and each E_i satisfies the 'Topological disjoint condition'.

For i = 1, 2, 3, 4 set

 $E_i = \{([x], [y]) \in \mathbb{R}P^3 \times \mathbb{R}P^3 : [x][y]^{-1} \in V_i\}.$

It is clear that $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup E_4 = \mathbb{R}P^3 \times \mathbb{R}P^3$, the sets E_i are pairwise disjoint, each E_i is an ENR and each E_i satisfies the 'Topological disjoint condition'.

Then we may define $\sigma_i : E_i \to P(\mathbb{R}P^3)$ by the formula

 $\sigma_i([x], [y]) = H^i([x][y]^{-1}, t) \cdot [y].$

It is a continuous motion planning over E_i . Hence, $\sigma = \{s_i : E_i \to P(\mathbb{R}P^3)\}_{i=1}^4$ is an optimal tame motion planner on $\mathbb{R}P^3$ and each E_i satisfies $\overline{E_i} \subset \bigcup_{i \le i} E_i$.

0 0 0 0 0

(3)

Let $k \geq 2$ and for each $\ell = k, \ldots, 4k$ define

$$X_{\ell} = \bigsqcup_{i_1 + \dots + i_k = l} E_{i_1} \times \dots \times E_{i_k}$$

One has that each X_{ℓ} is an ENR and X_k, \dots, X_{4k} form a partition of $\left(\underbrace{\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}P^3}_{k \text{ times}}\right) \times \left(\underbrace{\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}P^3}_{k \text{ times}}\right).$

Let $k \geq 2$ and for each $\ell = k, \ldots, 4k$ define

$$X_{\ell} = \bigsqcup_{i_1 + \dots + i_k = l} E_{i_1} \times \dots \times E_{i_k}$$

One has that each X_{ℓ} is an ENR and X_k, \ldots, X_{4k} form a partition of $\left(\underbrace{\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}P^3}_{k \text{ times}}\right) \times \left(\underbrace{\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}P^3}_{k \text{ times}}\right).$

We have thus constructed a tame motion planning algorithm (say σ) in $\underbrace{\mathbb{R}P^3 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}P^3}_{k \text{ times}} \text{ having } 3k + 1 \text{ regions of continuity } X_k, \dots, X_{4k}.$ Furthermore, each X_ℓ satisfies $\overline{X_\ell} \subset \bigcup_{i \leq \ell} X_i.$

Algorithms on $F(\mathbb{R}^d,k)$ for any $d\geq 2$

Section

 $\Gamma: F(\mathbb{R}-Q_m,k) \times F(\mathbb{R}-Q_m,k) \to F(\mathbb{R}^d-Q_m,k), \ (C,C') \mapsto \Gamma^{C,C'}$

Algorithms on $F(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ for any $d \geq 2$

Section $\Gamma: F(\mathbb{R} - Q_m, k) \times F(\mathbb{R} - Q_m, k) \to F(\mathbb{R}^d - Q_m, k), \ (C, C') \mapsto \Gamma^{C, C'}$



Figure: Section over $F(\mathbb{R} - Q_r, k) \times F(\mathbb{R} - Q_r, k)$. Vertical arrows pointing upwards (downwards) describe the first (last) third of the path $\Gamma^{C,C'}$, whereas horizontal arrows describe the middle third of $\Gamma^{C,C'}$.



On the configuration space $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$

In this section we present a tame motion planning algorithm on $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ having 2k - 1 domains of continuity. The algorithm works for any r > 0, $d \ge 2$ and $k \ge 2$; this algorithm is optimal when d is odd.

On the configuration space $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d,k)$

In this section we present a tame motion planning algorithm on $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ having 2k - 1 domains of continuity. The algorithm works for any r > 0, $d \ge 2$ and $k \ge 2$; this algorithm is optimal when d is odd.

Note that the optimal tame motion planning algorithm $\omega = \{\omega_{\ell} : Y_{\ell} \to PF(\mathbb{R}^{d}, k)\}_{\ell=2}^{2k} \text{ in } F(\mathbb{R}^{d}, k) \text{ induces an optimal tame}$ motion planning algorithm in $F_{r}(\mathbb{R}^{d}, k)$, say $\hat{\omega} = \{\hat{\omega}_{\ell} : Z_{\ell} \to PF_{r}(\mathbb{R}^{d}, k)\}_{\ell=2}^{2k}, \text{ where each } Z_{\ell} \text{ is given by}$

 $Z_{\ell} = (i \times i)^{-1} (Y_{\ell})$

and each local motion planner $\hat{\omega}_{\ell}$ by

$$\hat{\omega}_{\ell}(p,q) = \begin{cases} \hat{H}_{3t}(p), & 0 \le t \le \frac{1}{3}; \\ \rho\left(\omega_{\ell}(p,q)(3t-1)\right), & \frac{1}{3} \le t \le \frac{2}{3}; \\ \hat{H}_{3-3t}(q), & \frac{2}{3} \le t \le 1. \end{cases}$$

0 0

On the configuration space $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d,k)$

Similarly, the optimal tame motion planning algorithm $\Omega = \{\Omega_{\ell} : M_{\ell} \to PF(\mathbb{R}^d, k)\}_{\ell=3}^{2k}$ in $F(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ (for *d* even) induces an optimal tame motion planning algorithm in $F_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)$ (for *d* even), say $\hat{\Omega} = \{\hat{\Omega}_{\ell} : N_{\ell} \to PF_r(\mathbb{R}^d, k)\}_{\ell=3}^{2k}$, where each N_{ℓ} is given by

 $N_{\ell} = \left(i \times i\right)^{-1} \left(M_{\ell}\right)$

and each local motion planner $\hat{\Omega}_{\ell}$ by

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\ell}(p,q) = \begin{cases} \hat{H}_{3t}(p), & 0 \le t \le \frac{1}{3}; \\ \rho\left(\Omega_{\ell}(p,q)(3t-1)\right), & \frac{1}{3} \le t \le \frac{2}{3}; \\ \hat{H}_{3-3t}(q), & \frac{2}{3} \le t \le 1. \end{cases}$$

4. Algorithms

0 0 0

On the product $(\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)$ and $(\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)$ The optimal tame motion planning algorithms in $(\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)$ and $(\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)$ are given, one more time, by the construction given assembling the algorithms above. 0 0 0 • 4. Algorithms 45/47 On the product $(\mathbb{S}^1)^k imes F_r(\mathbb{R}^2,k)$ and $(\mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^3)^k imes F_r(\mathbb{R}^3,k)$

The optimal tame motion planning algorithms in $(\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^2, k)$ and $(\mathbb{RP}^3)^k \times F_r(\mathbb{R}^3, k)$ are given, one more time, by the construction given assembling the algorithms above.

We note that the results and motion planning algorithms described in this work can also be extended to the case of higher topological complexity (in the sense of Rudyak) and obtain multitasking collision-free optimal motion planning algorithms for rigid bodies.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to acknowledge support for this research from grant#2018/23678-6 and grant2016/18714-8, São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP).

