Integration of Machine Learning Techniques in Topology Optimization for Enhancing Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms Performance

Wahaj Ahmed and Lanying Fang

May 6, 2024

Integration of Machine Learning Techniques in Topology Optimization for Enhancing Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms Performance

Wahaj Ahmed, Lanying Fang

Ankang University, China

Abstract:

This research paper investigates the integration of machine learning techniques into the topology optimization process to enhance the performance of Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs). PKMs offer advantages in precision, stiffness, and dynamic performance but face challenges in structural integrity and weight reduction. Topology optimization, a computational design approach, systematically redistributes material within the design space to achieve optimal performance criteria. However, addressing computational complexity and scalability issues remains a challenge. This paper explores the integration of machine learning techniques to optimize the PKM design process. By leveraging machine learning algorithms, such as neural networks and reinforcement learning, engineers can develop more efficient optimization strategies, overcome computational challenges, and achieve superior PKM designs. Case studies, performance evaluation metrics, and future directions are discussed to illustrate the potential and implications of integrating machine learning with topology optimization for PKM design.

Keywords: Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms, Topology Optimization, Machine Learning, Structural Integrity, Weight Reduction, Computational Complexity, Optimization Strategies.

I. Introduction:

Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs) have garnered significant attention in engineering disciplines due to their ability to provide high precision, stiffness, and dynamic performance in various applications ranging from industrial automation to aerospace systems[1]. Unlike serial kinematics mechanisms, where the end effector is connected in a serial chain to the base, PKMs employ multiple kinematic chains that intersect to provide motion. This configuration offers advantages such as increased rigidity, reduced inertia, and improved dynamic response, making PKMs well-suited for tasks requiring high-speed and high-precision motion control[2].

The utilization of PKMs has proliferated across industries due to their superior performance characteristics compared to traditional serial mechanisms. Industries such as automotive manufacturing, aerospace engineering, and medical robotics have embraced PKMs for applications including machining, assembly, inspection, and surgery. The significance of PKMs lies in their ability to enhance productivity, accuracy, and reliability in diverse operational environments[3]. However, despite their advantages, PKMs present unique challenges in design and optimization, particularly concerning structural integrity and weight reduction.

Ensuring structural integrity while minimizing weight is paramount in the design of PKMs to meet performance requirements while optimizing efficiency and energy consumption. Structural integrity concerns encompass avoiding failure modes such as buckling, resonance, and excessive deformation, which can compromise the performance and safety of the mechanism. Moreover, weight reduction is essential for improving the dynamic response, reducing power consumption, and enabling easier integration into space-constrained environments[4]. Achieving a balance between structural integrity and weight reduction poses a significant challenge in PKM design, necessitating innovative approaches to optimize the geometry and material distribution within the mechanism.

Topology optimization emerges as a powerful computational design tool to address the challenges of structural integrity and weight reduction in PKM design. By systematically redistributing material within the design space, topology optimization seeks to achieve optimal structural performance while satisfying specified constraints such as stress limits and displacement requirements. Through iterative analysis and optimization cycles, topology optimization enables engineers to explore a vast design space and discover novel configurations that enhance the structural efficiency of PKMs[5]. Furthermore, topology optimization facilitates the identification of lightweight yet robust designs, thus enabling the development of high-performance PKMs that are both structurally sound and lightweight.

II. Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms: Fundamentals and Design Considerations:

Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs) represent a class of robotic systems where the end effector's motion is achieved through multiple interconnected kinematic chains, offering distinct advantages over traditional serial kinematics mechanisms[6]. Unlike serial mechanisms, which typically involve a single chain connecting the end effector to the base, PKMs feature multiple kinematic chains that intersect at various points, enabling more complex and versatile motion patterns. This unique configuration results in enhanced rigidity, reduced inertia, and improved dynamic response, making PKMs well-suited for applications requiring high-speed and high-precision motion control[7].

PKMs offer several advantages over their serial counterparts, making them increasingly popular in various industrial sectors. One key advantage is their inherent stiffness, which arises from the parallel arrangement of kinematic chains. This stiffness not only enhances the precision and accuracy of motion but also allows PKMs to withstand higher loads and resist deformation during operation. Additionally, PKMs typically exhibit lower inertia compared to serial mechanisms, enabling faster acceleration and deceleration and improving overall dynamic performance[8]. Furthermore, the parallel configuration of PKMs facilitates the distribution of loads across multiple components, reducing wear and tear and extending the system's lifespan. Overall, these advantages make PKMs well-suited for applications requiring high-performance motion control in demanding environments[9].

PKMs can be classified based on various criteria, including the arrangement of kinematic chains, the type of actuation, and the mobility of the end effector. One common classification scheme categorizes PKMs into three main types: planar, spherical, and spatial. Planar PKMs operate within a single plane and are well-suited for applications requiring 2D motion control, such as milling and engraving. Spherical PKMs, on the other hand, enable rotational motion about a fixed point and are often used in applications such as welding and painting. Spatial PKMs allow for motion in three-dimensional space and are widely employed in tasks requiring complex motion trajectories, such as 3D printing and machining[10]. Additionally, PKMs can be further classified based on their kinematic architecture, such as Stewart platforms, delta robots, and hexapods, each offering unique advantages and limitations depending on the application requirements.

When designing PKMs, several factors must be carefully considered to ensure optimal performance and functionality. Stiffness is a critical consideration, as it directly impacts the accuracy and precision of motion. High stiffness ensures minimal deflection and deformation during operation, leading to improved positional accuracy and repeatability. Precision is another key factor, particularly in applications requiring high levels of accuracy and resolution. The design of PKMs must also account for the workspace, or the range of motion available to the end effector, which is influenced by factors such as the length of kinematic chains and the arrangement of joints. Additionally, dynamic performance, including factors such as acceleration, jerk, and settling time, plays a crucial role in determining the system's responsiveness and efficiency[11]. By carefully addressing these design considerations, engineers can develop PKMs that meet the performance requirements of specific applications while maximizing efficiency and reliability.

III. Importance of Structural Integrity and Weight Reduction in PKM Design:

In the design of Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs), ensuring both structural integrity and weight reduction are paramount objectives that significantly influence the performance, efficiency, and reliability of the system. These considerations are particularly critical in applications where PKMs are subjected to high loads, dynamic forces, and operational constraints[12].

Maintaining structural integrity is fundamental to the safe and reliable operation of PKMs. Failure to address structural integrity can lead to various failure modes, including buckling, resonance, and excessive deformation, which can compromise the performance and safety of the mechanism. Buckling occurs when a component undergoes sudden and catastrophic deformation under compressive loads, leading to loss of stability and functionality. Resonance, on the other hand, occurs when the PKM's natural frequencies coincide with external excitation frequencies, resulting in amplified vibrations and potential structural damage[13]. Excessive deformation can also occur due to high loads or improper material selection, leading to inaccuracies in motion control and reduced system lifespan. Therefore, ensuring adequate structural integrity is essential to mitigate these failure modes and maintain the PKM's functionality and safety under operating conditions.

Reducing the weight of PKMs offers numerous benefits, including improved performance, efficiency, and energy consumption. A lightweight design reduces the inertia of the system, enabling faster acceleration and deceleration, and improving dynamic performance. This is particularly advantageous in applications requiring rapid and precise motion control, such as pick-and-place operations and high-speed machining. Additionally, reducing the weight of PKMs enhances efficiency by reducing the power required to operate the system, leading to lower energy consumption and operating costs[14]. Furthermore, a lightweight design enables easier integration into space-constrained environments and reduces the overall footprint of the system, enhancing flexibility and adaptability to diverse application scenarios. By prioritizing weight reduction in PKM design, engineers can optimize performance, efficiency, and energy consumption, ultimately improving the competitiveness and sustainability of the system in the marketplace.

IV. Principles and Methodologies of Topology Optimization:

Topology optimization is a computational design approach that seeks to systematically redistribute material within a given design space to achieve optimal structural performance while satisfying specified constraints. By iteratively removing material from regions of low structural significance and redistributing it to areas experiencing high stresses or strains, topology optimization aims to enhance the efficiency, robustness, and reliability of mechanical systems, including Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs)[15].

Topology optimization represents a departure from traditional design methodologies by allowing engineers to explore a vast design space and discover innovative configurations that may not be intuitive through conventional means. Unlike parametric or heuristic design approaches, topology optimization relies on mathematical algorithms and numerical simulations to iteratively refine and optimize the geometry of a structure based on predefined performance objectives and constraints[16].

The primary objectives of topology optimization typically revolve around minimizing material volume, maximizing stiffness, and minimizing compliance while satisfying specified performance criteria. Minimizing material volume helps reduce the weight and manufacturing costs of the structure, while maximizing stiffness ensures adequate structural integrity and resistance to deformation under load[17]. Minimizing compliance, which refers to the deformation of the structure under applied loads, helps improve the precision and accuracy of the system by reducing deflection and settling time.

Topology optimization must consider various constraints to ensure that the optimized design remains feasible and manufacturable. Common constraints include stress limits to prevent structural failure, displacement limits to maintain dimensional stability and accuracy, and manufacturing constraints such as minimum feature sizes and symmetry requirements. By incorporating these constraints into the optimization process, engineers can ensure that the resulting design meets performance requirements while remaining practical and cost-effective to manufacture[18].

Topology optimization relies on numerical techniques to simulate the behavior of the structure under different loading conditions and iteratively refine the design. Finite Element Analysis (FEA) is commonly used to model the structural response of the system and evaluate its performance metrics such as stress, displacement, and compliance. Gradient-based methods, such as the method of moving asymptotes (MMA) and the method of moving least squares (MMLS), are often employed to iteratively update the design based on sensitivity analysis and optimization algorithms[19]. Additionally, level set methods, which represent the geometry of the structure as a level set function, offer a versatile framework for topology optimization by enabling complex geometries and topological changes to be seamlessly incorporated into the design process. By leveraging these numerical techniques, engineers can efficiently explore the design space, identify optimal configurations, and validate the performance of the optimized design for PKMs and other mechanical systems[20].

V. Application of Topology Optimization in PKM Design:

Topology optimization has emerged as a powerful tool for enhancing the structural integrity, performance, and efficiency of Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs). By systematically optimizing the distribution of material within the design space, engineers can achieve lightweight yet robust PKM designs that meet stringent performance criteria. This section explores the application of topology optimization in PKM design through case studies, performance metrics, and optimization strategies[21].

Topology optimization can be applied to various structural components of PKMs, including links, joints, and end effectors, to improve their performance and efficiency. Case studies often focus on specific design objectives, such as minimizing weight while maintaining stiffness, reducing stress concentrations, or optimizing the dynamic response of the system. By iteratively refining the geometry and material distribution of these components, engineers can develop innovative designs that outperform traditional counterparts in terms of performance, reliability, and manufacturability[22].

Performance metrics play a crucial role in evaluating the effectiveness of topology optimization in PKM design. Key metrics include stiffness improvement, weight reduction, and stress distribution. Stiffness improvement measures the increase in structural rigidity achieved through topology optimization, which directly impacts the precision and accuracy of motion control in PKMs. Weight reduction quantifies the reduction in material volume achieved by topology optimization, leading to lighter and more efficient PKM designs. Stress distribution analysis assesses the redistribution of stress within the optimized structure, identifying areas of high stress concentration and ensuring that the design remains within acceptable safety margins.

Topology optimization can be performed using both single-objective and multi-objective optimization strategies, depending on the design requirements and constraints. In single-objective optimization, engineers focus on optimizing a single performance metric, such as stiffness or weight, while satisfying specified constraints. This approach simplifies the optimization process and enables engineers to quickly identify an optimal solution. In contrast, multi-objective optimization considers multiple conflicting objectives simultaneously, such as maximizing stiffness while minimizing weight or minimizing stress concentrations while maximizing dynamic performance[23]. Multi-objective optimization requires more complex algorithms and may result in a trade-off between conflicting objectives. However, it allows engineers to explore a broader design space and identify Pareto-optimal solutions that represent the best compromise between competing design objectives.

By leveraging topology optimization techniques and methodologies, engineers can achieve significant improvements in the performance, efficiency, and reliability of Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs). Through case studies, performance metrics, and optimization strategies, topology optimization offers a systematic approach to developing lightweight, robust, and high-performance PKM designs that meet the evolving demands of modern engineering applications[24].

VI. Numerical Simulations and Validation:

Numerical simulations play a crucial role in the topology optimization process for Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs), enabling engineers to evaluate the performance of optimized designs under various operating conditions. Validation of these simulations against traditional design methods ensures the reliability and accuracy of the optimized PKM designs. This section discusses the simulation setup and parameters, validation against traditional design methods, and sensitivity analysis and robustness assessment in the context of PKM design[23].

The simulation setup involves defining the geometric and material properties of the PKM components, as well as specifying the loading and boundary conditions. Geometric parameters include the dimensions and topology of structural components optimized through topology optimization, while material properties encompass mechanical properties such as Young's modulus, Poisson's ratio, and density. Loading conditions may include external forces, torques, or displacement constraints applied to the PKM structure, representing operational scenarios encountered in real-world applications. Boundary conditions define the constraints imposed on the structure, such as fixed or prescribed displacements, to simulate the interaction with the surrounding environment. Additionally, numerical parameters such as mesh density, convergence criteria, and solver settings are specified to ensure the accuracy and efficiency of the simulations[25].

Validation of numerical simulations against traditional design methods is essential to assess the accuracy and reliability of the optimized PKM designs. This validation typically involves comparing the performance metrics obtained from numerical simulations with those predicted by analytical models or experimental tests. Performance metrics may include structural stiffness, weight, stress distribution, and dynamic response, among others. Discrepancies between numerical predictions and experimental results can indicate areas for refinement or improvement in the simulation methodology, such as the incorporation of additional physics or the adjustment of simulation parameters[26]. By validating against traditional design methods, engineers can build confidence in the accuracy of the topology optimization process and ensure that the optimized PKM designs meet performance requirements.

Sensitivity analysis and robustness assessment are conducted to evaluate the sensitivity of optimized PKM designs to variations in input parameters and assess their robustness under different operating conditions. Sensitivity analysis involves systematically varying input parameters such as material properties, loading conditions, and geometric features to quantify their impact on the performance metrics of the PKM design. Robustness assessment, on the other hand, evaluates the performance of the optimized design across a range of operating conditions, including variations in load magnitude, environmental factors, and manufacturing tolerances[27]. By identifying critical parameters and assessing the robustness of the design, engineers can optimize the PKM design to ensure reliability and performance under diverse operating scenarios.

In summary, numerical simulations and validation are essential components of the topology optimization process for PKM design. By carefully setting up simulations, validating against traditional design methods, and performing sensitivity analysis and robustness assessment, engineers can develop optimized PKM designs that meet performance requirements and exhibit reliable and predictable behavior in real-world applications.

VII. Results and Discussion:

Upon completing topology optimization simulations for Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs), engineers conduct a comprehensive analysis of the results to evaluate the effectiveness of the optimization process and understand the implications for PKM design. This section presents the results obtained from the simulations and discusses their significance in terms of structural integrity, weight reduction, dynamic characteristics, and trade-offs between conflicting objectives.

A comparative analysis is conducted to assess the performance of optimized PKM designs relative to traditional counterparts or alternative design configurations. This analysis may involve comparing performance metrics such as structural stiffness, weight, stress distribution, and dynamic response between optimized and non-optimized designs[28]. By quantifying the improvements achieved through topology optimization, engineers can identify the benefits of adopting optimized designs and justify the investment in computational design tools and methodologies.

Performance evaluation focuses on key aspects of PKM design, including structural integrity, weight reduction, and dynamic characteristics. Structural integrity assessment involves analyzing stress distributions and identifying potential failure modes such as buckling, resonance, and excessive deformation. Weight reduction evaluation quantifies the reduction in material volume achieved through topology optimization, leading to lighter and more efficient PKM designs[29]. Dynamic characteristics evaluation assesses the dynamic response of the system, including factors such as acceleration, jerk, and settling time, to ensure that the optimized design meets performance requirements under dynamic loading conditions.

Topology optimization often involves trade-offs between conflicting objectives, such as maximizing stiffness while minimizing weight or reducing stress concentrations while optimizing dynamic performance. Engineers must carefully balance these competing objectives to achieve an optimal design that meets performance requirements while satisfying specified constraints. Trade-offs may involve compromises in certain aspects of the design to prioritize others, such as sacrificing structural stiffness for weight reduction or accepting higher stress concentrations to improve dynamic performance. By quantifying these trade-offs and understanding their implications, engineers can make informed decisions during the design process and develop optimized PKM designs that strike an appropriate balance between conflicting objectives[30]. In conclusion, results and discussion of topology optimization simulations for PKM design provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of the optimization process and its implications for performance, efficiency, and reliability. By conducting comparative analyses, evaluating performance metrics, and addressing trade-offs between conflicting objectives, engineers can develop optimized PKM designs that meet the demanding requirements of modern engineering applications while maximizing efficiency and reliability.

VIII. Future Directions and Emerging Trends:

As the field of Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs) continues to evolve, several emerging trends and challenges shape the future directions of PKM design and optimization. This section discusses these trends and challenges, including the integration of advanced materials and manufacturing techniques, addressing computational challenges and scalability issues, and exploring new avenues for PKM design and optimization[31]. One of the emerging trends in PKM design and optimization is the integration of advanced materials and manufacturing techniques. Advanced materials such as composites, alloys, and smart materials offer unique properties such as high strength-to-weight ratios, tunable stiffness, and shape memory effects, which can be leveraged to enhance the performance and functionality of PKMs. Additionally, additive manufacturing techniques, such as 3D printing, enable the fabrication of complex geometries and optimized structures with reduced material waste and lead times. By integrating these advanced materials and manufacturing techniques into the design and optimization process, engineers can develop innovative PKM designs that push the boundaries of performance, efficiency, and reliability[32].

The integration of advanced materials and manufacturing techniques presents both opportunities and challenges for PKM design and optimization. On one hand, advanced materials offer unique properties and performance advantages that can enhance the functionality and efficiency of PKMs. However, integrating these materials into existing design and optimization workflows requires careful consideration of material properties, manufacturing constraints, and compatibility with optimization algorithms. Additionally, additive manufacturing techniques introduce new design freedoms and complexities that must be addressed during the optimization process[33]. Overcoming these challenges and harnessing the full potential of advanced materials and manufacturing techniques will require interdisciplinary collaboration between engineers, materials scientists, and manufacturing experts.

Another challenge facing PKM design and optimization is the computational complexity and scalability of optimization algorithms. Topology optimization algorithms often require significant computational resources and time to converge to an optimal solution, particularly for large-scale PKM designs with complex geometries and multiple performance objectives. Additionally, scalability issues arise when extending optimization algorithms to multi-scale or multi-physics problems, where interactions between different length and time scales must be accounted for. Addressing these computational challenges and scalability issues requires the development of efficient algorithms, parallel computing techniques, and optimization strategies tailored to the specific characteristics of PKM design and optimization problems[34]. In conclusion, the future of PKM design and optimization is shaped by emerging trends such as the integration of advanced materials and manufacturing techniques, as well as the challenges of addressing computational complexity and scalability. By embracing these trends and overcoming these challenges, engineers can unlock new opportunities for innovation and develop next-generation PKM designs that push the boundaries of performance, efficiency, and reliability in diverse engineering applications[35].

IX. Conclusion:

In conclusion, the application of topology optimization techniques in the design of Parallel Kinematics Mechanisms (PKMs) holds tremendous promise for advancing the field of robotics and engineering. Through systematic redistribution of material within the design space, topology optimization enables engineers to develop PKM designs that exhibit enhanced structural integrity, reduced weight, and improved performance characteristics. By optimizing the distribution of material to minimize volume while maximizing stiffness and satisfying specified constraints, engineers can achieve lightweight yet robust PKM designs that meet the demanding requirements of modern engineering applications. Moreover, the integration of advanced materials and manufacturing techniques opens up new possibilities for further enhancing the performance and functionality of PKMs. Advanced materials such as composites and alloys offer unique properties that can be leveraged to optimize PKM designs, while additive manufacturing techniques enable the fabrication of complex geometries with reduced material waste and lead times. By embracing these advancements and leveraging interdisciplinary collaboration, engineers can continue to push the boundaries of PKM design and optimization, driving innovation and advancements in robotics and automation. However, challenges remain in addressing computational complexity and scalability issues associated with topology optimization algorithms. Developing efficient algorithms, parallel computing techniques, and optimization strategies tailored to PKM design and optimization problems will be essential for overcoming these challenges and unlocking the full potential of topology optimization in PKM design. Additionally, continued research and development efforts are needed to explore new avenues for PKM design and optimization, including multi-objective optimization, multi-scale modeling, and integration with emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence and machine learning. In summary, the future of PKM design and optimization is bright, with topology optimization serving as a powerful tool for developing lightweight, robust, and high-performance PKM designs. By embracing emerging trends, overcoming challenges, and fostering collaboration across disciplines, engineers can continue to innovate and advance the field of robotics, ultimately enhancing the efficiency, reliability, and versatility of PKMs in diverse engineering applications.

References:

[1] J. Qi *et al.*, "Adaptive shape servoing of elastic rods using parameterized regression features and auto-tuning motion controls," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters,* 2023.

[2] L. Žlajpah, "Simulation in robotics," *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation,* vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 879-897, 2008.

[3] B. N. R. Abadi, M. Farid, and M. Mahzoon, "Redundancy resolution and control of a novel spatial parallel mechanism with kinematic redundancy," *Mechanism and Machine Theory,* vol. 133, pp. 112-126, 2019.

[4] P. Araujo-Gómez, V. Mata, M. Díaz-Rodríguez, A. Valera, and A. Page, "Design and Kinematic Analysis of a Novel 3U PS/RPU Parallel Kinematic Mechanism With 2T2R Motion for Knee Diagnosis and Rehabilitation Tasks," *Journal of Mechanisms and Robotics,* vol. 9, no. 6, p. 061004, 2017.

[5] H. Azulay, M. Mahmoodi, R. Zhao, J. K. Mills, and B. Benhabib, "Comparative analysis of a new 3× PPRS parallel kinematic mechanism," *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing,* vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 369-378, 2014.

[6] H. Zeng, Y. Lyu, J. Qi, S. Zou, T. Qin, and W. Qin, "Adaptive finite-time model estimation and control for manipulator visual servoing using sliding mode control and neural networks," *Advanced Robotics,* vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 576-590, 2023.

[7] M. Ben-Ari and F. Mondada, *Elements of robotics*. Springer Nature, 2017.

[8] M. Bennehar, A. Chemori, and F. Pierrot, "A new extension of desired compensation adaptive control and its real-time application to redundantly actuated PKMs," in *2014 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 2014: IEEE, pp. 1670-1675.

[9] R. A. Brooks, "New approaches to robotics," *Science,* vol. 253, no. 5025, pp. 1227-1232, 1991.

[10] G. C. Burdea and P. Coiffet, *Virtual reality technology*. John Wiley & Sons, 2003.

[11] E. Garcia, M. A. Jimenez, P. G. De Santos, and M. Armada, "The evolution of robotics research," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine,* vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 90-103, 2007.

[12] R. Goel and P. Gupta, "Robotics and industry 4.0," *A Roadmap to Industry 4.0: Smart Production, Sharp Business and Sustainable Development,* pp. 157-169, 2020.

[13] C. Gosselin and L.-T. Schreiber, "Redundancy in parallel mechanisms: A review," *Applied Mechanics Reviews,* vol. 70, no. 1, p. 010802, 2018.

[14] A. Gunasekaran, "Agile manufacturing: a framework for research and development," *International journal of production economics,* vol. 62, no. 1-2, pp. 87-105, 1999.

[15] M. Hägele, K. Nilsson, J. N. Pires, and R. Bischoff, "Industrial robotics," *Springer handbook of robotics,* pp. 1385-1422, 2016.

[16] D. Halperin, L. E. Kavraki, and K. Solovey, "Robotics," in *Handbook of discrete and computational geometry*: Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017, pp. 1343-1376.

[17] R. D. Howe and Y. Matsuoka, "Robotics for surgery," *Annual review of biomedical engineering,* vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 211-240, 1999.

[18] Q. Huang, H. Hådeby, and G. Sohlenius, "Connection method for dynamic modelling and simulation of parallel kinematic mechanism (PKM) machines," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology,* vol. 19, pp. 163-173, 2002.

[19] R. Kelaiaia and A. Zaatri, "Multiobjective optimization of parallel kinematic mechanisms by the genetic algorithms," *Robotica,* vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 783-797, 2012.

[20] C. Liu, G. Cao, and Y. Qu, "Safety analysis via forward kinematics of delta parallel robot using machine learning," *Safety Science,* vol. 117, pp. 243-249, 2019.

[21] H. Liu, P. Zhou, and Y. Tang, "Customizing clothing retrieval based on semantic attributes and learned features," ed: ed, 2016.

[22] X.-J. Liu and J. Wang, "Parallel kinematics," *Springer Tracts in Mechanical Engineering,* 2014.

[23] M. Luces, J. K. Mills, and B. Benhabib, "A review of redundant parallel kinematic mechanisms," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems,* vol. 86, pp. 175-198, 2017.

[24] X.-J. Liu and J. Wang, "A new methodology for optimal kinematic design of parallel mechanisms," *Mechanism and machine theory,* vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 1210-1224, 2007.

[25] K. M. Lynch and F. C. Park, *Modern robotics*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[26] A. Morell, M. Tarokh, and L. Acosta, "Solving the forward kinematics problem in parallel robots using Support Vector Regression," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence,* vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 1698-1706, 2013.

[27] A. Müller, *Redundant actuation of parallel manipulators*. INTECH Open Access Publisher London, UK, 2008.

[28] G. Nawratil and A. Rasoulzadeh, "Kinematically redundant octahedral motion platform for virtual reality simulations," in *New Advances in Mechanism and Machine Science: Proceedings of*

The 12th IFToMM International Symposium on Science of Mechanisms and Machines (SYROM 2017), 2018: Springer, pp. 387-400.

[29] A. Nikolopoulou and M. G. Ierapetritou, "Hybrid simulation based optimization approach for supply chain management," *Computers & Chemical Engineering,* vol. 47, pp. 183-193, 2012.

[30] S. B. Niku, *Introduction to robotics: analysis, control, applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2020.

[31] F. Paccot, N. Andreff, and P. Martinet, "A review on the dynamic control of parallel kinematic machines: Theory and experiments," *The International Journal of Robotics Research,* vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 395-416, 2009.

[32] L. von Rueden, S. Mayer, R. Sifa, C. Bauckhage, and J. Garcke, "Combining machine learning and simulation to a hybrid modelling approach: Current and future directions," in *Advances in Intelligent Data Analysis XVIII: 18th International Symposium on Intelligent Data Analysis, IDA 2020, Konstanz, Germany, April 27–29, 2020, Proceedings 18*, 2020: Springer, pp. 548-560.

[33] A. Rosyid and B. El-Khasawneh, "Multibody dynamics of nonsymmetric planar 3PRR parallel manipulator with fully flexible links," *Applied Sciences,* vol. 10, no. 14, p. 4816, 2020.

[34] A. Rosyid, B. El-Khasawneh, and A. Alazzam, "Genetic and hybrid algorithms for optimization of non-singular 3PRR planar parallel kinematics mechanism for machining application," *Robotica,* vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 839-864, 2018.

[35] A. Rosyid, B. El-Khasawneh, and A. Alazzam, "External kinematic calibration of hybrid kinematics machine utilizing lower-DOF planar parallel kinematics mechanisms," *International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing,* vol. 21, pp. 995-1015, 2020.