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Laparoscopic surgery, also known as minimally invasive surgery (MIS), changed the face of surgery in the 1990s. With these procedures, surgeons use long, slender tools which pass through several small incisions. Performing surgery in this fashion has shown many benefits including reduced pain and recovery times, lower costs, and less scarring post-recovery.

The use of surgical robotics has shown several key advantages over MIS techniques. Minimally invasive surgeries typically require unnatural movements, have limited visibility, greatly reduce dexterity, and provide little tactile feedback. Through robot kinematics and specialized sensors, surgical robots can resolve many of these limitations, especially in terms of creating intuitive controls that can be mastered quickly, without losing many of the benefits of MIS. Because of these properties and their relatively small size, surgical robots could be viable options for use during space flight emergencies.

This thesis presents the design and assembly of a parabolic flight payload to evaluate these robots in microgravity where the robot performance and the operator capability is unknown. The structure supports all required hardware and is compliant with all NASA requirements and guidelines for microgravity research. Through future experiments using the payload, completion metrics such as
experimental time-to-completion and robot positioning accuracy will be used to define the challenges with working in microgravity as well as propose possible solutions to create a surgical system for space.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Availability of effective and standard healthcare during a space flight is vital. As the duration of spaceflight increases, timely evacuation of a medically-compromised individual back to earth may not be possible. As such, many technological developments are necessary prior to any long-distance spaceflight. Among these technologies to be developed are surgical systems to perform major surgeries in microgravity.

For surgeries in a standard operating room, a transition from large, open incisions to smaller, less significant ones has occurred. Traditional open surgery offered surgeons excellent manipulation, visualization, and tactile feedback but was incredibly painful for the patient and required significant time to fully heal. Through these consequences of open surgery, minimally invasive techniques were perfected in the early 1990s. These surgical techniques offer significant benefits to the quality of care a patient receives including reduced pain, shorter hospital stays, less scarring, and even lower mortality rates [1-7]. Laparoscopy, the most well-known form of MIS in which several slender tools pass through small incisions in the abdomen, has become a routine technique to many surgeons [8]. In weightlessness, this technique would also have a great advantage over open surgery in the fact that minimal bodily fluids can escape the body cavity during operation. However, with these benefits come several consequences including unintuitive controls, the lack of depth perception, and the loss of any touch sensations.

Recently, robotic systems have been developed to mimic laparoscopic techniques but with software packages to improve the surgeons experience. The most well-known system is the da Vinci® Surgical System which has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for a variety of surgeries [9-11]. This system, however, is far too large to be flown on any near-term mission.
Previous research in the Advanced Surgical Technologies Laboratory at the University of Nebraska has demonstrated technologies that show a viable option for major surgery in microgravity. This group has developed several two-armed multi-degree-of-freedom robots [12-14]. These robots are completely inserted through an umbilical incision and have been shown to be successful in performing colectomies, cholecystectomies, and a hysterectomy [15]. It has been proposed to evaluate these robots in a microgravity environment (Figure 1.1) in preparation for further research in the area of surgical robots for space applications.

Figure 1.1. Miniature in vivo surgical robot as seen from experiment operator’s view
Presented in this thesis is the initial design of a parabolic flight payload to be flown aboard a modified 727, owned by Zero Gravity Corporation and contracted by NASA to evaluate the robot and operator performance in microgravity. Presented first is a background of current surgical technologies used on Earth as well as other methods that have been evaluated in microgravity. Next, the motivations for this microgravity experiment will be discussed. The design and development of the console will be described. Experimental procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of such robots and supporting systems will be listed. Lastly, future areas of improvement and research, for the payload as well as the robots, will be identified.
Chapter 2: Background

Section 2.1: Minimally Invasive Surgery

2.1.1 Standard Laparoscopic Surgery

Through the late 1980s and early 1990s, a transition from traditional open surgeries to laparoscopic procedures occurred [16, 17]. Initially, this technological breakthrough was limited to simple procedures such as cholecystectomies. However, through specialized training and improved tools this technology has become synonymous with minimally invasive surgery.

During a laparoscopic procedure, slender tools are introduced into the body cavity through several small incisions. During the operation, the body is insufflated with CO$_2$ to increase the volume of the body cavity. Because of the positive pressure, a specialized port called a trocar is used to seal the incision against pressure loss. Visualization is achieved through the use of a laparoscope. When laparoscopic methods are used, reductions in patient pain, recovery time, and infection rates have been realized [18] largely due to smaller incision size (5-10mm vs. 20 cm).

However, these advances come with several costs. Firstly, range of motion and dexterity are largely reduced because each tool must pass through a specific point in the abdominal wall. Additionally, the motion of the tool tip is opposite to that of the surgeon’s hands and scales differently with various insertion depths due to a fulcrum effect at the incision. Tactile sensation is largely eliminated and visualization, particularly in regards to depth perception, is reduced. Some of these disadvantages can be solved with sophisticated instrumentation such as the 3D Tipcam® (Karl Storz, Tuttlingen, Germany) or equipment using vibration to provide force information [19]. Devices such as these have been shown to reduce task completion time [20].
Many virtual reality (VR) training simulations are currently being developed to provide a better learning platform for MIS students as opposed to the traditional “see one, do one” apprenticeship model [21]. These simulations generate virtual renderings of the surgical environment and provide haptic feedback to mimic realistic sensations. They have been shown to increase the skills of a surgeon prior to actual surgery [22] and could be beneficial for training surgeons in dealing with microgravity [23].

2.1.2 Laparoendoscopic Single-Site Surgery

A more modern approach to minimally invasive surgery is that of Laparoendoscopic Single-Site Surgery (LESS), also known as single-port surgery. LESS is achieved through a single 2-3 cm umbilical incision through which curved tools [24] are inserted. These tools typically cross each other at the insertion to provide better angles of attack.

LESS has been shown to be feasible for cholecystectomies, appendectomies, splenectomies, nephrectomies, and colectomies [25, 26]. Delany [27] documented a reduction in the length of hospital stays from 4-6 days for an open colectomy to 1-2 days for a LESS procedure. LESS procedures are also branching out into other areas of medicine including urology [28] and gynecology [29, 30].

While performing surgery through a single incision with curved tools, triangulation, or the ability to approach a target from a desired angle, can be very difficult even for experienced surgeons. Additionally, many of the difficulties of laparoscopic surgery (visualization, scaling, mirrored movements, etc.) are present in LESS procedures as well. Specialized tools with articulating ends have helped alleviate some of these problems but much research and training is yet to come in this area of MIS.
Section 2.2: Robotic Surgery

2.2.1 Surgical Laparoscopic Surgery

As standard laparoscopic techniques progressed, researchers attempted to provide assistance to surgeons through the use of robotics. The first example was the Automated Endoscopic System for Optimal Positioning (AESOP) [31]. With AESOP, the surgeon was capable of controlling the endoscope with his voice.

Since then, the process of automating laparoscopic tools has led to many versions of robotic laparoscopic surgery systems which have the potential to provide intuitive control and high precision without sacrificing the benefits of MIS [32]. These systems can combine highly scaled movements with magnified views to perform surgeries that would otherwise be extremely difficult.

Figure 2.1. da Vinci® Surgical System
Currently, the *da Vinci®* Surgical System (Figure 2.1), developed by Intuitive Surgical, is the most advanced robotic system and is the only system approved by the FDA [33]. Competing platforms include Raven [34], CoBRASurge [35], MC²E [36], and MiroSurge [37]. These robots are smaller in size and cost significantly less but are less capable. Also, because these platforms are not FDA-approved, they are used mainly as research platforms to test a variety of new functionality including haptic feedback [38] and remote collaborative surgery [39].

### 2.2.2 Miniature *in vivo* Surgical Robots

In contrast to the robotic laparoscopic systems, *in vivo* surgical robots are fully inserted into the body cavity. Though the body cavity is insufflated with CO₂ to increase volume, the robots still must be very small. The robots can be either mobile or can be fixed relative to the operating table. An incision across the navel is a typical point of access similar to that of LESS surgeries.

The Advanced Surgical Technologies Laboratory at the University of Nebraska has demonstrated several versions of such robots. These robots consist of two multi-DOF arms with either a grasper or monopolar cautery at the tooltip [12, 13, 15]. They pass through a special trocar inserted into an umbilical incision (Figure 2.2). They are then fixed to the operating table. Once inside the body cavity, these robots have shown capability in performing surgery in all four quadrants of the body cavity [14]. It is these such robots that are proposed for minimally invasive surgery in space and will be evaluated through NASA’s Reduced Gravity Program.
Section 2.3: Surgery in Space

As space technologies have increased, the possibility for a long-term space flight has also increased. With long-term space flight comes the potential for medical emergencies requiring intervention. However, no system yet has been shown to be a viable option for surgery in space.

In the last decade, an attempt to transfer laparoscopic techniques to microgravity has been undertaken [42]. Panait [43] concluded that while task completion rates were reduced in microgravity, there is no barrier to effective laparoscopic surgery. Rafiq [44] studied microgravity effects of on fine motor control, determining that force control and movement accuracy were noticeably reduced. Lastly, Kirkpatrick [45] observed that visualization during MIS techniques in microgravity was actually improved due to bodily fluids and debris clinging to the abdominal wall through surface tension. One challenge of the MIS approach is that the operator must be sufficiently trained in order for the surgery to be successful. Given the difficulty of MIS in 1-g, virtual reality simulations of microgravity surgery have been proposed as training tools for astronauts who may not have had any prior experiences performing in weightlessness [23].

It has been proposed recently that robots developed at the University of Nebraska will be capable of performing surgery in weightlessness [46]. These robots have the advantage of an easier learning
curve. The kinematics of the robot take care of mismatched movements allowing the surgeon to concentrate on what he means to do instead of how he needs to move. Additionally, robots such as these are extremely small (under a kilogram in mass). Additionally, the operator of the robot can be seated and stabilized in an ergonomic and stable position away from the table instead of being required to be “leaning” over the operation.
Chapter 3: Motivation

Section 3.1: Overview

The performance of miniature in vivo robots needs to be evaluated in microgravity where several parameters of the robot as well as the operators will be studied. In analyzing the robot, accuracy studies will be the most influential. In standard gravity, any backlash in the robot will typically fall to a gravity-neutral position. In weightlessness, there is no forces to stabilize the joints and it may be realized that the tooltips will oscillate throughout the surgery. This can be solved by elastic compensation at the joints if these mechanics are realized through microgravity experiments.

In analyzing the operators, task completion percentages and completion times will be used to infer performance. In microgravity, it has been documented that fine motor control is reduced [44]. This effect has yet to be seen when controlling a haptic device which is capable of providing reaction force. Additionally, methods to stabilize the operator can be determined for subsequent flights.

Section 3.2: Experiments

Throughout the flight a series of experiments can be performed. The main experiment to evaluate performance will be that of a stretch-and-dissect procedure. The stretch-and-dissect experiment (Figure 3.1) challenges the operator to grab one side of a marked rubber band. Once a successful grasp is achieved, he will cut along the mark, separating the two halves. In subsequent attempts, the operator may grasp the free end of a previously cut rubber band to stretch it and make a second cut.

This experiment challenges the system in a variety of ways. Firstly, it tests the accuracy of grasping as well as cutting. In these attempts, depth perception may be challenging due to the two-dimensional vantage point. Other visual cues such as shadows may be required. Secondly, once the cut is made the elasticity of the rubber band will provide insight into the rigidity of each arm as
well as the stability of the motor controllers. Lastly, attempting to grasp a free floating object will be challenging through the requirements of very fine movements and accurate positioning. Any attempts without these aspects will fail at grasping free-floating objects.

The microgravity manipulation experiment (Figure 3.2) uses a standard laparoscopic training tool in microgravity. The challenge is to grab a foam sleeve, transfer the sleeve to the opposite hand, and place the sleeve on an unoccupied peg. This experiment also challenges the ability to make fine, deliberate movements while maintaining accurate positioning. Because this task requires a grasper on each hand, this task is incompatible with robots that have dual grappers.
Figure 3.2. JackBot above peg transfer [14]
Note: JackBot (JB1) was developed by Jack Mondry at the University of Nebraska in 2012.
Chapter 4: Parabolic Flight Payload Design

Section 4.1: Overview

The following section provides a basic description of the test equipment design requirements and guidelines that must be met for flight on NASA’s Reduced Gravity Aircraft. Compliance with these requirements is evaluated prior to flight at the Technical Readiness Review (TRR). Further details can be found in NASA documentation [47-50].

4.1.1 Structural Requirements

Structural integrity of all equipment flown aboard NASA’s Reduced Gravity Aircraft must be verified. Factors of Safety (FS) of 2.0 or greater shall be applied to all structural elements. Any standard method of analysis can be used to verify structures. Material yield strengths are to be used as the maximum allowable throughout all design calculations per the requirements of NASA.

All test equipment including fasteners, individual components, frames, full assemblies, and enclosures must be designed to withstand the following g-loads during take-off and landing.

- Forward: 9-g
- Aft: 3-g
- Down: 6-g
- Lateral: 2-g
- Up: 2-g

Experimental equipment must also consider in-flight load cases. During the parabolic flight, the equipment will experience g-load transitions from 0-g up to 2-g. Additionally, equipment must be capable of withstanding inadvertent contact loads from floating individuals.
Test equipment fastened to the floor using bolts must possess a frame or baseplate that matches the floor attachment grid in the aircraft test cabin. Floor attachment holes in the experiment base plate must be centered on a 20±0.05 inch square pattern with holes drilled using a recommended clearance hole. No more than four anchor points may be used per payload.

4.1.2 Electrical Requirements

Each experiment must have emergency shutdown capabilities. The preferred method is a single “kill switch” located in an easily accessible location. This “kill switch” must de-energize all components in the system to a safe state, including hardware powered by an auxiliary source or an Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS). This capability must be demonstrated at the TRR.

In the event of electrical power loss, all experiments must fail to a safe configuration. There will be a brief interruption of electrical power during engine startup and momentary interruptions of electrical power may occur during flight. Test equipment should incorporate protection devices such as a UPS to prevent data loss.

Experiments must provide an electrical cable to reach a power distribution panel. All power cords should be 20 feet in length and have a descriptive tag secured to the end stating the voltage and maximum current required. Internal cabling must be restrained and clamped and the payload must be grounded to prevent electrical shock. The experiment should be self-protected with an incorporated circuit breaker or other current-limiting devices.

4.1.3 Functional Requirements

To evaluate UNL’s in vivo surgical robotics, several functional requirements were determined. Equipment descriptions will be found in the following sections.

For the parabolic flight, two robot designs are to be tested – EricBot 2.0 (EB2.0) and EricBot 2.1 (EB2.1), both designed at the University of Nebraska by Eric Markvicka [51]. The robots should
be isolated from the rest of the payload 1) to prevent any inadvertent contact with the robots during microgravity and 2) to contain any small free-floating components that are either from the experiment or are debris from a mechanical failure. The chamber is to be easily accessible if an individual needed to move a component or swap an experiment.

During operation it is desired that two individuals are capable of controlling robots at the same time. This required four total haptic devices and two independent computer systems. It was decided to add a third system to assist the prior two during operation by monitoring diagnostic information and to assist troubleshooting potential problems. A KVM switch is used to provide mouse and keyboard support to all three systems from a single location. Live visual information was obviously required to view the robots. Two viewpoints were requested through which an HDMI matrix was used to manage the feeds. A schematic of data and connections similar to what is shown in the Figure 4.1 was used to select components and design the payload.

Figure 4.1. System Schematic
Section 4.2: Equipment Descriptions

4.2.1 Robots

Two robots versions of EricBot (EB) are to be flown. Each version is of approximately equivalent size and weight. They both incorporate distributed motor control systems for brushless motors; the bulk of this hardware was developed by Bartels [41]. Each joint requires a small printed circuit board (PCB) including a microcontroller, motor driver, and feedback method. Each PCB is directed by a master board located elsewhere. This master board receives commands from the Robot Operating System (ROS) (see Section 4.2.3), directs them to each respective joint PCB, or slave, collects joint statuses, and returns this global robot status back to the Robot Operating System.

From a mechanical standpoint, the two versions of Eric Bot, EB2.0 and EB2.1 are almost identical. The kinematic structures of each robot is identical and both are constructed from machined aluminum and plastic with stainless steel machine screws. EricBot 2.1 was designed with slightly larger motors in the body but arm motors are the same.

In terms of electronics, the robots are more dissimilar. Circuit boards between the two are different in layout. EB2.1 uses more advanced cabling techniques such as flexible PCBs and custom flexcables. Small and robust Gecko connectors were also used and all circuitry was exposed.

Figure 4.2. EricBot 2.0 (left) and EricBot 2.1 (right)
Note: EB2.0 is not shown with wiring between joints.
4.2.2 Robot Chamber

The robot chambers (Figure 4.3) are constructed with MakerBeam™ aluminum extrusions. These extrusions are similar to 80/20™ extrusions but are less than half the size. Joints are created through 90° stainless steel plates and special M3 screws that slide within the extrusion.

The chamber is sealed using 3mm clear polycarbonate panels that slide within the grooves of the extrusion. A hinged access door is available to insert and remove the robots and camcorders. Access holes are created where cable pass-throughs are necessary. With the exception of these cables, nothing will be able to enter or exit the chamber while the access panel is closed.

Robots, camcorders, and experiments are all supported by an 80/20™ extrusion that passes through the chamber to provide more rigidity. The only loads applied to the MakerBeam™ structure are those generated from chamber’s own weight.
4.2.3 Computers

The flight console will incorporate three identical 64-bit Ubuntu computers – two for robot operation and one for assistance and troubleshooting. A build table for these computers is shown in Table 4.1. All components are housed in 18 inch rack-mount computer cases (Figure 4.4) located towards the bottom of the payload to keep the center of gravity as low as possible. Each complete computer weighs 10 kg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>i7-4770k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherboard</td>
<td>ASRock</td>
<td>Z87 Extreme6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>G.SKILL</td>
<td>Ripjaws X Series 16 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>840 Pro Series 128GB SSD, RAID 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Supply</td>
<td>Antec</td>
<td>EarthWatts 380W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FireWire Card</td>
<td>BYTECC</td>
<td>BT-FW310LV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Norco</td>
<td>RPC-250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4. Rackmount Computer Case
All computers and robots communicate through the Robot Operating System (ROS). In this fashion, robots are not necessarily installed to a single machine but instead are installed to a collective pool of computing power. This provides versatility against hardware and/or software problems by allowing control of any robot through any computer at any time.

4.2.4 Monitors

The flight system will incorporate a total of five Dell 1703FP LCD Monitors (Figure 4.5). These 17 inch monitors weigh approximately four kilograms each and are rated for 55 watts of power. Each robot operator will have a pair – one for visual feedback to control the robot and a second to display live diagnostic information. The fifth monitor will be used by an assistant to help the operators with control, strategy, and troubleshooting mid-flight.

Monitors will be mounted to the payload with a custom plate (Figure 4.6) that adapts the 100mm VESA mounting pattern located on the back of the monitor to an 80/20™ compatible pattern.
4.2.5 Physical Input

To manipulate the arms of each robot, a total of four Phantom® Omni haptic devices are used – one for each arm of each operator. This 6-DOF physical input device captures the three-dimensional position and orientation of its stylus and provides 3-DOF haptic feedback in Cartesian coordinates to the operator's hand. The devices do not provide rotational haptic feedback. A pair of momentary switches on the pen provide additional input. These are assigned to open and close the surgical robot grasper.
The haptic functionality of the Phantom Omnis has been shown to be effective in constraining the user to the robot’s workspace [41]. Additionally, the movements of the operators can be scaled before being executed at the robot level. This can provide highly accurate positioning during the surgical procedure. Lastly, though not currently developed for either version of EricBot, software limits could be programmed in the future to prevent the arms from colliding with each other.

Because these devices are meant to rest on a tabletop, a custom mounting solution was required. Modifications to prior brackets were made to provide compatibility with 80/20™ extruded aluminum profiles. With brackets installed, each device weighs 2.5 kg and is secured with four ¼-20 countersunk steel screws.

A Logitech K400 wireless keyboard was installed to provide traditional keyboard-and-mouse input to the computers. The K400 keyboard was chosen for its integrated track pad. This feature eliminated the need for a traditional computer mouse which would have been required to be free during operation but stowed for safety reasons when not in use – an unnecessary procedure which would have likely been performed several times throughout the flight.

Figure 4.8. Logitech K400 Keyboard
Through an IOGear KVM (Figure 4.9), an assistant will be able to bring up the diagnostic information presented on other monitors and control any computer using the single keyboard described above.

The addition of a Monoprice HDMI matrix (Figure 4.9) allows all video feeds to be displayed on any monitor. This is switched by a technician through a simple button press. For any future flights, control of the matrix can be programmed into ROS through an RS485 connection.

![Image of KVM Switch and HDMI Matrix](image)

**Figure 4.9. KVM Switch (left) and HDMI Matrix (right)**

### 4.2.6 Video Capture

Five Panasonic HC-V110 digital camcorders (Figure 4.10) will be used to record footage of the experiment. Within the robot chamber, one camcorder will provide a downward view for each robot while a third and fourth will provide off-axis views to determine depth. Each camcorder will be supported by a ball socket camera bracket (see Figure 4.10). An additional camera will be placed outside the payload to capture in-flight footage of the crew.

![Image of Panasonic Camcorder and Universal Camera Bracket](image)

**Figure 4.10. Panasonic Camcorder (left) and Universal Camera Bracket (right)
Note: Images are not to scale**
4.2.7 Power Supplies

4.2.7.1 UPS

An Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) is used for all components. In this fashion, transition periods during transportation of the console or interruptions of power during flight will not cause the system to forcefully power down. Also, because all components pass through the UPS, its power button becomes a system kill-switch in the case of an emergency. Electrical specifications will be described in Section 4.4.

It is possible through an RS485 or USM connection between the UPS and the Robot Operating System to command the computers to perform some actions based on the status of the UPS. For example, if no input power is present and the UPS is at a low capacity, the computers can be automatically signaled to safely shut down. These features have yet to be programmed but could be easily implemented for future flights.

4.2.7.2 Robot Power

Three power supplies will be used for the robots. These include 12V and 9V supplies for motor power and a 5V supply for logic power. The 12V and 9V supplies are passed through an emergency stop located within reach of either operator. The logic supply is not to be interrupted. The power supply package that was chosen was that of a standard laptop charger (Figure 4.11). These supplies are completely sealed and are thus immune to damage due to from floating debris during microgravity.
4.2.8 Additional Equipment

Several additional components are required for operation. Firstly, a Belkin 12-Outlet Surge Protector (Figure 4.12) is used to expand the number of power outlets. This is located at the top of the structure near the monitors, haptic devices, and camcorders. All twelve outlets are used. A TRENDnet TEG-S50g gigabit network switch is used to network all computers together.

An accelerometer attached to an Arduino Uno is used to measure acceleration. This data stream is passed through USB into the assistant computer. Within the ROS network, this data is published
for other nodes to use if necessary. Additionally, this acceleration is time stamped to match that of robot diagnostics. From the Arduino UNO, an LED within the robot enclosure will illuminate during microgravity. This allows the ROS data to be synced with the video footage during post-analysis.

**Section 4.3: Structural Design and Verification**

4.3.1 Overview

In designing the structure (Figure 4.13), several factors had to be considered. First, the locations of monitors and haptic devices were placed at a comfortable height. This set the height of the payload to be 36 inches above the floor. The haptic devices are secured to the bases through ten #8 screws while the base is secured to a double wide 80/20™ beam through four ¼-20 screws. Monitors are secured to 80/20™ beams through ¼-20 screws and a custom monitor support bracket. The beams supporting the angled monitors can be adjusted to meet the needs of various operator heights. The power supply is mounted on its own beam located between these monitors as seen in Figure 4.12.

Through the dimensions of the robots and their workspaces, it was determined that eleven inches of chamber width was sufficient if the robots were orientated in the same direction as the operators. This is to say that the robots would face each other. As mentioned earlier, the cameras and robots are secured on an 80/20™ beam that passes through the chamber. This height of this beam is set three inches below the polycarbonate to provide clearance for the downward facing camcorders.
The width of the monitors, haptic devices, and robot chamber set the width of the entire payload to 50 inches. Because this is incompatible with the 20” x 20” repeating bolt pattern, it was decided that the depth must be compatible with the pattern while the location of the supports along the width of the payload would be adjustable. Custom floor supports (Figure 4.14) were machined from 7075-T6 aluminum. The mounting surface is ½ inch from the centerline of the floor bolt. Therefore, the depth of the payload must be 39 inches to match the aircraft’s bolt pattern. Structural simulation of the floor support is found in following sections.
Double 80/20™ beams were used to mount the computers for two reasons. Firstly, the additional strength is need as the computers are some of the heaviest components in the payload. Secondly, this slightly recesses the computers in the payload, reducing the chance of accidental contact with power buttons.

A diagonal beam was installed on each side to resist translational loads. As one will see in following sections, loads in this direction are most significant and these beams become integral to the rigidity of the payload. All other beams were designed to complete the structure through sufficient stiffness, strength, or mounting capability. Table 4.2 shows a summary of the payload, and an image of the assembled structure is shown in Figure 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2. Payload Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Loading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.15. Assembled Payload Structure
Note: The equipment installed on the structure is different than what is specified throughout this thesis. The structure, however, is identical and the casters are removed for the experiment
4.3.2 Assembly

During assembly, 4-hole gusset connectors were used wherever high loads were experienced. Where possible, additional 2-hole gussets and anchors were used to create a very rigid joint. Joint information is shown in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Number</th>
<th>X-Y Plane</th>
<th>X-Z Plane</th>
<th>Y-Z Plane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1x A, 1x DG</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2x 45P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1x DG</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1x 90P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2x 90P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1x DG</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1x DG</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td>1x A, 1x DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2x 45P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td>4x SG</td>
<td>2x SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2x SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1x SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a digital torque wrench, all fasteners were tightened to five ft-lbf per manufacturer specifications. This torque is claimed to be high enough to preload the T-nuts into the 80/20™ extrusions while preventing the screws from vibrating loose. Torques higher than this create the potential of weakened threads or tool damage. At a load beyond five ft-lbf, a ball hex socket broke within the head of a button cap screw. A hacksaw was required to remove the tightened screw – an unnecessary consequence of over-tightening.
4.3.3 Mechanical Properties of 80/20™ Aluminum Extrusions

Table 4.4. Acceptable Loading of 80/20™ Beams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam</th>
<th>Moment of Inertia (x 10^-9 m^4)</th>
<th>Allowable Moment (Nm) 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>174.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>329.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128.12</td>
<td>608.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Maximum Moment was determined by solving the standard bending stress equation for the moment required to generate 50% of the yield stress. From [57], the yield stress for 80/20™ extrusions is 241.3 MPa (35,000 psi).

Table 4.5. Acceptable Loading of 80/20™ Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load Condition 1</th>
<th>Anchor</th>
<th>90° Joining Plate</th>
<th>2 Hole Corner Gusset</th>
<th>4 Hole Corner Gusset 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Shear Force</td>
<td>1112 N</td>
<td>389 N</td>
<td>723 N</td>
<td>1446 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Bending Moment</td>
<td>70.7 Nm</td>
<td>14.2 Nm</td>
<td>62.2 Nm</td>
<td>124.4 Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Torsion</td>
<td>10.2 Nm</td>
<td>28.2 Nm</td>
<td>14.7 Nm</td>
<td>29.4 Nm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These are loads stress the connector to 50% of the load at which it would fail.
2 Not provided by 80/20™ Inc. Loads are assumed double capacity as 2 Hole Corner Gusset. This should be valid for shear force and torsion while conservative for bending stress.

4.3.4 Stress Calculation Methods

In order to evaluate the structural integrity of the payload, the structure was simulated using SolidWorks Simulation (Figure 4.17). Through this simulation, the mass of monitors, haptic devices, robot chambers, computers, the UPS are considered. The values used are shown in Table 4.6. Small components such as the keyboard, E-stops, power strips, and power supplies are not considered because their effect is negligible compared to the loads created by the larger components. Inertial loads of the 80/20™ structure are not considered.
Table 4.6. Component Weights Used for Structural Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Mass (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haptic Devices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robot Chamber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.17. SolidWorks Simulation

Through SolidWorks simulation, peaks stress locations were realized. At these locations, the complex three-dimensional assembly was reduced to simple, conservative two-dimensional structures such as simply-supported and cantilevered beams. Through traditional hand calculations, these conservatively simplified structures are used to prove structural integrity of the entire structure. The hand calculations of the simplified beams are found in the following sections.
When hand calculations are not possible, SolidWorks Simulation was solely required to verify the brackets used to support the monitors and the floor supports used to secure the entire chassis to the aircraft.

4.3.5 Load Cases

Five total load cases for the system are described – Forward, Downward, Lateral, Aft, and Upward. These are calculated by hand using conservative assumptions. The Upward and Aft load cases are not explicitly calculated because the Downward and Forward load cases, respectively, are similar in loading but are higher in magnitude. Because elasticity and strengths are assumed to be equivalent for both compressive and tensile loads, the resulting margins will be identical between a compressive load and an equal and parallel tensile load. Therefore, the Downward and Forward load cases, which have loads in the same direction but with higher magnitudes, will pass the Upward and Aft load cases by default. Table 4.7 shows a summary of the margins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Acceleration (g)</th>
<th>Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Supports</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Supports</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5.1 Forward

When installed in the aircraft, the forward direction is from the robot container towards the monitors or the positive-z direction as visualized in Figure 4.16. At 9-g this is the most challenging loading condition.

The computers and UPS are loaded onto two beams through the use of standard rack-mount hardware. In this direction, the computers press against the plate. By summing the moments and forces (Figure 4.18), the resultant loads are easily calculated at 600N and 1895N per beam. A bending moment of 331.5 Nm can also be calculated. Referring to Table 4.4, the margin on the strength of the beam can be calculated as seen below. Note that the acceptable moment listed in the table was determined with a safety factor of two. An additional safety factor in the calculation of the safety margin would be redundant and has been removed.

\[
\text{Margin} = \frac{608.6}{331.5} - 1 = 85\%
\]

[Diagram of mass and load location of computers and UPS]
With the beam passing structurally, the next likely failure point is at the bottom connector. In this particular location, it is assumed that the connector will fail when the T-nuts constraining the connector fail. From Figure 4.19, one can see that five bolts – two in the front and three on the backside – are resisting this load. For clarity, these are circled in red in this figure.

![Figure 4.19. Lower brackets of left computer column beam](image)

In order to determine the failure load of the T-nuts, the shear area of the threads is used. From a screw chart, \(\frac{3}{4}-20\) screws have a pitch diameter of 0.219” and a major diameter of 0.25”. Using the equation below, the shear area and ultimate fastener loads were calculated [52].

\[
A = \pi nLD \left( \frac{1}{2n} + 0.57735(D - E) \right)
\]

where \(E = \text{Pitch Diameter of Internal Thread}\)
\[
D = \text{Major Diameter of External Thread}
\]
\[
L = \text{Fastener Engagement}, n = \text{Threads per inch}
\]
\[
A = 0.09389 \text{ in}^2
\]
\[
F_{\text{ult}} = 0.0939 \text{ in}^2 \times 33000 \text{ psi} \times 0.577 = 1787.95 \text{ lbf} = 7.95 \text{ kN}
\]

When the bolts are preloaded to the specified 5 ft-lbf, a force of 3559 N (800 lbf) is achieved [53]. Subtracting this force from the ultimate load of the fasteners gives a working range of 4391 N. From this working range, the minimum number of equally distributed bolts required can be calculated below. For comparison, a margin is also calculated.

\[
n = \frac{4391N}{2 \times 1895N} = 1.15
\]

\[
\text{Margin} = \frac{7950N}{3559N + 2 \times \left(\frac{1895}{5}\right)} - 1 = 84\%
\]

Note that while all five bolts are not likely to carry the load equally, the margin is sufficient to assume structural stability.

During the 9g forward acceleration, the top of the structure will want to translate. With a total of 40.4 kg (monitors, haptic devices, and robot enclosures) at the top of the structure, a force of 1783.5 N per side is applied. When combined with the 600 N reaction from the computers and UPS, a total of 2383 N is experienced per side.

To determine structural integrity against translation, the diagonal 80/20™ beam is assumed to carry all of the load. Using basic statics, the compressive load in this beam will be 3370 N. To ensure that the beam will not buckle, Euler’s column buckling equation and the Rankine-Gordon function for medium length beams are used below [53].
\[ F_{Euler} = \frac{\pi^2 EI}{(KL)^2} \text{ where } K = 0.65 \text{ (fixed ends)} \]

\[ F_{Euler} = 24.98 \text{ kN} \]

\[ F_c = \text{Area} \ast \sigma_{yield} = 68.18 \text{ kN} \]

\[ F_{\text{max}} = \left( \frac{1}{F_{Euler}} + \frac{1}{F_c} \right)^{-1} = 18.28 \text{kN} \]

\[ \text{Margin} = \frac{18.28}{2 \ast 3.37} - 1 = 171\% \]

At the connectors, 3370 N is also experienced. Because 80/20™ connectors will slip at this load, additional measures are taken. A 45° plate uses two fasteners. As calculated previously, these fasteners create a preload force of 3559 N each. From the coefficient of friction between two anodized aluminum surfaces (0.17 from [55]), a friction force of 605 N is available per fastener. Even when using two plates with four fasteners total, this connection will slip.

To combat this, holes are drilled through the 80/20™ beams. This has the advantage of an increased preload (15702 N from [54]) as well as a constrained linkage through the plates and the beam where only limited movement is possible even if slippage occurs. Using the rated preload for a standard socket cap screw (15702 N) with a full-size hex nut at the four contact points (two holes per plate, one plate on each side)

\[ F_{\text{slip}} = 0.17 \ast 15702 \ast 4 = 10.68 \text{ kN} \]

\[ \text{Margin} = \frac{10.68}{2 \ast 3.37} - 1 = 58.5\% \]

In addition to this margin is the fact that all other connectors were neglected. It is likely that these connectors will carry some portion of these loads as well, further increasing the margin.
4.3.5.2 **Aft**

The calculations for this loading direction are the same as those used for the forward direction with the exception that the diagonal member is in tension instead of compression. Because the forward study passed, it can be safely assumed that the 3g study in the opposite direction passes as well.

4.3.5.3 **Downward**

Highlighted in blue in Figure 4.20 are the downward load areas of concern. The beam on the left is due to the complete load of the five monitors while the beam on the right is due to 50% of the weight of the computers and the UPS. Both of these loads cause bending in a 1” x 1” beam while most other loads are carried axially by vertical beams into a 2” x 1” 80/20™ beam.
In analyzing the effect from the monitors, it is assumed that the entire weight is carried down the two vertical columns into the lower beam. At 4kg per monitor in a 6-g environment, the total load in each vertical beam would be 588.6 N. The length of the horizontal beam is 940 mm while the spacing between the central axes of these columns is 533 mm. The equation for the peak moment within a simply supported beam with two symmetric loads is shown below [56].
Figure 4.21. Two Symmetrically Spaced Concentrated Loads

\[ M = P \times a, \text{ where } a = \text{distance from support to closest load} \]

\[ M = 588.6 \times 0.203 = 119.6 \text{ Nm} \]

Through Table 4.4,

\[ Margin = \frac{174.8}{119.6} - 1 = 46.2\% \]

Half of the weight of the computers and UPS is carried by the second beam to study (the other half is carried by the double beams to which support the fronts). In summation, the computers and UPS have a total mass of 56.6 kg and it is assumed that the weight of these computers will be applied to the beams at the corners of the cases. By this assumption, the previous equation can also be used.

\[ M = P \times a, \text{ where } a = \text{distance from support to closest load} \]

\[ M = \frac{50\% \times 56.6 \text{ kg} \times 9.81 \frac{m}{s^2} \times 6g's}{2} \times 0.203 \text{ m} = 169.24 \text{ Nm} \]

\[ Margin = \frac{174.8}{169.24} - 1 = 3.3\% \]
4.3.5.4 Upward

With the downward load passing sufficiently at 6-g, it can be assumed that the upward load case will also pass. Given that compressive and tensile elasticity and strengths are assumed equal, the margin will be greater than 200% for an upward acceleration of 2-g.

4.3.5.5 Lateral

From monitors, haptic devices, and the robot enclosure, a total of 40.4 kg of equipment is located at the top of the structure. At 2-g this corresponds to 792.6 N. If the top connectors are assumed to have no rigidity, the problem can be simplified to ten cantilevered beams (neglecting diagonal members) which are fixed through the bottom connectors. At six of these lower joints, double gussets directly prevent angular deflection while the computer column beams are strengthened by a total of four 90° joining plates. In the remaining two joints, single gussets are used. There also exists anchor connectors located at Joints 8 & 11. These, however, are not explicitly rated for moment loads in this direction and are thus ignored.

From the height of the equipment, a moment of 704.7 Nm is generated. The computers and the UPS would generate an additional moment of 230.3 Nm. Through Table 4.5, the summation of acceptable loads for six double gussets, two single gussets, and four 90° joining plates would be 925.2 Nm. The margin on these connectors loaded in this fashion is shown below.

\[
Margin = \frac{925.2}{704.7 + 230.3} - 1 = -1.0\%
\]

Though this margin is negative, it was determined in a very conservative fashion. If the top of the structure were also considered rigid against rotation at the connectors, the strength in each joint would theoretically go up by a factor of four. Because the structure is not fixed against translation and the loading in each beam would not be equal, the strength would not increase by nearly this
much. However, it would increase my some amount. Furthermore, anchor connectors and diagonal members were ignored. Through these points, it can be safely assumed that the connectors satisfy the required safety factor of two.

In analysis of the beams, each 1” x 1” member can carry a load of 174.8 Nm with the safety factor (Table 4.4). In these terms only 5.35 single wide beams would be required to carry this load if the load were distributed equally. In the designed payload, eight 1” x 1” beams and two 1” x 2” beams are used.

4.3.5.6 Floor Supports

The floor supports are milled from 7075-T6 aluminum. They accept four ¼-20 screws which are tightened into 80/20™ T-nuts within an extrusion. Four 3/8” hex cap bolts are then used to secure the supports to the floor.

During the forward 9g load condition, the highest forces are applied to the structure. Because the center of gravity of the payload is above the supports, the weight of the console will induce a moment load in addition to the shear load of the structure. These two loads are set independently in SolidWorks Simulation and their values can be calculated as follows.

\[
Shear = 1112 \, N \times 9g's = 10008 \, N = 2500 \, N \text{ per connector horizontally}
\]

\[
Moment = 10008 \, N \times 0.5 \, (CG \, Location) = 5000Nm = 2500Nm \text{ per side}
\]

\[
Moment - induced \, Force = \frac{2500Nm}{1.016 \, m} \approx 2500 \, N \text{ upward or downward}
\]

The results of this simulation are shown in Figure 4.22. During the simulation, the filleted edge shows stress that does not satisfy a safety factor of two. This is not likely realistic due to the simulated infinitely-rigid fixed surface nearby. Nevertheless, a margin is calculated below using
this value. It should be noted that only a small volume is stressed above the safety factor (Figure 4.23) and nothing will yield.

\[
Margin = \frac{505}{2 \times 326.2} - 1 = -22.6\%
\]

Figure 4.22. Stress Simulation of Floor Supports
4.3.5.7 Monitor Supports

To verify the structural integrity of the adapter plates, a remote load equivalent to 9-g (353.16 N) was applied three inches off the face of the plate to account for the center of gravity of the monitor. For the worst case, force was transferred directly to the mounting holes via the rigid purple lines seen in Figure 4.24. The plate was secured by fixing the mating surface of the plate. A 0.75” circle was used for each bolt/washer combination.
From the simulation a peak stress and corresponding moment were determined and are shown below. The stress distribution can be seen in Figure 4.25.

\[
\text{Max Stress} = 131.4 \text{ MPa}
\]

\[
\text{Margin} = \frac{275}{2 \times 131.4} - 1 = 4.64\%
\]

Figure 4.25. Stress Distribution for Monitor Supports
Section 4.4: Electrical Analysis

4.4.1 Load Analysis and UPS Selection

As mentioned previously, a UPS was desired to prevent power fluctuations during operation. A CyberPower OR1500LCDRM2U was chosen as it was capable of supplying electrical loads displayed in Table 4.8. At full load (15A), six minutes of capacity are available while 18 minutes are available at half load. This UPS model has an easily accessible power switch on the front and is rack mountable. An LCD display provides quick status information while RS485/USB output can provide smart shutdown procedures if implemented. While some of the loads in Table 4.8 were measured experimentally, several are specified at the rated input of the power supply which is unlikely to be seen during operation. The overestimate of these components will provide a noticeable margin on the load capacity of this UPS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Current (A)</th>
<th>Total Current (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phantom Omni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>4.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Switch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVM Switch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDMI Matrix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camcorder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12V Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9V Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
<td>1.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5V Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14.81</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Devices in Bold were experimentally measured using a Kill A Watt™ EZ electricity load meter at maximum conditions. Computers were run at 100% CPU for 5 minutes while current was measured. Monitors displayed a fully white screen. Camcorders were recording while charging. Values with an asterisk (*) were determined by the rated input of the power supply and will likely be much lower during operation.
4.4.2 Emergency Stops

Two emergency stops will be available to flight members. The first will be an E-stop to kill motor power to the robots. In this fashion, the software systems on both on the robot microcontrollers and on the three Linux computers will not be interrupted. Both robots will be disabled if pressed.

The second E-stop is provided through the power switch located on the front of the UPS. This switch will forcefully shut down all electronics. This will only be used in an extreme case. It should be noted that this does not de-energize the batteries in the UPS.
Chapter 5: Experimental Procedures

This section describes several procedures that must take place prior to, during, and after the microgravity experiment.

1. Ground Operations

While on the ground, casters are to be used for easy movement. These are simply installed with four bolts per wheel. Prior to installation in the aircraft, the casters must be removed. Lift points (Figure 5.1) must be installed at the corners of the assembly.

Figure 5.1. Lift point with handle
Because the payload exceeds 200lb, several components must be removed. These include the monitors and the UPS. The monitors are removed by unscrewing four M3 screws located on the back of each monitor. The UPS is removed through four #8 screws located on the front face of its enclosure. These components will be carried in individually and installed on the aircraft.

While on the ground, the experiment will be set up. This includes placing marked rubber bands in the respective experiment tray, ensuring the robots are fixed securely, and angling cameras to appropriate targets.

2. **Loading/Stowing**

The experiment will be loaded onto the aircraft by forklift if possible. Once on the plane, the structure will be moved into position by four individuals located at the four corners of the payload. The orientation shown in Figure 5.2 is the orientation used for all directional loading calculations. The experiment will be properly secured to the aircraft floor through the use of four 3/8” steel bolts. Monitors and the UPS will be reinstalled and connected and lift points will be removed. A power cable will be run to the power panel. An extension cord may or may not be necessary.

![Figure 5.2. Preferred aircraft orientation](image)

*Note: The box represents the 80/20™ frame, circles represent operators, and the triangle represents the off-payload camcorder.*
Because the stiffness of foam padding in the aircraft is unknown, the foot restraint bars (Figure 5.3) will need to be set to create sufficient downward pressure on the operator's feet to ensure stability. This is accomplished by loosening the ¼-20 screws, sliding the bar downward to the desired level, and then retightening the screws.

![Foot Restraint Bar (looking downward)](image)

**Figure 5.3. Foot Restraint Bar (looking downward)**

3. **Pre-Flight**

During pre-flight, ROS will be started and a system initialization will take place. This process will load the communication protocol for the haptic devices and robots and set each device to its proper variable in the system. Camcorders will be turned on but will not be set to record yet. A quick monitor check should take place to ensure each monitor is receiving video from the proper source.

4. **Take-off/Landing**

During take-off and landing, no operations are required.

5. **In-Flight**

Prior to experimentation, the robots must be activated. If stowed for take-off, experiments must be loaded into the robot enclosures. Camcorders must be set to record.
While experimenting, one flyer monitors the ROS network through the lower assistant computer. Two operators will be in charge of manipulating the haptic devices to maneuver the robots. These members will be stabilized via the foot straps installed at the base of the payload. The fourth and final flight member will monitor the experiments and the mechanical status of the robots. He may advise the operators throughout the experiments if necessary.

If at some point a crew member gets motion sickness or is injured, the experiment can be performed at full capacity with three people. The robot operator will take a dual role in this scenario. If a second member is incapable of assisting with the flight, both robots can be operated without assistance assuming that no troubleshooting is required.

6. **Post-Flight**

ROS information will be saved between parabolic flights but camcorders will not. Therefore, camcorders must stop recording and save data. The computers will be safely shut down. Once everything is off, the UPS master switch will cut power to everything it sources and the UPS will be unplugged from the aircraft.

7. **Off-Loading**

In preparation of unloading, monitors and the UPS will be removed from the structure and will be taken off the plane independently. Lift points will be reinstalled and the structure will be carried by four individuals to the exit. It will be removed from the aircraft via forklift. Casters will be reinstalled once the payload is on hard ground and the experiment will be rolled to the proper staging area.
Chapter 6: Summary

Minimally invasive techniques have shown great capability over the last decade. Through the use of laparoscopic instruments, the quality of health care has greatly improved for the patient at the cost of increased difficulty for the surgeon. Robotic surgical devices assist the surgeon by solving several challenges such as using unintuitive tools and working without tactile feedback or proper depth perception. Whether the device is similar to the da Vinci® Surgical System or to the miniature in vivo surgical robots developed by the University of Nebraska and mentioned throughout this thesis, robotic surgical systems can greatly improve the medical experience for both the patient and the surgeon.

Long-duration space flight will be attempted at some point in the future. Currently however, there are no viable options for major medical intervention in microgravity; applicants are thoroughly health screened to prevent complications during short missions but this method becomes much less effective for long-duration missions. Through minimally invasive techniques and intuitive controls, surgical robotics show great promise for operation in microgravity environments and should be further developed to do so.
Through NASA’s Reduced Gravity program, systems developed at the University of Nebraska will be evaluated in a microgravity environment. To carry the experiment, a parabolic flight payload has been developed and assembled (Figure 6.1) and is documented per the requirements of NASA’s Reduced Gravity Program [47-50]. The payload design and documentation required for this microgravity research is presented throughout this thesis.

The payload was flown on April 25th, 2014 (Figure 6.2). Two back-to-back flights were completed consisting of 28 zero-gravity parabolas each. Data from these flights is currently being compiled and analyzed to determine if a future flight is necessary. If so, the results of this flight will be very important in developing the second round of experimentation.
Section 6.1: Future Work

One factor that has inhibited the usability of the robots during in vivo testing in standard has been the method of insertion. Currently, the robots are manually inserted using a specialized two-chamber port that maintains insufflation. During this process, a specific series of movements are required to prevent the robot from contacting the organs as it is inserted.

One proposed solution is a gross positioning system with four DOFs about the insertion point – three rotations and one translation. This system would position the body of the robot during insertion prior to surgery, during surgery, and after surgery as the robot is removed. When added to robots with four-DOF arms, the total number of DOFs for the entire system approaches twelve. This creates a robot with six effective DOFs per arm without increasing the size of the in vivo portion of the robot. Though empirical analysis, this concept has been determined to provide a
sufficient range of tooltip orientations for any point within an equally sized workspace. This addition could greatly reduce the burden of any surgical assistants and would be beneficial in developing a viable system for surgical robots in space.
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Appendix A: 80/20™ Datasheets

80/20® Inc.
The Industrial Erector Set®
THE STANDARD

Simple Beam Deflection Calculations

Use the formulas listed below to find the worst case deflection for a beam:

**Formula A**

\[
\frac{L^3 \cdot W}{48 \cdot E \cdot I} = D
\]

This formula will yield worst case deflection for a beam supported at both ends with the load centered over the span.

**Formula B**

\[
\frac{5L^3 \cdot W}{384 \cdot E \cdot I} = D
\]

This formula will yield worst case deflection for a beam supported at both ends with the load evenly distributed over the span.

**Formula C**

\[
\frac{L^3 \cdot W}{3 \cdot E \cdot I} = D
\]

This formula will yield worst case deflection for a beam fastened at one end and cantilevered horizontally with the load applied at the end of the beam.

**Example Using Formula A:**

Using the 1515 T-slotted profile, a length of 30.0", and an applied force of 50 lbs., you should find the approximate beam deflection to be .011".

**Formula Reference:**

- **L** = Length in inches
- **W** = Load in Pounds
- **E** = Modulus of Elasticity (10,200,000)
- **I** = Moment of Inertia (see material specifications on pages 68-69)
- **D** = Deflection in Inches

**Fractional Profile Standards**

- Yield strength 35,000 lbs. /sq. in. minimum
- Tensile strength 38,000 lbs. /sq. in. minimum
- Elongation A5 minimum 10%
- Elongation A10 minimum 8%
- Elasticity E approximately 10,200 k lbs./sq.in.
- Rockwell hardness approximately E-88
- Extrusion conforming to DIN 17 615 specifications
- Twist per foot of length not to exceed .25 degree and total twist over 20 feet of length not to exceed 1.5 degrees
- Flatness .004° per inch of width
- Straightness 0.0125° per foot of length, not to exceed .120" over 20 feet of length
- Unless otherwise specified, all profiles will have etch and clear (MIL-A-8625F) anodizing with depth of .0004" and surface hardness of approximately 250 HV (anodized profiles should not be welded because of toxic fumes)

We specialize in same day shipments!
Torque Specifications

- See table below for the amount of torque in foot-lbs. required to activate the 2nd drop-lock feature for T-slotted profiles
- Nut and bolt combination is pre-loaded when tightened to the minimum torque rating
- When properly tightened, fasteners will not loosen even under heavy vibration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part Number</th>
<th>Fastener Description</th>
<th>Tested Profile</th>
<th>Minimum Ft-lbs. Torque</th>
<th>Maximum Ft-lbs. Torque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>5/16-18 x 11/16 Flanged BMSCS &amp; Economy T-Nut</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>5/16-18 x 3/4 Economy T-Slot Stud, Washer &amp; Hex Nut</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3360</td>
<td>15 Series Anchor Fastener Assembly</td>
<td>1515-Lite</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3360</td>
<td>15 Series End Fastener Assembly</td>
<td>1515-Lite</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3395</td>
<td>1/4-20 x 1/2 Flanged BMSCS &amp; Economy T-Nut</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3395</td>
<td>10 Series Anchor Fastener Assembly</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3391</td>
<td>10 Series End Fastener Assembly</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fastener Application Tests

1: Single Anchor  2: Double Anchor  3: End Fastener  4: Joining Plate  5: 90° Joining Plate  6: Corner Bracket  7: Corner Gusset

A: Direct Force  B: Cantilevered Force  C: Torsional Force

Horizontal Profile Dimension
10 Series = 5,000" 15 Series = 6,000"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fastener</th>
<th>1010 Profile</th>
<th>1515-Lite Profile</th>
<th>1515 Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (lbs)</td>
<td>B (lbs)</td>
<td>C (inch-lbs.)</td>
<td>A (lbs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Plates, brackets and gussets were attached with 80/20® recommended bolt kits. Fasteners were tightened according to 80/20® torque specifications found at the top of the page.

Test results reflect the connection failure point. Loads at or above these points are not recommended.
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### 1010 T-Slotted Profile - 10 Series

- Compatible with all 10 Series fasteners
- Four open T-slots for mounting accessories
- 1010 is ideal for machine guards, sound enclosures, work benches, displays and panel mount racks
- Compatibility Code*: 6-10

**Vibration Proof**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No.</th>
<th>1010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>6165-T5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td>Clear Anodized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Per Foot</td>
<td>.5927 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Length (+/- .125&quot;)</td>
<td>97&quot; - Part No. 1010-97 145&quot; - Part No. 1010-145 242&quot; - Part No. 1010-242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment Of Inertia</td>
<td>Iy=.0442&quot;^3  Iz=.0442&quot;^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Area</td>
<td>.4379 Sq. In.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quick Machining Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machining Service</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut to Length</td>
<td>7005 (see page 563)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.218&quot; Access Hole</td>
<td>7051 (see page 565)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Counterbore</td>
<td>7042 (see page 567)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap Profile End</td>
<td>7061 (see page 564)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pre-Cut Lengths

- 48" - Part No. 1010-48 72" - Part No. 1010-72
- Pre-cut, ready to ship
- Cut to our standard tolerance of +/- .015"
- One part number, one price (includes cut charge)

---

* See Compatibility Code Information on page 152.
** See 2" Drop-Lock Information on page 150.
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1020 T-Slotted Profile - 10 Series

- Compatible with most 10 Series fasteners
- Six open T-slots for mounting accessories
- The center cavity can be pressurized up to 150 psi; refer to pages 451-453
- Ideal for machine guards, sound enclosures, work benches, displays and panel mount racks
- Compatibility Code**: 6-10

**VIBRATION PROOF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No.</th>
<th>1020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>6063-T5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td>Clear Anodized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Per Foot</td>
<td>.9212 Lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Length (+/- .125&quot;)</td>
<td>97&quot; - Part No. 1029-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145&quot; - Part No. 1029-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242&quot; - Part No. 1029-242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment Of Inertia</td>
<td>(X = 3078&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Y = 903&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Area</td>
<td>.7414 Sq. in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick Machining Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machining Service</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut to Length</td>
<td>7000 (see page 563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.218&quot; Access Hole</td>
<td>7051 (see page 563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Counterbore</td>
<td>7042 (see page 567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Profile End</td>
<td>7045 (see page 564)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Cut Lengths

- Pre-cut, ready to ship
- Cut to our standard tolerance of +/- .015*
- One part number, one price (includes cut charge)

* See Compatibility Code information on page 150.
** See 2" Drop-Lock information on page 150.