



**An Improved Mobile Robot Based  
Gas Source Localization with  
Temperature and Humidity Compensation  
via SLAM and Gas Distribution Mapping**

by

**Kamarulzaman Bin Kamarudin**

**(1140610652)**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

**School of Mechatronics Engineering  
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

**2016**

## THESIS DECLARATION

©This item is protected by original copyright

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praises be to Allah for guiding and giving me strength to complete this challenging yet exciting PhD research.

I would like to express my greatest thanks to the Vice Chancellor of UniMAP for granting me permission to study in this university. Also, my appreciation goes to the Dean of School of Mechatronic Engineering for providing support and facilities for the project's implementation.

My deepest gratitude is dedicated to my supervisor, Prof. Dato' Dr. Ali Yeon Md Shakaff for the outstanding guides, ideas, support and financial aids throughout my research progress. Without his contributions, I will not be able to complete this PhD research. Not to forget all CEASTech members especially Dr. Ammar, Dr. Latifah Munirah, Syed Muhammad Mamduh, Retnam Visvanathan and Ahmad Shakaff for the helpful discussions on the knowledge, investigations and experiments. I am also indebted to individuals in Orebro University, Sweden, especially Dr. Victor Hernandez Bennetts for sharing ideas and expertise through Skype and emails.

Special thanks to UniMAP and the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia for the financial sponsorship under the Academic Staff Training Scheme (SLAB).

I would also like to express highest appreciations to my family and my in-laws who always by my side during the thick and thin of my studies. I am really grateful for the prayers and encouragements by my father, Kamarudin Hussin and mother, Noridah Yangman. They have been providing continuous support and love throughout my life.

Sincere gratitude is devoted to my wife, Nurul Nadiah Idris who has been my true companion all the time. Her unconditional love, support and understanding have

been driving me towards the goals. Not to forget my daughter, Dhia Alisya and Afif Fayyad, they keep my life with laughter and happiness.

Special thanks to everyone who directly or indirectly involve in this research. I wish that the content of this thesis could benefit the readers and contribute to the body of knowledge.

©This item is protected by original copyright

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>THESIS DECLARATION</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>XVII</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>XIX</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>XX</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Problem Statement	2
1.3 Objectives	3
1.4 Scope	4
1.5 Thesis Structure	5
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND OVERALL METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Literature Review	7
2.2.1 Gas Dispersal in Uncontrolled Environment	7
2.2.2 Gas Sensor Technology	8
2.2.3 Indoor Robot Navigation and Mapping	14
2.2.4 Gas Source Localization	20

2.2.5	Gas Distribution Mapping (GDM)	25
2.3	Research Gaps	28
2.4	Overall Methodology	31
2.5	Summary	33
<b>CHAPTER 3: HARDWARE AND SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE</b>		<b>34</b>
3.1	Introduction	34
3.2	Mobile Robot Olfaction System	35
3.2.1	System Architecture	35
3.2.2	Kinect 3D depth sensor vs Laser Scanners	42
3.2.3	Devices Synchronisation	44
3.3	Gas Sensor Characterization (GSC) System	46
3.3.1	GSC System Architecture	47
3.3.2	Software Design	49
3.3.3	Recipes Setting	49
3.3.4	Gas Chamber Design	51
3.3.5	Results	52
3.4	Summary	59
<b>CHAPTER 4: IMPROVEMENT AND SELECTION OF SLAM METHOD FOR GDM</b>		<b>61</b>
4.1	Introduction	61
4.2	Methodology	62
4.2.1	Kinect's 3D Depth Data to 2D Obstacle Locations	62
4.2.2	Wheel Odometry	66
4.2.3	Raw Mapping	70

4.2.4	2D Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM)	71
4.2.5	Merging Kinect's 2D Obstacle Locations and Laser Scan	75
4.3	Experimental Results and Discussions	77
4.3.1	Kinect based SLAM	77
4.3.2	2D SLAM with Kinect & Laser Scan	91
4.4	Summary	103
<b>CHAPTER 5: REAL-TIME SLAM AND GDM</b>		<b>106</b>
5.1	Introduction	106
5.2	Methodology	109
5.2.1	Kernel DM+V	109
5.2.2	Real time SLAM-GDM: Integrating Hector SLAM and Kernel DM+V	111
5.2.3	Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V	113
5.3	Experimental Results	117
5.3.1	Preliminary Mobile Gas Sensing Experiment	118
5.3.2	Real-time SLAM-GDM Experiments	122
5.3.3	Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V	134
5.4	Summary	142
<b>CHAPTER 6: IMPROVED GDM BY COMPENSATING TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT</b>		<b>146</b>
6.1	Introduction	146
6.2	Motivation: Preliminary Experiment	148
6.3	Modelling the Gas Sensor Drift due to Ambient Temperature and Humidity	150
6.3.1	Hardware Setup	150
6.3.2	Experimental Procedure	152

6.3.3	Data Visualization and Exploration	155
6.3.4	Model Generation through Linear Regression	159
6.3.5	Model Verification	171
6.4	Improving GDM and Gas Source Localization using Kernel DM+V/T/H	177
6.4.1	Method: Kernel DM+V/T/H	177
6.4.2	Results and Discussions	181
6.5	Summary	195
	<b>CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK</b>	<b>199</b>
7.1	Summary of Contributions	199
7.2	Future Work	202
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>199</b>
	<b>APPENDIX - A</b>	<b>216</b>
	<b>APPENDIX - B</b>	<b>218</b>
	<b>APPENDIX - C</b>	<b>219</b>
	<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	<b>220</b>
	<b>LIST OF AWARDS</b>	<b>222</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

NO.		PAGE
3.1	Comparison between Kinect's depth camera and 2D laser scanners.	43
3.2	Example of recipes setting for a customized experiment.	50
3.3	Recipes setting for studying sensor response at 25ppm H <sub>2</sub> S	53
4.1	Duration of each experiment.	79
4.2	Comparison of map obtained with different SLAM technique and scan type in [4.50m x 3.18m] room, without any feature present. The red arrow and text indicate the dimension of the wall calculated between innermost black pixels and each pixel has a width of 0.05m.	94
4.3	Comparison of maps obtained with different SLAMs, scan types and room's configurations. The red arrows indicate the <i>shorter_feature</i> being mapped.	96
4.4	Comparison of map obtained with different SLAM and scan type in the corridor with various features of different types and sizes.	100
4.5	Total number of transform and map update in each experiment.	101
4.6	Comparison of performances between Gmapping and Hector SLAM based on the experiments conducted.	103
5.1	Parameters setting for Kernel DM+V algorithm.	125
5.2	Summary of two trials with single gas source.	126
5.3	Distance (i.e. error) between the actual and predicted gas source location in the mean and variance map.	128
5.4	Summary of three subsequent SLAM-GDM trials in the environment exposed to multiple gas sources.	130
5.5	Error of predicted source locations (i.e. distance of each source to its predicted location in map).	133
5.6	Distance (i.e. error) between the actual to predicted location of gas source in the mean and variance map for Trial 1.	140
5.7	Distance (i.e. error) between the actual and predicted location of gas source in the mean and variance map for Trial 2.	141
5.8	Time taken to complete the calculation (in offline mode) for Gaussian and Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V.	142

6.1	Comparison of Mean Square Error obtained from training and cross validation between sensors. The <i>Sensor 1</i> 's model is cross validated using <i>Sensor 2</i> 's data and <i>Sensor 2</i> 's model is validated using <i>Sensor 1</i> 's data.	168
6.2	Mean Square Error of the generalized model to the <i>Sensor 1</i> , <i>Sensor 2</i> and the combined data.	170
6.3	Same parameters setting is used for the simulations of Kernel DM+V, Instantaneous Kernel DM+V/T/H, Maps Fusion Kernel DM+V/T/H.	182
6.4	The concentration of ethanol solution and the interval between the source is exposed and experiment started.	189
6.5	Estimated distance (i.e. error) between the gas source and the predicted location in each experiment.	195

©This item is protected by original copyright

## LIST OF FIGURES

NO.		PAGE
2.1	General architecture of metal oxide (MOX) gas sensor.	9
2.2	General schematic of MOX gas sensor.	10
2.3	Overall Methodology	32
3.1	Devices and physical connections.	36
3.2	The integrated robot.	36
3.3	Summary of the devices' functions, software and communication protocols.	37
3.4	The Kinect's Components	40
3.5	Sensors board consisting of gas (1), temperature (2) and humidity (3) sensor.	42
3.6	Timeline of synchronization between robot, netbook and base station. The red coloured texts indicate the time-critical events which are synchronized between multiple devices.	45
3.7	Architecture of the integrated system. The solid arrows indicate the flow of the gases while the dashed arrows indicate the electrical connection between the devices.	48
3.8	3-D drawing of the gas chamber and the simulated gas flow at 100ml/min.	52
3.9	TGS 825 gas sensor response in 2 different experiments, (a) Test 1 and (b) Test 2 when induced with 25ppm hydrogen sulfide.	54
3.10	The recorded load voltages when using 5V (left) and 10V (right) reference voltages.	56
3.11	Sensor resistance for (a) 5V and (b) 10V reference voltage setting.	57
3.12	The measured sensor response with increasing step of gas concentrations.	58
3.13	Averaged sensor's signal ( $R_S/R_O$ ) with error bar at different hydrogen sulfide concentrations.	59
4.1	An example showing a sonar sensor placed at certain height unable to detect and measure the obstacle location. The red arrow indicates the direction of measurement.	63

4.2	(a) The RGB image obtained from the Kinect's RGB Camera (only for the purpose of comparison) and (b) the depth image (i.e. Z-coordinate) obtained after conversion from raw data to real measurements. Darker pixels indicate nearer locations.	64
4.3	Depth image (i.e. Z-coordinates) obtained after eliminating the floor and objects above the robot. The remaining dark pixels are considered as 3D obstacles to the robot.	65
4.4	2D obstacle locations and robot position as depicted on the base station.	66
4.5	Differential drive kinematics for the case of moving along a curvature (obtained from (Dudek & Jenkin, 2010)).	69
4.6	Raw mapping in a square room (3x3m) after the robot moved in (a) one complete circle and (b) two complete circles. Robot pose was directly indexed by the odometry while the scan was computed using the proposed Kinect method in Section 4.2.1. The black pixels indicate the obstacles (walls) while the red pixels indicate the robot's trajectory (i.e. from the odometry)	71
4.7	The proposed method to merge Kinect's and Laser Scanner's scans. The green, blue and red areas indicate the FOV of Kinect, Laser Scanner and Merged Scan respectively. The grey area is the blind spot area not covered by the sensors. Note that the illustration is not scaled to the real dimension.	76
4.8	The map of the locations of SLAM experiments in CEASTech building, Unimap. (a) Corridor with features (i.e. desks, chairs and stairs). (b) Small office room with no feature. Values shown are in centimeters.	78
4.9	Raw map (on the left) and Gmapping's map (on the right) obtained from real-time SLAM in the corridor.	80
4.10	Raw map (on the left) and Gmapping's map (on the right) obtained from real-time SLAM in the small office room.	80
4.11	Comparison of maps obtained using Gmapping and Hector SLAM using default parameters.	83
4.12	Comparison of Gmapping and Hector SLAM maps obtained using default parameters.	83
4.13	Corridor maps obtained using the Gmapping technique with different numbers of particles.	85
4.14	Room maps obtained using the Gmapping technique with different numbers of particles.	85

4.15	Corridor maps obtained using the Gmapping technique with different combinations of Linear and Angular Update values.	87
4.16	Room maps obtained using the Gmapping technique with different combinations of Linear and Angular Update values.	87
4.17	Corridor maps obtained using the Hector SLAM technique with different combinations of Distance and Angle Threshold values.	89
4.18	Room maps obtained using the Hector SLAM technique with different combinations of Distance and Angle Threshold values.	89
4.19	Map obtained after the experiment using Hector SLAM with <i>merged_scan</i> ; to illustrate the trajectory of the robot (as indicated by red line).	93
4.20	Configuration of features in [4.50m x 3.18m] room for two different experiments.	95
4.21	Trajectory of the robot (red line) in two experiments with different features configuration. The duration of the first and second experiment was 116s and 218s respectively. The map was obtained using Hector SLAM with <i>merged_scan</i> .	95
4.22	Trajectory of the robot (red line) in the experiment conducted in the corridor of CEASTech, UniMAP. The map is obtained using Hector SLAM with <i>merged_scan</i> .	98
5.1	Example combination of Distributed Mean and SLAM map.	112
5.2	3D distribution of Gaussian kernel function across grid cells with $\sigma=2$ and location of measurement at (X,Y)=(0,0)	114
5.3	2D Gaussian with variable kernel width, $\sigma$	114
5.4	Comparison of the proposed Epanechnikov based kernel function with respect to the Gaussian kernel function.	116
5.5	The robot was initially placed at one of the room's corners. The red circle indicates the location of ethanol solution.	120
5.6	TGS 2600 gas sensor reading during the robot's movement over 290 seconds. The black dots show the points of interest with the corresponding time.	120
5.7	Sketched robot movement based on the video recording. The dash line indicates the room's boundary. The continuous line shows the robot's movement. The red dot and green dot represent the ethanol gas source and the initial robot position respectively. The black dots indicate the point of interests at different time, t as displayed in Figure .5.6	121

5.8	Map of the CEASTech's corridor (with dimensions in meter) and the arrangement of important components.	123
5.9	Location of the gas source (indicated by red block) in the corridor of CEASTech's building.	125
5.10	The SLAM map, mean concentration map and variance maps obtained from real-time SLAM-GDM experiments. The blue lines in the SLAM map indicate the trajectory of the robot. The coloring scale in the mean and variance map was set according to the maximum, average and minimum values in each corresponding map.	127
5.11	Location of gas sources (denoted by red blocks) in the corridor of CEASTech's building.	129
5.12	The SLAM map, mean concentration map and variance maps obtained from real-time SLAM-GDM experiments in an environment with three gas sources. The blue lines in the SLAM map indicate the trajectory of the robot. The coloring scale in the mean and variance maps was set according to the maximum, average and minimum value in each corresponding map, as indicated in Figure .5.10	132
5.13	Mean maps computed using Gaussian and Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V at varying kernel width for Trial 1. The grey pixels indicate the unexplored gas distribution area, while cyan and blue blocks are the source and its estimated location.	136
5.14	Variance maps computed using Gaussian and Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V at varying kernel width for Trial 1. The grey pixels indicate the unexplored gas distribution area, while cyan and blue blocks are the source and its estimated location.	137
5.15	Mean maps computed using Gaussian and Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V at varying kernel width for Trial 2. The grey pixels indicate the unexplored gas distribution area, while cyan and blue blocks are the source and its estimated location.	138
5.16	Variance maps computed using Gaussian and Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V at varying kernel width for Trial 2. The grey pixels indicate the unexplored gas distribution area, while cyan and blue blocks are the source and its estimated location.	139
6.1	Gas sensor response with respect to ambient temperature and humidity during GDM experiment.	149
6.2	The computed (a) SLAM map (with trajectory), (b) distributed mean map, (c) temperature map and (d) humidity map of the corridor with no gas source present. Note that lower sensor response, $R_S$ indicates higher gas concentration. The red arrow indicates the area with peak level of gas concentration.	149

6.3	Hardware setup of the experiment.	151
6.4	A partially closed chamber was designed to allow inflow and outflow of ethanol gas in and out. The top cover has air strips to ensure the air inside the chamber is mixed with the incubator's air so that the temperature and humidity could be controlled. The sensors board was designed to consist of 2 gas sensors, 1 temperature sensor and 1 humidity sensor.	152
6.5	Setup of each experiment.	154
6.6	Example of result using ethanol solution of 0.02% concentration and 75% humidity setting.	156
6.7	$R_{S1}$ reading over temperature reading at different level of humidity (i.e. 45, 55, 65 and 75%) and concentrations of ethanol solution (i.e. 0%, 0.02%, 0.05%, 0.10%, 0.20%, 0.50%, 1.00% and 2.00%).	157
6.8	3D surface graph of <i>Sensor 1</i> 's response, $R_{S1}$ at varying temperature and humidity levels. Figure (a), (b) and (c) are the same graph but viewed from different angle. Note that Figure (c) is slightly slanted to allow observation of the spacing between the plots of different concentrations.	158
6.9	An ideal model is expected to output constant $R_S^*$ value (i.e. equal to $R_{S\_T20H65}$ ) when exposed to the same concentration of gas but varying temperature and humidity. The conditions of the graphs are: (a) temperature varies but humidity fixed to 65% and (b) humidity varies but temperature fixed to 20°C.	160
6.10	Example of sensor response using ethanol solution of 0.02% concentration and 75% humidity setting. The useful data range and $R_{S\_T20H65}$ data range are the data in the range of 1800 <sup>th</sup> to 9000 <sup>th</sup> second and 9900 <sup>th</sup> to 10800 <sup>th</sup> second respectively.	161
6.11	3D surface graph of modeled <i>Sensor 1</i> 's response (using M1) at varying temperature and humidity levels. Figure (a), (b) and (c) are the same graph but viewed from different angle.	163
6.12	Averaged MSEs and standard deviation of M1 to M7 model for both gas sensors using 10-fold cross validation with 100 repetitions.	165
6.13	3D surface graph of $RS1^*$ and $RS2^*$ (using M5) at varying temperature and humidity levels, and different concentration of ethanol solutions (indicated by c0.00, c0.02...c2.00).	167
6.14	3D surface graph of $R_{S1}^*$ using <i>Sensor 2</i> 's model and $R_{S2}^*$ using <i>Sensor 1</i> 's model.	169
6.15	3D surface graph of $R_{S1}^*$ and $R_{S2}^*$ using general model.	171

6.16	The temperature and humidity control of the incubator. The first 15 minutes of the plot is represented as dashed line as the initial condition varies.	172
6.17	$R_{S1}^*$ and $R_{S2}^*$ predicted using individual and general model at varying temperature and humidity; using 0.075% ethanol solution for bubbling.	174
6.18	$R_{S1}^*$ and $R_{S2}^*$ predicted using individual and combined model at varying temperature and humidity; using 0.35% ethanol solution for bubbling.	174
6.19	$R_{S1}^*$ and $R_{S2}^*$ predicted using individual and combined model at varying temperature and humidity; using 1.3% ethanol solution for bubbling.	175
6.20	Acquired and sensor modelled response in a closed room using Sensor 3 and Sensor 4. The temperature and humidity was controlled using air conditioner.	177
6.21	Map of the CEASTech's corridor (with dimensions in meter) and the arrangement of objects, air conditioners and windows. The red arrow indicates the server room in which the robot explored in some of the experiments.	182
6.22	Results of Trial 1 in CEASTech's corridor with no gas source introduced to the environment.	186
6.23	Results of Trial 2 in CEASTech's corridor with no gas source introduced to the environment.	187
6.24	Results of Trial 3 in CEASTech's corridor with no gas source introduced to the environment. The red shades in variance maps for Sensor 3 using Kernel DM+V/T/H methods is not visible since the value is too low.	188
6.25	Results of Trial 1 in CEASTech's corridor with single ethanol gas source. The cyan represents the source location while the blue rectangle indicates the predicted location of source.	192
6.26	Results of Trial 2 in CEASTech's corridor with single ethanol gas source. The cyan represents the source location while the blue rectangle indicates the predicted location of source.	193
6.27	Results of Trial 3 in CEASTech's corridor with single ethanol gas source. The cyan represents the source location while the blue rectangle indicates the predicted location of source.	194



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CP	Conductive Polymer
CV	Cross Validation
DC	Direct Current
DP	Distributed Particle
EC	Electrochemical
EMI	Electromagnetic Interference
FOV	Field of View
FPGA	Field-Programmable Gate Array
GDM	Gas Distribution Mapping
GPM	Gaussian Process Mixture
GPS	Global Positioning System
GSC	Gas Sensor Characterization
ICC	Instantaneous Center of Curvature
IP	Internet Protocol
MOX	Metal Oxide
MSE	Mean Square Error
PID	Photo Ionization Detector
RAM	Random Access Memory
RBPF	Rao-Blackwellised Particle Filter
RFI	Radio Frequency Interference
RGB	Red Green Blue
RGB-D	Red Green Blue – Depth
ROS	Robot Operating System
SLAM	Simultaneous Localization and Mapping
SPA	Sparse Pose Adjustment

TCP	Transmission Control Protocol
USB	Universal Serial Bus
UV	Ultraviolet
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WI-FI	Wireless Fidelity

©This item is protected by original copyright

# **Penambahbaikan Penentuan Lokasi Sumber Gas Berdasarkan Robot Bergerak dengan Mengambil Kira Suhu dan Kelembapan serta Melalui SLAM dan Pemetaan Peredaran Gas**

## **ABSTRAK**

Kajian ini meliputi masalah menentukan lokasi sumber gas di persekitaran dalaman dengan menggunakan sebuah robot mudah alih. Masalah ini adalah hampir sama seperti situasi kebocoran gas berbahaya dalam bangunan. Memandangkan keadaan persekitaran tempat tersebut tidak diketahui oleh robot, operasi Penempatan dan Pemetaan Serentak (SLAM) diperlukan. Dua teknik SLAM (iaitu Gmapping dan Hector SLAM) telah digunakan untuk memberikan maklumat penting ini. Hasil eksperimen dan analisis menunjukkan bahawa Hector SLAM lebih sesuai untuk tugas pemetaan peredaran gas (GDM) disebabkan oleh ketepatan yang lebih baik dari segi anggaran kedudukan robot, keperluan pengiraan yang lebih rendah dan hanya memperbaiki peta di kawasan berhampiran. Oleh itu, Hector SLAM digabungkan dengan algoritma Kernel DM+V untuk mencapai penyelesaian SLAM-GDM bagi meramal kedudukan punca gas. Beberapa eksperimen telah dijalankan untuk mengesahkan prestasi kaedah SLAM-GDM dalam bangunan pejabat dan dengan kehadiran gas etanol. Keputusan eksperimen menunjukkan bahawa ramalan lokasi sumber gas sering tepat pada lingkungan 0.5 hingga 2.0m. Di samping itu, algoritma Kernel DM+V berdasarkan Kernel Epanechnikov juga telah diperkenalkan untuk menghadkan jarak ekstrapolasi dalam pengiraan GDM. Kelebihannya adalah keperluan pengiraan yang lebih rendah dan ramalan lokasi sumber gas yang lebih tepat. Lebih penting lagi, peta yang dihasilkan dapat menunjukkan kawasan peredaran gas yang belum diterokai oleh robot dan seterusnya boleh digunakan untuk merancang laluan robot. Bahagian akhir dan utama dalam tesis ini membincangkan kesan suhu dan kelembapan persekitaran terhadap tindak balas sensor gas (iaitu TGS 2600) yang seterusnya boleh mempengaruhi keputusan GDM. Proses regresi linear telah dijalankan untuk mewujudkan satu model bagi membetulkan ralat suhu dan kelembapan. Model ini telah diuji dalam pelbagai konfigurasi dan didapati mampu mengurangkan kesan kedua-dua faktor tersebut terhadap tindak balas sensor dalam kepekatan gas yang berbeza. Akhir sekali, dua versi algoritma Kernel DM+V/T/H telah dicadangkan dan digabungkan dengan model tersebut untuk mengambil kira suhu dan kelembapan persekitaran semasa tugas pemetaan gas. Keputusan eksperimen menunjukkan bahawa algoritma Kernel DM+V/T/H berjaya menghasilkan peta peredaran gas yang lebih stabil dan ramalan lokasi sumber gas yang lebih tepat berbanding Kernel DM+V sebanyak 34%.

# **An Improved Mobile Robot Based Gas Source Localization with Temperature and Humidity Compensation via SLAM and Gas Distribution Mapping**

## **ABSTRACT**

This research is concerned with the problem of localizing gas source in indoor environment using a mobile robot. The problem could be seen as similar to the event of hazardous gas leak in a building. Since the environment is often unknown to the robot, the Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) operation is required. Two open source SLAM techniques (i.e. Gmapping and Hector SLAM) were implemented to provide this crucial information. Extensive experiments and analysis on both SLAM techniques yielded that the Hector SLAM is more suitable for gas distribution mapping (GDM) application due to the improved robot pose estimation, less computational requirement and only performs map correction locally. Therefore, the Hector SLAM is combined with Kernel DM+V algorithm to achieve real-time SLAM-GDM for predicting gas source location. Rigorous real-time experiments were conducted to verify the performance of the proposed SLAM-GDM method in an uncontrolled office building with the presence of ethanol emission. The experimental results showed that the prediction of gas source location is often accurate to 0.5 to 2.0m. Furthermore, an Epanechnikov based Kernel DM+V algorithm was also introduced to limit extrapolation range in GDM computations. The observed advantages were lower computational requirement and slightly more accurate prediction on gas source location. More importantly, it was found that the maps produced were able to indicate the areas of unexplored gas distribution and therefore could be used for the robot's path planning. The final and the main part of the thesis deals with the effect of ambient temperature and humidity on metal oxide gas sensor (i.e. TGS 2600) response; which could affect the GDM results. Linear regression processes were conducted to create a model to correct the temperature and humidity drift of the gas sensor response. The model (i.e. function) was tested in various configurations and was found to minimize the effects of the two environmental factors on the gas sensor response in different gas concentrations. Finally, two versions of Kernel DM+V/T/H algorithms were proposed and coupled with the drift model to compensate for temperature and humidity variation during the GDM task. The experimental results showed that the Kernel DM+V/T/H algorithms were able to produce more stable gas distribution maps and improve the accuracy of gas source localization prediction by 34%.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview

Olfaction is the ability of an organism to sense smell by detecting tiny particles of substance that evaporate and spread through air. Most animals and insects use their olfactory senses in order to locate food sources, find mate, detect predator and mark territory (Wyatt, 2003). While in human, the sense of smell has been said to influence emotional and aesthetical aspects that affect the social interaction with others as well as subjective perception to the surrounding. Even though the olfactory system is important, human still lack proper vocabularies to describe odour precisely. They tend to describe smells using vague or abstract terms related to their personal experience or similarity to other odour (Loutfi, 2006). Animals have been said to have more sensitive olfactory system compared to human. For instance, a dog that possesses around 220 million olfactory receptors has a thousand times more sensitive sense of smell than a human with 5 million receptors (Correa, 2005).

Furthermore, the human's olfactory sense has limited capability such that it is not able to detect the presence of certain gases and distinguish between them. Although there are gases that could be sensed, often the source's location could not be determined accurately. There could also be situations where human get exposed to harmful gas and being silently harmed or killed.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the gas sensing technology with mobile robot has been an active research study. The motivations are due to critical problems such as

detecting drugs and explosive, identifying gas leaks location, early detection of fire and as well as monitoring polluted area. One real example of such problem is the massive explosion in Koahsiung, Taiwan on the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2014. It was reported that there were a series of five explosions along sewage system's pipeline; killing at least 25 people and injuring 265 people. The event was described to have been caused by gas leak and among the victims were four fire-fighters who were inspecting for the leakage (MailOnline, 2014).

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

The presence of toxic gases in the environment can be harmful to human. A person may not be aware of their presence and can be silently poisoned or killed. On the other hand, the leakage of natural gases could cause headache, fatigue, loss of consciousness and death. More importantly, this type of gas is highly flammable; thus a tiny spark could result in massive fire or explosion. The current technique of detecting the gas leak location requires involvement of human operators on-site. For instance, the rescuers need to carry portable gas detectors to several suspected area for monitoring the gas concentration. However, this practice could risk their lives and prone to error or misinterpretation.

Mobile robot equipped with olfactory system could be used to determine the location of gas source while being monitored remotely by human operators. Nevertheless, in a real-life situation, the surrounding area is often unknown; thus requiring the robot to localize itself and map the environment. Moreover, the current gas sensor technologies also suffer from many issues such as slow response, non-selectivity and highly affected by temperature and humidity of the surrounding. The problems are further enhanced by the existence of wind and the variability of gas movement such as

through diffusion and turbulence (Patrick P Neumann, 2013). In particular, this thesis attempts to solve the problem of localizing gas source in indoor environment, such as the condition of gas leak in a building.

### **1.3 Objectives**

The main objective of this research is to improve the existing methods of finding location of gas source in indoor environment using a mobile robot. The work consists of two major aspects. First is to combine Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) and Gas Distribution Mapping (GDM) operations to achieve real-time SLAM-GDM solution. The SLAM is implemented to map the unknown area, while the GDM is utilized for representing the areas of high concentration of gas, where the gas source may exist. The combined map from both operations could provide real-time prediction of the gas source location. The second and more important aspect is to further enhance the performance of gas source localization by compensating ambient temperature and humidity in GDM operation. The specific objectives of the research are as follow:

- i. To design robust and reliable mobile robot olfaction system for gas source localization.**
- ii. To improve SLAM operation and select the suitable SLAM algorithm for GDM.**
- iii. To propose real-time SLAM-GDM combination and further improve the performance of gas source localization by introducing an improved GDM method.**

- iv. **To model the gas sensor drift due to the changes in ambient temperature and humidity, and subsequently propose novel GDM algorithm that compensate for these two factors.**

#### **1.4 Scope**

This thesis concerns the tasks of finding the location of gas source using a single mobile robot. The robot was remotely controlled to perform gas sensing measurements across different areas in a building. Path planning strategy is out of scope of this thesis since the focus is rather on the SLAM and GDM algorithms. Instead, the robot was manually controlled to maneuver and cover as much areas as possible in all experiments presented.

Metal oxide (MOX) gas sensor particularly TGS 2600 (i.e. sensitive to volatile organic compound) was used throughout the research as it was proven to produce relatively reliable results and by far the most employed technology in mobile robotics (Trincavelli, 2010). The gas sensor was mounted on the robot at fixed position and exposed directly to the environment, rather than enclosing it in a chamber. No calibration has been performed on the gas sensor to measure the actual concentration of gas. This is due to the unavailability of ground truth information and considering to the fact that the sensor itself suffers from temperature, humidity and long-term drifts (C. Wang, Yin, Zhang, Xiang, & Gao, 2010). Instead, only the sensor's signal was used to indicate relative gas concentration. This information is sufficient for the project's objective of building gas distribution map and localizing gas source.

In addition, ethanol solution was utilized as the gas source since it is volatile and not dangerous to human. Single or multiple cups of the solution were placed at different locations while allowing the robot to build the gas distribution maps. A