

DIJIT: A Robotic Head for an Active Observer

Mostafa Kamali Tabrizi, Mingshi Chi, Bir Bikram Dey, Yu Qing Yuan,
Markus D. Solbach, Yiqian Liu, Michael Jenkin, and John K. Tsotsos

Abstract—We present DIJIT, a novel binocular robotic head expressly designed for mobile agents that behave as active observers. DIJIT’s unique breadth of functionality enables active vision research and the study of human-like eye and head-neck motions, their interrelationships, and how each contributes to visual ability. DIJIT is also being used to explore the differences between how human vision employs eye/head movements to solve visual tasks and current computer vision methods. DIJIT’s design features nine mechanical degrees of freedom, while the cameras and lenses provide an additional four optical degrees of freedom. The ranges and speeds of the mechanical design are comparable to human performance. Our design includes the ranges of motion required for convergent stereo, namely, vergence, version, and cyclotorsion. The exploration of the utility of these to both human and machine vision is ongoing. Here, we present the design of DIJIT and evaluate aspects of its performance. We present a new method for saccadic camera movements. In this method, a direct relationship between camera orientation and motor values is developed. The resulting saccadic camera movements are close to human movements in terms of their accuracy.

I. Introduction

Robotic and human visual systems differ significantly; robotic vision systems often utilize fewer degrees of freedom and are typically designed for a small number of specific tasks, while human vision offers many more degrees of freedom in terms of camera/eye control and is intended for a wider range of tasks. Exploring the differences between computer and machine vision methods can provide insights into how eye and head movements aid in solving visual tasks.

In humans, vision tasks employ active vision. Eye fixation direction is actively controlled as part of visual task solutions. Active vision in robotics has become a research paradigm inspired in part by biological vision systems [1], [2]. It has been shown to have benefits for various tasks, including SLAM [3] and object recognition [4]. Typically, active vision machine systems are monocular or utilize a fixed binocular stereo camera pair on a pan-tilt system. In humans, stereo vision is more than just two fixed eyes rotating on a pan-tilt neck; rather, each eye is highly adjustable to its viewing conditions, and its movements

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

All authors were with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, at the time they were working on this research. (email: mkamali@yorku.ca; mingshic@yorku.ca; bir.b.dey@gmail.com; kellyyuan@yorku.ca; solbach@yorku.ca; yql@yorku.ca; jenkins@yorku.ca; tsotsos@yorku.ca)




Fig. 1. The DIJIT head from four different viewpoints. The upper part of the head, excluding the neck, is $22\text{cm} \times 18\text{cm} \times 12\text{cm}$ ($W \times D \times H$), and the whole head, including the neck, is $22\text{cm} \times 22\text{cm} \times 26\text{cm}$.

are controlled by a complex set of muscles that provide three rotational degrees of freedom to each eye, and the head itself is mounted on a controllable neck.

To explore the versatility the human visual system has over active computer vision systems, a human-like binocular robotics platform is needed. The DIJIT head (see Fig. 1) mirrors a wide range of the properties of the physical human vision system, and was designed to address this need.

Biomimetic systems in robotics, including stereo heads that mimic human binocular stereoscopic systems, are a popular area of study for improving existing systems and evaluating visual theories. The development of active stereo heads has a long history, tracing back to the early 1970’s [5], [6]. To have a robotic system that fully encompasses the human visual system, many properties must be considered, including the degrees of freedom of the cameras, the kinematic structure including the inter-camera baseline, and the speeds and ranges of camera motion. The size and weight of the device come into play when performing a task that involves the requirement to move around in 3D space, especially when mounted on a mobile robotic platform. Existing robotic heads fall short in one or more of these aspects, often with designs relying on large and heavy metal frames and incorporating large inter-camera baselines. Very few existing heads encompass all the necessary degrees of freedom, and even fewer report on their performance in the literature in a

concrete way. To the best of our knowledge, DIJIT is the first robotic head with a baseline and degrees of mechanical freedom similar to those of humans (three degrees of freedom for each camera and three for the neck), in addition to four optical degrees of freedom for each camera.

Here, DIJIT’s ability to perform in a manner similar to humans is evaluated in terms of its ability to execute a saccade, the most frequent voluntary human eye movement, occurring 2-3 times per second [7], making it essential for biological active vision. DIJIT attains over 85% of the peak saccade speed relative to human performance and has an accuracy comparable with human performance. A supplementary video demonstrates DIJIT in operation.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the characteristics of existing robotic heads. Section III describes DIJIT’s mechanical, hardware, and software design. Section IV describes an approach to saccade control using DIJIT. This approach takes advantage of the mechanical and visual properties of the head. Section V provides experimental results on executing saccades on DIJIT. Finally, Section VI summarizes the paper and describes ongoing and planned future work with DIJIT.

II. Previous Work

A. Stereohead Designs

For an earlier review of stereo head designs, see [8]. Table I updates the set of stereo heads reviewed in [8] and summarizes some of their characteristics. The heads reviewed here were chosen based on the design goal to be “human-like”. Most existing human-like robotic heads can be categorized into one of four groups based on their kinematic structure:

- 1) Systems that use fixed stereo camera geometry; such as ATLAS [9] and THORMANG [10];
- 2) Systems that utilize cameras that pan individually and utilize a common tilt; such as Manfredi [11], the COG Project [12], iCub [13], and Tombatossals [14];
- 3) Systems that utilize cameras that pan and tilt individually; such as OREO [15], KTH [16], ESCHeR (ETL) [17], Agile [18], and Zhang [19]; and,
- 4) Systems that utilize cameras that pan, tilt, and roll independently; such as ETL-Humanoid [20], Robot Bionic Eyes [21], TRISH [22], MAC-EYE [23], and Van Opstal [24].

DIJIT falls in the fourth category; it is equipped with a full three rotational degrees of freedom for each of its two cameras. This is augmented by a neck providing an additional three mechanical degrees of freedom. Considering the heads in Category 4, only ETL-Humanoid [20] and Robot Bionic Eyes [21] also have three degrees of freedom in the neck. Robot Bionic Eyes [21] does not provide optical degrees of freedom and has lower resolution

TABLE I
Comparison Between Different Robotic Heads

Head	DOF ⁽¹⁾ (Eyes, Neck)	Baseline (mm)	Motion Range (pan, tilt) (degree)
Human	(6, 3) [26]	45-80 [27]	(89, 75) [28]
DIJIT	(6, 3)	115	(92, 80)
ETL-Humanoid [20]	(6, 3)	N/R ⁽²⁾	N/R
RBE ⁽³⁾ [21]	(6, 3)	118	(100, 100)
TRISH [22]	(6, 1)	320	(90, 45)
MAC-EYE [23]	(6, 0)	N/R	(110, 110)
Van Opstal [24]	(6, 0)	One eye ⁽⁴⁾	(50, 50)
OREO [15]	(4, 3)	58	(82, 89)
KTH [16]	(4, 2)	150-400	N/R
ESCHeR (ETL) [17]	(4, 0)	180	(200, 190)
Agile [18]	(4, 0)	50-550	(40, 40)
Zhang [19]	(4, 0)	N/R	N/R
Manfredi [11]	(3, 4 ⁽⁵⁾)	N/R	(90, 90)
COG [29]	(3, 3)	125	(120, 75)
iCub [13]	(3, 3)	68	(90, 80)
Tombatossals [14]	(3, 1)	270	N/R

⁽¹⁾ Only rotational degrees of freedom are considered. ⁽²⁾ N/R stands for Not Reported. ⁽³⁾ Robot Bionic Eyes ⁽⁴⁾ Van Opstal [24] is only a prototype of one eye; it does not have a full head, and the experiments are conducted in simulation; however, we consider six DOF for the eyes, assuming a full head. ⁽⁵⁾ Manfredi [11] has four degrees of freedom in the neck because its neck has two tilts at two different levels, in addition to pan and roll.

cameras. TRISH [22], while having very precise motors, has only one degree of freedom in the neck, and does not have a human-like inter-camera baseline. MAC-EYE [23] focused on mimicking the muscles of the human eye with a sphere actuated by four independent tendons and motors. However, the robot does not include a neck [25]. The Van Opstal robot [24] uses six independent tendons that resemble human eye muscles; however, only a single camera has been constructed, with the experiments reported in simulation.

Of all the heads reviewed, only iCub [13], OREO [15], and Agile [18] have a baseline length that is close to that of humans. However, iCub [13] only implements three degrees of freedom in total in the two cameras, and many experiments on the real robot use fixed camera orientation. OREO [15] lacks an individual camera roll and does not report on saccade performance, focusing instead on speed. In Agile [18], each camera is bulky, 20.5cm×20cm (W×H), and the head provides a range of motion that is considerably smaller than that of humans.

B. Saccade Methods

Just as humans use saccades to fixate different locations of interest in the visual scene, robotic heads must decide “where to look next” and execute that motion. In biological systems, these motions are known as saccades

or saccadic motions. We briefly review existing methods proposed for saccadic motion for robotic heads. We concentrate on how to actually redirect an individual camera, rather than on the problem of where to look next. For a review of where the head should attend, see [30].

In biological systems, saccades often take place in multiple phases. A primary saccade drives the eye to the direction of interest, and sometimes this is followed by a corrective saccade to refine the motion executed in the primary saccade. See [31] for a review on corrective saccades. Machine systems can also benefit from a multi-stage saccade strategy. This can be due to a number of factors, including errors in mapping from camera measurements to motor commands to backlash in the mechanical motion system in the head. Here, we concentrate on primary saccades, but also touch on corrective saccades as appropriate.

Some saccade execution methods (e.g., [14], [24]) model the kinematics, dynamics, and/or optics of the robot, typically requiring substantial time for training and/or execution; Other methods (e.g., [14], [32], [33]) train neural networks to learn saccade strategies, which requires extensive data collection and training. The approach presented for DIJIT uses an approach similar to the one developed for COG [34] in terms of assigning the appropriate motor values to candidate fixation points; however, they report 90 minutes of processing time for calibration, limiting the applicability of the approach. They utilize an online learning approach, whereas the approach proposed here utilizes homographies to solve the task without extensive training.

III. DIJIT Design

Here, we describe the mechanical design, hardware components, and ROS interface of DIJIT. The 3D part models, parts list, and software code are all available online under the MIT license¹.

A. Mechanical Design

DIJIT has nine mechanical degrees of freedom: three for the neck, which are pan rotation, side-bending, and flexion/extension; and three for each camera, which are pan, tilt, and roll. See Figs. 1-3. There are also four optical degrees of freedom associated with each camera and lens: focusing distance, camera exposure time, camera white balance, and sensor gain. Focusing distance is similar to eye accommodation in humans, camera exposure time is similar to visual integration time, camera white balance is similar to color constancy in the visual cortex, and sensor gain is similar to photoreceptor sensitivity.

Three motors control the neck. A large motor located at the base of the neck controls the pan rotation of the entire head. Two smaller motors, mounted on either side of the neck, work together to push and pull metal




Fig. 2. The degrees of freedom of the neck (a) and cameras (b).

rods on the sides of the neck. When they pull or push in the same direction, the neck performs flexion or extension, respectively; When they push or pull in opposite directions, a side-bending motion is performed. Just as the roll, pitch, and yaw rotational motions of the individual camera mirror the rotational motions of the human eye, the neck motions of DIJIT were designed to match the motions of the human neck.

Within the head, the orientation of each camera is controlled by three motors. Two motors located behind the camera provide pan and tilt motions. Each of them is connected to the camera frame through two connected linkages. One linkage is connected to the motor on one side and to the other linkage on the other side. The other linkage is connected to the outer surface of the circular camera frame.

To feature all degrees of freedom exhibited in the human eye, DIJIT's cameras have a third motor responsible for roll that rotates the camera around the line of sight, or principal axis. This motor is located behind the camera and is attached to the camera frame. There is a ring slightly smaller than the camera frame, sliding inside it, rolling on ball bearings located between them. The roll motor is connected to this inner frame through two linkages. Fig. 3b highlights these motors and linkages to distinguish between pairs of linkages and their role in the motion of the camera.

DIJIT utilizes a rigid body linkage system, allowing the placement of the motors behind the cameras. Although many previous designs align motors with the rotational axes for simpler kinematic calculations, our design allows for a more compact design, with the camera

¹URL is obscured during the review process.




Fig. 3. (a) The degrees of freedom of the right camera. (b) Red boundaries highlight the motor and linkages responsible for the primary tilting motion, green boundaries highlight those for the primary pan motion, and blue boundaries highlight those responsible for the roll motion.

frames being closer, having a baseline length comparable to that of humans. DIJIT weighs approximately 1.4kg. The upper part of the head, excluding the neck, is $22\text{cm} \times 18\text{cm} \times 12\text{cm}$ (W \times D \times H), and the whole head, including the neck, is $22\text{cm} \times 22\text{cm} \times 26\text{cm}$. The neck provides a standard mount point for the head to be mounted on a mobile robot platform or to a rigid mount. For the experiments reported here, a rigid mount was used.

B. Hardware

Important considerations for our design included developing a compact, light, and agile binocular robotic head. The body, frames, and joint parts are 3D printed using PA6-CF, which is a lightweight, high-performance thermoplastic material. This is to be contrasted with many other robotic heads, which are constructed using heavy metal. Each camera is controlled by three MG90S metal gear servos, which are small and light. The motor located at the base of the neck is a 20kg DC4.8-6.8V servo. The two motors on the sides of the neck are Hitec HS-422 servos. The nine motors are controlled by a Teensy 4.0 ARM microcontroller operating at an I2C data rate of 400kHz. The motors are connected to an I2C servo driver interface, which is monitored by the Teensy 4.0.

The high-performance iDS U3-3881LE-AF camera with a global shutter is used for image capture. It is

powered by and communicates through a single USB 3.0 port at 5 Gb/s for a capture speed of 59 fps at the highest resolution of 3088×2076 pixels. The software for the cameras provides control over focusing distance, exposure, white balance, and gain. Each camera is equipped with a Corning Varioptic C-S-25H0-096 liquid 9.6mm lens with a focus control board that includes an auto-focus feature. Equipped with these lenses, each camera in DIJIT has a field of view of approximately $40^\circ \times 30^\circ$ (H \times V).

DIJIT is also equipped with two IMUs that are rigidly connected to the camera frames. Using the BNO085 IMU, the rotational states of the cameras are obtained at 60Hz. The states of the IMUs are monitored by the same Teensy that provides motor control.

C. ROS Interface

The motor controller firmware communicates with the Teensy 4.0 microcontroller. This enables the Teensy board to send signals to control the analog servo motors at 60Hz while running a ROS node. ROS nodes are self-contained functions that continuously receive, process, and/or send information for the system. The microcontroller firmware also prompts responses from the IMU units at 60Hz, obtaining measurements of the gravity vector, absolute rotation relative to a fixed world frame, linear acceleration, and the confidence of each measurement. This information is available to the ROS node. Each camera's gain, white balance, exposure time, and focusing distance can be controlled in software. We currently set these parameters before startup.

IV. DIJIT Saccade Control


Humans are capable of saccade shifts of speeds up to $700^\circ/\text{s}$ [35]. A saccade shifts the fixation of a camera from one point to another. A saccade consists of pure eye motion with no head motion. When a camera is fixated on a point, that point is projected on the principal point of the camera. Similar to other saccade methods, we assume the principal point is located at the image center. In a saccade, the amount of movement is calculated, and then the camera moves rapidly toward the target in a swift motion. Methods for determining the next fixation point are outside the scope of this paper. We assume that a target point is given in image coordinates relative to one of a set of calibration images, as described later.

Fig. 4 shows a sample saccade. Fig. 4a shows the state before saccade execution. The red point is the image center, and the green point is the target point where we wish to fixate. Fig. 4b, centered at the green point, shows the state after a precise saccade execution.

What makes this a difficult task to solve is that in practice it is difficult to construct a device that it rotates the camera about the camera's optical center. Difficult to estimate offsets between the motor axes and the optical ones complicates the accurate estimation of the appropriate motor rotations. Here, we propose a



(a)



(b)

Fig. 4. Views from DIJIT: The red point indicates the image center in both images. (a) Before saccade execution, the green point indicates the target point for fixation. (b) After a precise saccade execution, the image is centered at the intended fixation point.

data-driven method to avoid explicitly modelling and calibrating the relationship between the motor rotational axes and the change in saccade direction.

Our approach relies on a set of calibration views of a calibration target that enables estimation of a homography between the views of any two images in the calibration set. This allows us to map the center of each calibration image to the calibration image corresponding to the pixel location of the planned saccade. Since not all motor states are recorded in the calibration data collection, some interpolation process is required to approximate unseen views. The set of calibration mappings is used along with the known pan and tilt values of the calibration images to estimate the pan and tilt values required for the saccade. This process is applied separately to the left and right cameras using the pan and tilt motions needed for a simple saccade. It can easily generalize to cyclotorsion, which may be additionally needed for off-horopter binocular fusion (ongoing work).

A. Calibration Data Collection

We consider the problem for each camera independently. Rather than relying on modelling the kinematic structure of the camera pan, tilt, and roll motors, we address the problem by assuming an idealized model of the kinematics with rotation about the camera center and utilizing a standard visual target (ChArUco [36]) to link camera motions to pixel offsets. We start by collecting a set of calibration images to develop the relationship between potential fixation points and motor settings for the pan and tilt motors. A ChArUco board is fixed in

front of DIJIT. The pan and tilt motors are moved in discrete steps (e.g., five degrees) over the range of the pan and tilt values, and images are captured of the target. These pan and tilt values are chosen to provide a dense sampling of the pan and tilt space. Note that here we assume that the same calibration target is visible in all views, although the approach can be easily generalized using multiple ChArUco targets in different positions to deal with situations in which an individual target is not in the field of view of all fixation directions.

When the pan and tilt motors are in positions p_i and t_i , respectively, the motor values (p_i, t_i) and the image I_i taken in this state are recorded. The IMU values (s_i^x, s_i^y, s_i^z) , which are three Euler angles, are recorded as well, although these values are not used in the work described here. This results in a set of calibration data, $\mathcal{C} = \{(I_i, p_i, t_i, s_i^x, s_i^y, s_i^z)\}$.

B. Fixation Point to Motor State Correspondence

Assume that for all possible motor states, the corresponding data is recorded during the calibration data collection stage. Let $\mathbf{t} = [t_u, t_v]^T$ be the image point where we wish to fixate, defined in image I_s , an image in the calibration set \mathcal{C} . Point \mathbf{t} is initially obtained in the current view of the camera at the test time and then transferred to image I_s in the same state of the motors in the calibration set \mathcal{C} . The methods to obtain point \mathbf{t} are out of the scope of this paper, and we assume this point is given. For sample k in the calibration set, we establish the homography between I_k and I_s and use this to estimate \mathbf{c}_k , the location of the center of image I_k as viewed in I_s . We define an image-space error metric between \mathbf{c}_k and \mathbf{t} to define the closest \mathbf{c}_k in I_s . Here, we use the Cartesian distance in image space as this metric. The discrete nature of the sampling process means that the closest \mathbf{c}_k may correspond to an unseen view. Thus, we utilize some interpolation process to estimate \mathbf{c}_k for unseen views. This is accomplished by identifying \mathbf{c}_k that are near \mathbf{t} and interpolating over that set.

C. Finding Correspondences of Image Centers

We aim to determine point \mathbf{c}_k in image I_s , which corresponds to the center of image I_k . We accomplish this by estimating a homography from image I_k to image I_s . A homography relates two images in two cases: when the captured scene is a planar surface in 3D space or when the camera undergoes pure rotation [37].

The ChArUco board is visible in both images and forms a planar region in them, enabling us to estimate a homography that maps between them. Let $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_r\}$ and $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r\}$ be corresponding corners of the ChArUco board in the images I_s and I_k , respectively. We use these correspondences to estimate the homography matrix \mathbf{H}_k from image I_k to image I_s . Thus, we have:

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}_j = \mathbf{H}_k \bar{\mathbf{b}}_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, r \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_j$ and $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_j$ are the homogeneous coordinates of \mathbf{a}_j and \mathbf{b}_j , respectively.

TABLE II
Performance Evaluation

Method	Saccade Error	Saccade Speed (deg/sec)	Motor Res (degree)	Assumes Precise Robot ⁽¹⁾
Human	(2)	Up to 700 [35]	N/A ⁽³⁾	N/A
DIJIT	1.13°	Up to 600	1	No
Manfredi [11]	1.57°	Up to 120	N/R ⁽⁴⁾	Yes
Van Opstal [24]	1.47°	344	N/R	Yes
iCub [38]	< 1°	Up to 50	0.005	Yes
COG [12]	< 1 pixel	Up to 360	0.125	No
Tombatossals [14]	> 5 pixels	N/R	N/R	Yes
Schenck [32]	1 pixel	N/R	N/R	Yes
OREO [15]	N/R	Up to 535	0.036	Yes

⁽¹⁾ "Assumes Precise Robot" means whether the method assumes the alignment of the camera, eye frame, and motors. ⁽²⁾ Reported human saccade errors vary from 0.6° to 2.89° depending on different factors, such as the target eccentricity, saccade direction, and task and experiment conditions [39], [40], [41], [42]. ⁽³⁾ N/A stands for Not Applicable. ⁽⁴⁾ N/R stands for Not Reported.

We assume that the camera rotates around its center; therefore, although this homography is obtained for a planar surface covering only part of the images, it relates all pixels between the two images. Thus, we apply this homography to the image center \mathbf{p} in I_k to determine its corresponding point \mathbf{c}_k in I_s :

$$\bar{\mathbf{c}}_k = \mathbf{H}_k \bar{\mathbf{p}} \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_k$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ are homogeneous coordinates of \mathbf{c}_k and \mathbf{p} , respectively.

D. Interpolation of Unseen Motor States

A range of different interpolation processes is possible, given the nature of the discrete sampling process. Here, we sample over pan and tilt uniformly, suggesting a bilinear interpolation. When I_s is among the sampled data in the calibration set \mathcal{C} , we identify the four closest samples to the planned saccade direction and interpolate to find the best pan and tilt. When I_s is not in \mathcal{C} , we identify the four closest samples to I_s , consider point \mathbf{t} in them, find the best pan and tilt to fixate on \mathbf{t} in each of them, and interpolate them to obtain the best pan and tilt to fixate on \mathbf{t} in I_s .

V. Experimental Results

We evaluate the saccade method using the left camera of DIJIT. To conform with the other methods to which we compare, we assume that the camera is fixated on the image center. In the experiments we conducted, an ArUco marker was placed in front of the camera view, and its center detected using OpenCV. After executing a saccade, the center of the ArUco marker was detected again for performance evaluation. To plan the next saccade, the location of the ArUco marker was

changed with respect to the current camera view; hence, the start direction of the next saccade was the end direction of the current saccade. The placement of the ArUco marker was sampled such that the distribution of the target eccentricities would be similar to that of humans. Specifically, 58% of the saccades were within 6° of the image center, 33% between 6° and 12°, and 9% between 12° and 18°. This distribution approximates the distribution of human saccade amplitudes, as described in [43].

Saccade error is defined as the angle between the back-projected ray of the landing point and that of the image center. A landing point is the location of the target point after executing the saccade, which should be at the image center. We conducted 191 trials in total. The average saccadic error was 1.13°, which is an acceptable value compared to human saccade error. Different values are reported for human saccade errors in the literature depending on various factors, such as the target eccentricity, saccade direction, and task and experiment conditions. In [39], the error for saccades of amplitude 10° is reported as 2.89° when a distractor is present and 1.17° in the absence of a distractor. In [40], the reported error for 8° rightward horizontal saccades is 1.2° for long latency and 0.6° for short latency. In [41], for saccades of amplitude 10° leftward horizontally, the error is reported as 1.25°, for 6° leftward it is 0.79°, and for 6° rightward it is 1.11°. Note that human saccades are most accurate along the horizontal direction. In [42], the median saccadic error for flashed targets is 0.93° horizontally and 1.1° vertically, and for visible targets it is 0.59° horizontally and 0.60° vertically. The median error of our method is 0.72° horizontally and 0.41° vertically.

In Table II, we compare our results with previously reported saccade results from the literature. Some methods [24], [38] are only evaluated in simulation. Simulations may involve many simplifications and may not account for mechanical and physical limitations and for deviations when manufacturing and assembling the robot; therefore, the results may vary significantly when applied to real robots. In these simulations, the error reported in [24] is 1.47°; and while the mean error reported in [38] is less than 1°, the error was calculated after a corrective saccade. DIJIT's error after a corrective saccade is 0.96°. A corrective saccade is a saccade executed after a primary saccade to reduce its error [31].

For [12], [14], and [32], the saccade error is reported in pixels, not in angular terms. Pixel error is not an ideal measure for estimating error because its significance varies depending on the pixel size of the camera sensor and the focal length of the lens. We converted these pixel errors into angular errors using the camera and lens information provided by the authors. In [12], where less than one pixel of error in fixation is reported, the images are 120×120 pixels, and the field of view is

115.8°×88.6°. Based on these values, one pixel distance from the image center is between 0.93° and 1.52°, which is comparable to our results. [32] operates on images resembling retinal images and reports an error equivalent to 1.8% of the size of a plain image or one pixel in an image of size 100. We were not able to convert this value into an equivalent angular error based on the information provided in their paper. [14] report that their best performance among different parameters was 0.47 and 5 pixels of error for binocular and monocular cases, respectively, in simulation; and 3.70 pixels of error for the binocular case in the real robot. They do not report the monocular result for the real robot; however, they report that the pixel size of their camera sensor in the real robot is 4.65 μ m, and the focal length of the lens is 5mm. 3.70 pixels of binocular error in the real robot is equivalent to 0.2°. Considering a similar relative difference between binocular and monocular performances in simulation and real robot, we expect the monocular result in the real robot not to be better than our result.

The maximum saccade speed of DIJIT surpasses all other reported values in Table II. Although the motor encoders used in DIJIT do not have as high a resolution as encoders used in other binocular heads, we obtain better or comparable accuracies in executing saccades. This indicates the strong performance of DIJIT and the accuracy of the saccade method.

On average, the error for saccades with smaller amplitudes was less than that for larger amplitudes measured in degrees. The average error for saccades with an amplitude less than 6° was 0.93°, for saccades with an amplitude between 6° and 12°, it was 1.41°, and for large saccades with an amplitude between 12° and 18° it was 1.62°. No saccades performed in our experiments were larger than 18°.

The distribution of the target’s eccentricity in our experiments is very similar to that in humans. When humans are asked to freely look at images displayed on a monitor [43], 52% of the saccades are between 0° and 6°, 33% are between 6° and 12°, 11% are between 12° and 18°, and 4% are larger than 18°. DIJIT’s performance has a mean performance comparable to that of humans. After conducting a corrective saccade, the average error for DIJIT is decreased to 0.96° (0.77° for 0°-6°, 1.16° for 6°-12°, and 1.36° for 12°-18°).

We also considered fixation errors in the horizontal and vertical directions. Consider a 2D coordinate system on the image where its center is the image center, and the axes are aligned with the horizontal and vertical borders of the image. We projected the landing points onto these two axes and calculated the angle between the back-projected rays of these projections and the image center. The average horizontal and vertical errors in the 191 experiments were 0.90° and 0.54°, respectively.

Fig. 5 shows landing points after completing saccades in our experiments. The landing point of a perfect saccade should be at the center, (0°, 0°). The field of view




Fig. 5. Landing points after saccade executions (191 fixations). (a) An image of similar size to DIJIT images, the green circle is centered at the image center and has a radius of 1°. (b) A zoomed-in portion of the center of the image in (a).

of each of DIJIT’s cameras is approximately 40°×30° (H×V). Fig. 5a shows an image that is the same size as DIJIT’s camera images. The green circle is centered in the image center and has a radius of 1°. Fig. 5b is a zoomed-in view of Fig. 5a.

Over 191 experiments, for 58% of saccades, the error after completing the primary saccade is less than 1° (inside the green circle in Fig. 5), and for 90% of saccades, the error is less than 2°. For the remaining 10% of cases, the error is greater than 2°, which typically occurred when the starting point of the saccade was far from the image center. Fig. 6a plots the subset of the 191 saccades in which the error is 2° or greater. Here, the saccade is plotted showing the starting position prior to the saccade in blue with the final position, which should ideally be at (0°, 0°), in red. The two green circles centered on the image center have radii 1° and 2°. Fig. 6b shows the subset of all 191 saccades in which the saccade error is less than 1°. The two green circles are centered at the image center and have radii of 6° and 12°.

VI. Discussion and Future Work

This paper introduces the DIJIT binocular robotic head. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first open-source robotic head with full nine mechanical degrees of freedom and four optical degrees of freedom with a baseline close to human specification. It is well-suited for active vision tasks and for evaluating theories in cognitive science and neuroscience. It is straightforward and affordable to replicate DIJIT: the design and software are open source, and the hardware and 3D printing parts are inexpensive.

We developed a saccade algorithm to drive the cameras in the head. We demonstrate performance similar to that found in humans and provide a comparison between saccade performance with DIJIT relative to published performance of other robot heads in the literature.

Numerous existing saccade methods typically assume that the robot is highly precise: the camera’s coordinate system, the camera frame’s rotational axes, and the rotating axes of the motors are all perfectly aligned. The method described here does not depend on these assumptions and, as a result, inherently avoids the




Fig. 6. Saccade errors: blue and red points indicate the points before and after the saccade, respectively. (a) Saccades with larger than 2° of error, the green circles are centered at the image center and have radii of 1° and 2° . (b) Saccades with smaller than 1° of error, the green circles are centered at the image center and have radii of 6° and 12° .

need for precise axis alignment. Instead, a data-driven approach is used to map from pan and tilt motor states to image coordinates, coupled with an interpolation process. Performance results indicate the accuracy of the approach.

Ongoing work on DIJIT includes work on binocular saccades, the development of active binocular 3D reconstruction algorithms, and the deployment of the device within an autonomous system to support wheelchair-bound individuals.

References

- [1] R. Bajcsy, Y. Aloimonos, and J. K. Tsotsos, "Revisiting active perception," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 42, pp. 177–196, 2018.
- [2] J. M. Findlay and I. D. Gilchrist, *Active Vision*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [3] J. A. Placed, J. Strader, H. Carrillo, N. Atanasov, V. Indelman, L. Carlone, and J. Castellanos, "A survey on active simultaneous localization and mapping: State of the art and new frontiers," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics (T-RO)*, vol. 39, pp. 1686–1705, 2023.
- [4] Y. Guan and A. Kanazaki, "Active object recognition with trained multi-view based 3D object recognition network," in 2nd Workshop on Mobile Manipulation and Embodied Intelligence at IEEE ICRA, Yokohama, Japan, 2024.
- [5] J. M. Tenenbaum, A. C. Kay, T. O. Binford, G. Falk, J. A. Feldman, G. Grape, R. Paul, K. K. Pingle, I. Sobel, and R. F. Sproull, "A laboratory for hand-eye research," in *IFIP Congress (1)*, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, 1971, pp. 206–210.
- [6] H. P. Moravec, "The stanford cart and the CMU rover," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 71, pp. 872–884, 1983.
- [7] M. J. Gray, A. Blangero, J. P. Herman, J. Wallman, and M. R. Harwood, "Adaptation of naturally paced saccades," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, vol. 111, pp. 2343–2354, 2014.
- [8] M. Jenkin, "Evolution of robotic heads," in *Computer Vision*, K. Ikeuchi, Ed., 2021, pp. 406–409.
- [9] N. Banerjee, X. Long, R. Du, F. Polido, S. Feng, C. G. Atkeson, M. Gennert, and T. Padi, "Human-supervised control of the atlas humanoid robot for traversing doors," in *IEEE-RAS Int. Conf. Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*, Seoul, South Korea, 2015, pp. 722–729.
- [10] S. J. Yi, S. G. McGill, L. Vadakedathu, Q. He, I. Ha, J. Han, H. Song, M. Rouleau, B. T. Zhang, D. Hong, M. Yim, and D. D. Lee, "Team THOR's entry in the DARPA robotics challenge trials 2013," *J. Field Robot.*, vol. 32, pp. 315–335, 2015.
- [11] L. Manfredi, E. Maini, P. Dario, C. Laschi, B. Girard, N. Tabareau, and A. Berthoz, "Implementation of a neurophysiological model of saccadic eye movements on an anthropomorphic robotic head," in *IEEE-RAS Int. Conf. Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*, Genova, Italy, 2006, pp. 438–443.
- [12] R. A. Brooks, C. Breazeal, M. Marjanović, B. Scassellati, and M. M. Williamson, "The COG project: Building a humanoid robot," in *Computation for Metaphors, Analogy, and Agents*, C. L. Nehaniv, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 52–87.
- [13] R. Beira, M. Lopes, M. Praca, J. Santos-Victor, A. Bernardino, G. Metta, F. Becchi, and R. Saltaren, "Design of the robot-cub (iCub) head," in *IEEE ICRA*, Orlando, FL, USA, 2006, pp. 94–100.
- [14] M. Antonelli, A. J. Duran, E. Chinellato, and A. P. Del Po-bil, "Learning the visual-oculomotor transformation: Effects on saccade control and space representation," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems (RAS)*, vol. 71, pp. 13–22, 2015.
- [15] S. Huber, B. Selby, and B. Tripp, "OREO: An open-hardware robotic head that supports practical saccades and accommodation," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters (RA-L)*, vol. 3, pp. 2640–2645, 2018.
- [16] K. Pahlavan and J. O. Eklundh, "A head-eye system—analysis and design," *CVGIP: Image Understanding*, vol. 56, pp. 41–56, 1992.
- [17] Y. Kuniyoshi, S. Rougeaux, O. Stasse, G. Cheng, and A. Nagakubo, "A humanoid vision system for versatile interaction," in *Biologically Motivated Computer Vision*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000, pp. 512–526.
- [18] E. Samson, D. Laurendeau, M. Parizeau, S. Comtois, J. F. Allan, and C. Gosselin, "The Agile stereo pair for active vision," *Machine Vision and Applications*, vol. 17, pp. 32–50, 2006.
- [19] X. Zhang, "An object tracking system based on human neural pathways of binocular motor system," in *International Conference on Control, Automation, Robotics and Vision*, Singapore, 2006, pp. 1–8.
- [20] Y. Kuniyoshi and A. Nagakubo, "Humanoid as a research vehicle into flexible complex interaction," in *IEEE/RSJ IROS*, Innovative Robotics for Real-World Applications., Grenoble, France, 1997, pp. 811–820.
- [21] D. Fan, X. Chen, T. Zhang, X. Chen, G. Liu, H. M. Owais, H. Kim, Y. Tian, W. Zhang, and Q. Huang, "Design of anthropomorphic robot bionic eyes," in *Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO)*, 2017, pp. 2050–2056.
- [22] E. Milius, M. Jenkin, and J. K. Tsotsos, "Design and performance of trish, a binocular robot head with torsional eye movements," *Int. J. Pattern Recognit. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 7, pp. 51–68, 1993.
- [23] D. Biamino, G. Cannata, M. Maggiali, and A. Piazza, "MAC-EYE: a tendon driven fully embedded robot eye," in *IEEE-RAS Int. Conf. Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*, San Diego, Cali, USA, 2005, pp. 62–67.
- [24] R. Javanmard Alitappeh, A. John, B. Dias, A. J. Van Opstal, and A. Bernardino, "Emergence of human oculomotor behavior in a cable-driven biomimetic robotic eye using optimal control," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*, vol. 16, pp. 1546–1560, 2024.
- [25] G. Cannata, M. D'Andrea, and M. Maggiali, "Design of a humanoid robot eye: Models and experiments," in *IEEE-RAS Int. Conf. Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*, Genova, Italy, 2006, pp. 151–156.
- [26] M. D. Solbach and J. K. Tsotsos, "The psychophysics of human three-dimensional active visuospatial problem-solving," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, p. 19967, 2023.
- [27] N. A. Dodgson, "Variation and extrema of human interpupillary distance," in *Proceedings of SPIE - The International Society for Optical Engineering*, Stereoscopic displays and virtual reality systems XI, San Jose, CA, USA, 2004, pp. 36–46.
- [28] W. J. Lee, J. H. Kim, Y. U. Shin, S. Hwang, and H. W. Lim, "Differences in eye movement range based on age and gaze direction," *EYE*, vol. 33, pp. 1192–1192, 2019.
- [29] B. Scassellati, "A binocular, foveated active vision system," *A.I. Memo*, 1999.
- [30] F. Kadner, T. Thomas, D. Hoppe, and C. A. Rothkopf, "Improving saliency models' predictions of the next fixation

- with humans' intrinsic cost of gaze shifts," in IEEE/CVF WACV, Waikoloa, HI, USA, 2023, pp. 2103–2113.
- [31] W. Becker and A. F. Fuchs, "Further properties of the human saccadic system: Eye movements and correction saccades with and without visual fixation points," *Vision Research*, vol. 9, pp. 1247–1258, 1969.
 - [32] W. Schenck, "Robot studies on saccade-triggered visual prediction," *New Ideas in Psychology*, vol. 31, pp. 221–238, 2013.
 - [33] M. Mulas, M. Zhan, and J. Conradt, "Integration of biological neural models for the control of eye movements in a robotic head," in *Biomimetic and Biohybrid Systems*. Springer International Publishing, 2015, vol. 9222, pp. 231–242.
 - [34] M. Marjanovic, B. Scassellati, and M. Williamson, "Self-taught visually-guided pointing for a humanoid robot," in *From Animals to Animats 4: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior*, 1996, pp. 35–44.
 - [35] B. L. Zuber, L. Stark, and G. Cook, "Microsaccades and the velocity-amplitude relationship for saccadic eye movements," *Science*, vol. 150, pp. 1459–1460, 1965.
 - [36] S. Garrido-Jurado, R. Muñoz-Salinas, F. J. Madrid-Cuevas, and M. J. Marín-Jiménez, "Automatic generation and detection of highly reliable fiducial markers under occlusion," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 47, pp. 2280–2292, 2014.
 - [37] R. Hartley and A. Zisserman, *Multiple View Geometry in Computer Vision*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
 - [38] W. Muhammad and M. W. Spratling, "A neural model of binocular saccade planning and vergence control," *Adaptive Behavior*, vol. 23, pp. 265–282, 2015.
 - [39] M. J. Schut, N. Van Der Stoep, J. H. Fabius, and S. Van Der Stigchel, "Feature integration is unaffected by saccade landing point, even when saccades land outside of the range of regular oculomotor variance," *Journal of Vision*, vol. 18, pp. 1–17, 2018.
 - [40] E. Zimmermann, M. C. Morrone, and D. Burr, "Adaptation to size affects saccades with long but not short latencies," *Journal of Vision*, vol. 16, p. 2, 2016.
 - [41] N. M. Hanning, M. Szinte, and H. Deubel, "Visual attention is not limited to the oculomotor range," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 116, pp. 9665–9670, 2019.
 - [42] A. Z. Zivotofsky, K. G. Rottach, L. Averbuch-Heller, A. A. Kori, C. W. Thomas, L. F. Dell'Osso, and R. J. Leigh, "Saccades to remembered targets: the effects of smooth pursuit and illusory stimulus motion," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, vol. 76, pp. 3617–3632, 1996.
 - [43] B. W. Tatler, R. J. Baddeley, and B. T. Vincent, "The long and the short of it: Spatial statistics at fixation vary with saccade amplitude and task," *Vision Research*, vol. 116, pp. 217–241, 2006.