1 Introduction

The inverted pendulum has widely established itself in technical literature as a platform for demonstration of control theory and practice. A relatively recent offshoot of the classical inverted pendulum is the WIP, popularized in contemporary culture by the Segway Personal Transporter [1,2]. There have been other WIPs of varying architectures that have been successfully designed and constructed. Perhaps the first implementation of a WIP is described by Nakajima et al. [3] and Ha and Yuta [4]. Another WIP was described by Grasser et al. [5] and there are numerous other examples and variants [6,7] of WIPs used as teaching and research platforms. The Ballbot [8–10] perhaps deserves a special mention as an omni-directional WIP that balances on a sphere.

The performance of a WIP is greatly affected by its electromechanical design and construction. Yet, models for WIPs do not account for the full complexity of the construction of the platform. Most models use four states, the minimum necessary to describe WIP dynamics with a linear model. As a result, feedback gains computed via linear quadratic regulator (LQR), pole placement, or other techniques do not result in desired performance. For example, Lauwers et al. [8] derive stable LQR feedback gains for the Ballbot; however, they report having to manually adjust one of the gain terms to be able to balance successfully without limit cycling. Grasser et al. [5] derive their gains using pole placement and use experimental data to justify their selection of poles; however, the authors also describe the presence of backlash chattering on higher gains. Akesson et al. [7] describe the addition of a hysteresis based friction compensation term to the standard full state feedback controller to avoid limit cycling. In a series of papers [11–14] dealing with parametric and frictional nonlinearities in WIPs, authors Li, Yang, and Zhang describe a set of adaptive control techniques in conjunction with learning systems such as neural networks and support vector machine to design stable bounded controllers.

In this paper, we address the question of WIP design. Specifically, we model five design choices that influence WIP performance:

1. Effect of tire visco-elasticity on balancing behavior
2. Effect of velocity filters
3. Limit cycle compensation for WIPs
4. Effect of voltage versus current control for DC motors in WIPs
5. Effect of motor gearing

In particular, we study how the above design choices affect performance of WIPs. We do not intend to derive complete mathematical models/proofs of the above aspects of design, rather we study design tradeoffs that affect performance. Our goal is to provide insight that enables the WIP designer to develop a machine best suited to his or her application. A block diagram of the architecture of a typical WIP is shown in Fig. 1, highlighting thematically the design choices under investigation in this paper.

We organize this paper as follows: first, we describe our experimental platform and its architecture. We then describe the analytical and experimental methodology we use to make comparisons. Following this, we study the effects of each of the WIP design aspects listed above. We then proceed to discuss the implications of our results on the design of WIPs and finally we conclude by discussing possible avenues of future investigation.

2 Experimental Platform

Our balancing machine “Charlie” is shown in Fig. 2(a). Charlie is a “cluster wheel” balancing machine with three wheels on each
Fig. 2 (a) Charlie—balancing and (b) system architecture
side of the vehicle arranged in a triangular cluster. This is so
designed to allow the robot to balance on two wheels and also rest
statically stable on four wheels. While Charlie can transition
between two and four wheel modes, we solely describe the two
wheel balancing behavior in this paper.

Mechanical movement of wheels is controlled using pulse-
width modulated (PWM) voltages. The drive system consists of a
series of gear heads and timing belts attached to the motors and
wheels. The drive system is geared and nonbackdrivable. Note
that while we can independently control wheels on either side of
the robot, for the purposes of this paper, we link them mechani-
cally with a common drive axle to avoid out-of-plane motions and
to examine dynamics of interest.

The robot is controlled via a tether which is suspended from the
ceiling to minimize disturbance forces. All motor control and sen-
sor data is sent over two RS-232 links. One link interfaces with a
peripheral interface controller microcontroller which transmits in-
ternal measurement units data to the control personal computer
(PC), the other link is connected to the motor controllers. The
motors are driven via motor control modules (PIC-Servo SC, Jef-
frey Kerr, Berkeley, CA) on board the robot and batteries are
also carried on board. A PC issues supervisory commands over a
user datagram protocol link to the Control PC, this link is used for
high level commands such as commanding cluster angle changes
and for logging data from the robot. A schematic representation
of the system architecture is described in Fig. 2(a).

3 Comparison Methodology
In making performance comparisons for a WIP, we first identify
a performance metric. The closed loop performance of a WIP,
such as rise time, overshoot, etc., is determined by the location of
the closed loop poles. To compare analytically the performance of
a WIP over variations in tire damping, gearing ratio, and motor
control schemes, we compute closed loop gains required to main-
tain fixed pole locations. We view a lowering of control gains
while maintaining pole locations as a desirable quality. Lower
control gains will allow the system to operate in a linear region
for larger error signals since actuator saturation will occur at
larger error values. Additionally, they indicate that better perform-
ance, i.e., faster responses may be attainable at higher gains.

In making performance comparisons for a WIP, we are con-
strained by the dimensionality of the WIP control system. The
Lagrangian equations and linearized system models with numeri-
cal values used in this paper are detailed in the Appendix for
reference. The linearized model for a WIP is a four state system
(Eq. (A3) in the Appendix) which makes closed form analytical
expressions exceedingly complex. Therefore, for analysis, we use
numerical values given in the Appendix (Table 4). The procedure
used to carry out our analysis is described below:

1. We form linearized state matrices by using the numerical
values used in Table 4 (in the Appendix).

2. We then use the pole-placement technique to estimate feed-
back gains at fixed pole locations while varying parameters
under study.

For consistency throughout this paper, we design all linearized
controllers to have poles at locations given by Eq. (1). Note that
any other pole location could be chosen for the same purpose and
in our experience our numerical results remain valid as long as
stable pole locations are chosen. Additionally, in analyzing vari-
ous aspects of design discussed in this paper, we also present
results from the simulation of an ideal WIP with no noise and ac-
tuator saturation. These theoretical simulations parallel our exper-
imental observations and indicate that our results can be
generalized to any WIP design:

\[
\begin{align*}
    p_1 &= -7.0867 + 0.3005i \\
    p_2 &= -7.0867 - 0.3005i \\
    p_3 &= -1.2323 + 1.1338i \\
    p_4 &= -1.2323 - 1.1338i
\end{align*}
\]

To determine the relative performance of WIPs experimentally,
we employ the phase diagram. Since the WIP has two degrees of
freedom, pitch and wheel position, we analyze two separate phase
portraits. These are pitch angle versus pitch rate and wheel posi-
tion versus wheel velocity. Improved performance is indicated by
smaller orbits, whereas larger orbits indicate large limit cycles in
pitch and wheel position.

4 Effect of Tire Visco-Elasticity on Balancing
Behavior
Visco-elasticity and other rolling phenomena in tires has been
the subject of extensive research. An introductory survey of tire
models is described by Fraggstedt [15]. Visco-elastic properties
contribute to “damping” in rolling tires and are described by Stutts
and Soedel [16]. Kim and Savkoor [17] examine three different
damping models of tires. A document prepared by the NTSB [18]
describes an increase in rolling resistance with speed and also
describes the lowering of rolling resistance with temperature. It
may be these two competing effects that reflect the common
notion that rolling resistance is independent of speed [15]. Note
that almost all studies on rolling tires were performed on vehicles
designed to move faster than WIPs. To the best of our knowledge,
the analysis presented by Thacker and Kauzlarich [19] for wheel-
chair tires is closest to what we desire for WIPs. The authors eval-
uate various models to estimate tire losses in wheelchairs coming
to the conclusion that a combined hysteresis and visco-elastic loss
model may be most appropriate. Based on this, for our analysis,
we assume that tires exhibit an oppositional viscous torque to roll-
ing motion at low velocities. To verify the accuracy of this
assumption, we present experimental evidence subsequently.

We first describe analytically the basis for enhanced perfor-
ance with soft tires. We then provide experimental evidence of
viscous damping between soft tires and the ground while rolling
and finally demonstrate reduced limit cycles when our experimen-
tal WIP, Charlie is balancing on soft tires. In addition to tire-
ground damping, we also investigate drive train viscous friction in
a similar manner and we will present both results in this section.

To model the effect of these damping terms, we derive the equa-
tions of motion with the following damping torques:

\[
\tau_w = B_w \dot{\phi}
\]
where \( \phi \) and \( \theta \) are the angular positions of the wheel and the pendulum, respectively, as described in the Appendix. \( \tau_w \) is the damping torque caused by the visco-elasticity of the tire and \( \tau_{wp} \) is the torque due to the drive train. The equations of motion derived with these assumptions are given as follows:

\[
\tau_w = B_{wp} (\phi - \dot{\theta})
\]  

(3)

\[
-gL M_b \sin(\theta) + \dot{\theta}(J_b + L^2 M_b) + \dot{\phi} B_{wp} - \dot{\phi} B_{wp} + T = 0
\]  

(4)

\[
(J_b + L^2 M_b) (\dot{\phi} (R^2 (M_b + M_w) + J_w) + \dot{\phi} (B_w + B_{wp}) - \dot{\theta} B_{wp} - T)
\]

\[-LR M_b (\dot{\theta}^2 \sin(\theta) (J_b + L^2 M_b) + \cos(\theta) (B_{wp} (\dot{\theta} - \dot{\phi}) + T))
\]

\[+ gL^2 R M_b^2 \sin(\theta) \cos(\theta) = 0
\]  

(5)

To analytically determine the effect of tire–ground and drive train damping, we vary \( B_w \) and \( B_{wp} \) in the range \([0, 1]\) while keeping the other zero and recomputing gains required to keep the poles in the locations \( p_1, p_2, p_3, \) and \( p_4 \) given by Eq. (1).

We see from Fig. 3 that tire–ground damping has a desirable effect. This is evident from the reduction in gains with increasing \( B_w \) and \( B_{wp} \). Physically, we attribute this to the slower rate at which the WIP “falls” due to opposition to rolling in the tires. However, Fig. 3 does show a resonancelike peak but discounting this narrow spike in gain, which is a pole-zero elimination, increasing tire damping results in a general trend of reducing controller gains. Figures 3(e) and 3(f) also show the simulated output of the WIP to a disturbance. Note the reduction in the magnitude of the transient response when tire–ground damping is introduced.

4.1 Experimental Evidence of Tire Ground Damping. We have now described the analytical basis for increased performance
on account of tire–ground damping. In this section, we present experimental results that indicate the presence of viscous damping between tire and ground. To test tires for viscous damping, we use the experimental setup in Fig. 4. Figure 4(c) shows an instrumented cart with a steel bar as load. The cart is fitted with an optical encoder to capture position and velocity data.

We use this setup to test two types of tires, the tire on the left in Fig. 4(a) is a soft RC car tire with a foam insert, whereas the tire on the right is a stiff plastic wheel with a thin neoprene covering. To characterize the rolling behavior of either tire, we roll the cart down a 3 deg slope while recording position and velocity. The bearings supporting the axles in the cart have low viscous damping. To account for the possibility that the experiment may also capture effects of damping in bearings in addition to the tire–ground damping, we test the soft tires against the stiff plastic wheels. Hence, comparison between soft tires and hard wheels should yield contrasting results in spite of the damping at the bearings.

Our hypothesis is that if the soft tire exhibits viscous damping, then the velocity of the cart down the slope will be described by a two term exponential curve of the form given by Eq. (6). However, if there is very little tire–ground damping, the velocity versus time curve will be a straight line described by Eq. (7).

\[
\begin{align*}
    v & = v_T (1 - e^{-Bt}) \\
    v & = g \sin(\theta) \times t
\end{align*}
\]  

(6)  

(7)

Figure 5 shows the results of our tests, each curve displayed is the average of three trials. In all cases, with no load, 0.912 kg, and 2.220 kg loads, the cart fitted with soft tires rolls slower. Additionally, the curves obtained using softer tires have an unmistakable exponential shape to them. A two term exponential also fits the data better than a straight line fit. This can be seen from Table 1 which shows the residual sum of squares (RSS) for both the exponential and linear fits. We see from the plots that the damping is also load dependent, with the cart rolling slower with increasing load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curve</th>
<th>RSS—exponential fit</th>
<th>RSS—linear fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No load soft tires</td>
<td>0.215712</td>
<td>4.886807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No load hard tires</td>
<td>0.449012</td>
<td>4.165307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.912 kg soft tires</td>
<td>1.122077</td>
<td>4.189834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.912 kg hard tires</td>
<td>0.277047</td>
<td>1.106508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.220 kg soft tires</td>
<td>0.809054</td>
<td>3.584972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.220 kg hard tires</td>
<td>0.169956</td>
<td>0.648381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To compare the performance of the WIP with soft tires and hard tires, we mount both tires on Charlie our experimental WIP and require the control loop to stabilize the pendulum at zero pitch angle and constant ground position. We then compare the phase portraits of both the wheel position and the pitch angle.

Figure 6 shows phase plots in pendulum and wheel positions for Charlie operated with both soft tires and hard plastic wheel. We see a substantial reduction in limit cycling behavior in

4.2 Experimental Results—Performance of Soft Tires While Balancing. In Sec. 4.1, we established the viscous damping characteristics of tire–ground interactions. In this section, we present experimental evidence of enhanced performance of a WIP balancing on soft tires.
Figs. 6(b) and 6(d) compared to Figs. 6(a) and 6(c) which correspond to operation with soft tires and hard plastic wheels respectively.

4.3 Energetics of Soft Tires. In Sec. 4.2, we have shown that soft tires enhance the performance of a WIP, we now investigate the possible tradeoffs in using soft tires. We wish to investigate the energy cost of balancing on soft tires versus hard plastic wheels. To do this, we setup two experimental scenarios:

1. Charlie is commanded to move 10 wheel revolutions ($20\pi$ rad) on horizontal ground. Figure 7(a) shows the energy consumed averaged over two trials, each using hard wheels and soft tires. The upper curve clearly shows that on soft tires, the robot consumes more energy.

2. Charlie balances in position for 60 s. Figure 7(b) shows the energy consumption for three trials each with soft tires and hard wheels. In this application, we see that the energy consumed by the robot does not differ noticeably on either set of tires.

Note that the energy supplied to the motors is computed as:

$$P = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} V[n]f[n]T_s}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I[n]I[n]}$$

where $T_s$ is the sampling time, $V$ is the PWM voltage times the duty cycle, and $I$ is the current. We see from the above experiments that the energy cost of using tires depends greatly on the intended application of the WIP.

In this section, we have seen that the visco-elastic nature of tires leads to a viscous damping torque between the tire and ground. Our analytical simulations as well as experiments point to an increase in performance with increasing tire–ground damping. We also see that there is a tradeoff between energy efficiency of the WIP and tire–ground damping; however, the extent of the tradeoff depends on the nature of the task executed by the WIP. For applications involving sustained motion, soft tires that exhibit tire–ground damping are less energy efficient than hard plastic tires. However, in applications that mostly involve holding position, there is no discernible difference in energy efficiency between soft tires and hard wheels. This is because the use of soft tires results in smaller wheel limit cycles resulting in reduced energy dissipation.

We believe that our results are extensible to pneumatic tires, which also exhibit visco-elastic deformations. In this case, however, tires inflated to a lower pressure would exhibit better performance and tires inflated to higher pressures would show more limit cycling. Our results also indicate that WIPs designed for continuous motion in open environments will have better energy efficiency with tires inflated to higher pressures; for stationary applications, the tires may be inflated to lower pressures for better limit cycle performance.

5 Effects of Velocity Filtering

In Sec. 4, we investigated the effect of tires on the stability of WIPs. In this section, we discuss velocity filtering. Wheel encoders are a common feature on WIPs and backward differences estimation is the preferred method of obtaining velocity values. However, this method of velocity estimation necessitates filtering to avoid noise. While one author avoids this problem by using analog quadrature encoders [7], this technique is not wide spread in its application. In this section, we demonstrate via simulation and experiments that it is not the filter cutoffs alone that matter. We show that a mismatch in filter cutoffs between the pitch rate and wheel velocity filters can introduce large limit cycles and instabilities in WIPs.

5.1 Simulation. To simulate the effect of low pass filtering of velocity in WIPs, we turn to the planar model described by Eqs. (A1) and (A2) (in the Appendix). Additionally, we introduce a
second order low pass butter filter for velocity signals $\dot{\theta}$ and $\dot{\phi}$. As we do with other simulations described in this paper, we design the linearized controller using pole placement techniques with poles at locations given by Eq. (1). Figure 8 shows the simulated response of the WIP to various filter cutoff frequencies. From the simulated results, it is interesting to note that matched filter cutoff frequencies for wheel velocity and pitch rate do not introduce instabilities in the balancing behavior. However, a mismatch between the pitch rate cutoff and the wheel velocity cutoff where the pitch rate cutoff is significantly lower than the pitch rate cutoff can introduce instabilities as well as limit cycles. To explore if this result will also extend to real WIPs, we setup appropriate filtering on our experimental WIP system. We describe the results in Sec. 5.2 below.

5.2 Experiments. To determine the effect of mismatch in filter frequency, we setup our experiment in the following manner. We implement two separate first order digital Butterworth filters for both the pitch rate and wheel velocity signals. While balancing at a fixed position, we measure both the pitch rate and the wheel position and wheel velocity for a 30 s period. We perform three trials each, with filter frequencies set at 9.69 Hz and 28.60 Hz, i.e., both filters at 9.69 Hz and then with filters at either 9.69 Hz or 28.60 Hz. The resulting phase plots are shown in Fig. 9. Note that while we simulated cutoff frequencies of 5 Hz and 50 Hz in Sec. 5.1, experimentally we start seeing limit cycles and instabilities as soon as we reduce the filter cutoffs to 9.69 Hz and 28.6 Hz. This difference is probably on account of parameter uncertainties and unmodeled nonlinearities.

We see that the experimental results in Fig. 9 are in broad agreement with the behavior predicted by simulations. We can see that the system is stable with both cutoff frequencies set to 9.69 Hz. However, Figs. 9(c) and 9(f) clearly show an unstable system when the cutoff of the wheel velocity filter cutoff is higher than the pitch rate filter cutoff. Our analytical simulations indicate that the matching of pitch rate and velocity filters is essential to ensure good limit cycle performance. While setting a pitch rate filter cutoff lower than the wheel velocity cutoff can work under most conditions, there is a possibility of inducing limit cycles or instabilities. We believe that the important design implication from this section is that higher filter cutoffs do not necessarily contribute to stability unless the frequency content in both the pitch and velocity rate signals is matched.

6 Limit Cycle Compensation for WIPs

In this section, we discuss another often encountered issue in WIPs, limit cycling. In practice, limit cycling is present in all WIPs; in this section, we focus on a strategy to minimize limit cycling behavior. A detailed look at the performance of the algorithm as well as the parameters affecting performance is given by Vasudevan et al. [20]. In this section, we explain the basic concepts of the algorithm and present experimental data, showing the reduction in limit cycling.

We note that in control systems designed for mechanical positioning, the most common source of limit cycles is friction. Ollsen [21] describes the effect of friction in a classical inverted pendulum and cart setup. Campbell et al. [22] analyze limit cycles generated by the presence of stick–slip friction between the inverted pendulum cart and track and design a controller to stabilize the system. There is also research [23–26] that deals with methods to stabilize an inverted pendulum exhibiting frictional limit cycles. However, based on our observations, most friction compensation techniques based on friction models in literature are complex and depend on numerical values of frictional parameters.

For WIPs, Akesson et al. [7] describe a method of compensation for coulomb friction. Our research focuses on automating the process of finding a compensation term ($V_{ac}$) added to the four state feedback equation (9) to minimize limit cycling. While Eq. (9) may look like friction compensation, the algorithm makes no attempt to model friction. Our method has been inspired by passivity-based approaches for haptic devices [27] and we borrow the idea of a “passivity” observer to measure the flow of power in and out of the system.

$$
V_{ac} = K1(\theta - \theta_{des}) + K2(\phi - \phi_{des}) + K3\dot{\theta} + K4\dot{\phi}
$$

(8)

$$
V = V_{ac} + V_{uc}\text{sign}(V_{uc})
$$

(9)

To estimate the value of $V_{uc}$, we start by measuring the power supplied by the motors to the WIP. By observing the direction of power supplied to the two degrees of freedom of the system, we determine the type of limit cycle the WIP is executing. To do this, we evaluate two power products given as follows:

![Image of simulated output of WIP response to disturbance of 0.0873 rad/s in pitch rate under the following filter configurations.](http://mechanismsrobotics.asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/)

Fig. 8 Simulated output of WIP response to disturbance of 0.0873 rad/s in pitch rate under the following filter configurations. (a) and (d) Wheel velocity filter $f_c = 5.0$ Hz and pitch rate filter $f_c = 5.0$ Hz; (b) and (e) wheel velocity filter $f_c = 5.0$ Hz and pitch rate filter $f_c = 50.0$ Hz; (c) and (f) wheel velocity filter $f_c = 50.0$ Hz and pitch rate filter $f_c = 5.0$ Hz. Note the instability of the response in plots (c) and (f).
Figure 10 shows the behavior of the WIP interpreted in terms of the sign of the power products, with the arrows showing the direction of motion of each degree of freedom. Figure 11 shows both the power products as well as the wheel and pendulum positions from experimental data. On the left side, we see limit cycles due to under-compensation. A close look at Fig. 11(a) shows that the pendulum mostly operates in quadrants III and IV. However, brief spikes of power into quadrants I and II result in limit cycles in pitch and wheel position. Our objective is to reduce limit cycling by minimizing operation in quadrants I and II.

Figure 11 also shows the effect of over-compensation on the right. An over-estimated \( V_{fc} \) term can also generate limit cycles, though of a different nature. The nature of power products during this type of limit cycle is markedly different and the power products exhibit an almost uniform distribution above and below zero. We use this difference in the nature of the power products between under-compensation and over-compensation to algorithmically tune the compensation term to minimize limit cycles. The algorithm is described in Fig. 12(a) and Table 2 explains the parameters in the algorithm. The algorithm works by increasing the compensation term \( (V_{fc}) \) if the WIP operates in quadrants I and II and by decreasing the compensation term if the power products exhibit symmetry about the zero line and exceed a threshold power \( (P_{Thd}) \). A phase plot showing the reduction in limit cycling during the runtime of the algorithm is given in Fig. 12(b).

The main advantage of the algorithm presented in this section is its robustness to parameter variations in WIPs such as tensioner variability, battery voltage, etc. Its implementation is simple and can be an easy addition to common full state feedback controllers employed in WIPs.

7 Effect of Voltage Versus Current Control

In design of control systems for WIPs, DC electric motors are usually the primary actuators. Two control techniques for DC motors are current (or torque) control and voltage (or velocity) control. A WIP design must implement either of these control paradigms and in this section we present results that indicate that the voltage controlled motors may offer a simpler alternative while maintaining the same performance as current controlled motors.

\[
P_p \propto \tau \dot{\theta} \\
\propto V \dot{\theta} \\
P_w \propto \tau \dot{\phi} \\
\propto V \dot{\phi}
\]

(10) (11)
A majority of WIP platforms in research have implemented current controllers [3,5,9] while voltage controlled platforms [7] are fewer. Equation (13) along with Table 3 shows a simple model that ignores motor inductance. We also note that numerically \( k_e = \frac{kt}{Ra} \), as we shall use this in our simulations later in this section.

Equations (12) and (13) are the basis for the control of DC motors. Equation (13) represents the voltage control of DC motors. In this case, the torque output is influenced by the back-emf due to rotor motion. Torque control for DC motors requires a current feedback control system to maintain a constant armature current which can be implemented with either an analog or digital control loop. In practice, at large angular velocities, this control loop can saturate and back emf effects can still appear. However, in our analysis, we will assume a perfect torque control system. Equation (12) therefore describes the ideal current controller.

To study the effect of the two motor control techniques on WIP performance, we set up the following analytical simulation. The dynamic equation of WIP control under torque or voltage control paradigm is formed by Eqs. (12) and (13) substituted into the dynamic equations of the WIP defined by Eq. (A2) and

\[
\begin{align*}
T &= k_t i \quad \text{(12)} \\
T &= \frac{k_t}{R_a} (V - k_e \omega) \quad \text{(13)}
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 11 Two types of limit cycle behavior depending on the magnitude of the compensation term, \( V_{fc} \). From 0 to 40 s, the plots display limit cycles generated due to an underestimation of \( V_{fc} \) while from 40 to 100 s limit cycles due to and overestimation of \( V_{fc} \) are displayed. (a) Wheel and pendulum power products. The negative spikes in \( P_w \) and positive spikes of \( P_p \) between 0 and 40 s indicate deviation quadrants IV and III, and (b) pitch and wheel positions.

A majority of WIP platforms in research have implemented current controllers [3,5,9] while voltage controlled platforms [7] are fewer. Equation (13) along with Table 3 shows a simple model that ignores motor inductance. We also note that numerically \( k_e = k_t \), as we shall use this in our simulations later in this section.

![Flowchart](image_url)

Fig. 12 (a) Friction compensation algorithm and (b) phase plot of operation of compensation algorithm. Time is encoded in color with red representing \( t = 0 \) s and blending into dark gray at \( t = 35 \) s. Note the reduction in limit cycles indicated by small central dark gray orbit.

| Table 2 Parameters in limit cycle compensation algorithm |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Parameter | Description |
| \( P_{Thp} \) | Noise threshold in pendulum power-equivalent product |
| \( V_{fc} (t) \) | Friction compensation term to be estimated |
| \( \Delta \) | Amount to increment or decrement from the friction compensation term |
| \( \delta \) | Time window to perform averaging of samples, i.e., number of samples to keep in memory |
| \( P_{Thd} \) | Threshold for average energy output from the system over the last \( \delta \) samples |

| Table 3 Parameters in DC motor in Eq. (13) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Parameter | Description |
| \( i \) | Current through armature (A) |
| \( R_a \) | Resistance of armature (5.0 \( \Omega \)) |
| \( k_e \) | Voltage constant of motor (V s/rad) |
| \( k_t \) | Torque constant of motor (A s/rad) |
| \( \omega \) | Angular velocity of motor (rad/s) |
subsequently linearized into Eqs. (A4) and (A5) (in the Appendix). Now we compare change in feedback gains for motors of various torque and back-emf capabilities by varying motor constants $k_e = k_t$ while fixing closed loop pole positions (Eq. (1)). The feedback gains for torque control have the dimensions (A/rad, A s/rad) and feedback gains for current control have dimensions (V/rad, V s/rad), making a direct comparison difficult. To work around this problem, we modify the voltage control feedback gains ($K_{v1}$, $K_{v2}$, $K_{v3}$, $K_{v4}$) to ($K_{v1}/R_a$, $K_{v2}/R_a$, $K_{v3}/R_a$, $K_{v4}/R_a$). This ensures that we are making a correct dimensional comparison, while numerically corresponding to the “stall” current of a DC motor:

$$p_1 = -7.0867 + 0.3005i$$
$$p_2 = -7.0867 - 0.3005i$$
$$p_3 = -1.2323 + 1.1338i$$
$$p_4 = -1.2323 - 1.1338i$$

(14)

We see from Fig. 13 that three of the four gains required are identical between torque and velocity control schemes. The wheel velocity gain is the only gain that shows variation between the two control schemes. Given the similarity in performance, we argue that velocity control is preferable for simplicity in implementation. We can infer from the lower values for wheel velocity gains that current control may present an alternative for WIPs designed for high speed where back-emf effects are significant. In other cases, the complexity of implementing either additional analog circuitry or a high speed digital control loop makes the simpler velocity control a more attractive alternative.

8 Effect of Motor Gearing

As the results from our study of voltage and current control indicate, a sufficient actuator torque is required to maintain adequate balancing performance. However, there are two methods of achieving high actuator torque—by employing larger and more expensive motors or by using an appropriately sized gearhead. In this section, we investigate the effect of employing gearing to achieve appropriate actuator torque.

The numerical values of parameters used in this analytical simulation are described in Table 4. To analyze the effect of gearing, we include amplification of rotor inertia, torque, and back-emf effects. This is given by Eqs. (15)–(17). Additionally, we fix the closed loop poles at locations given by Eq. (14) and simulate a voltage controlled motor (Eq. (A4), in the Appendix). The results of the simulation are shown in Fig. 14.

$$J_{w\text{eff}} = J_w + J_m N^2$$

(15)

$$k_e = k_e N$$

(16)

$$k_t = k_t N$$

(17)

We see that at low gearing ratios, very large gains are required to stabilize the WIP, this can be attributed to the insufficiency of actuator torque. However, the curves even out very soon and the wheel and wheel velocity gains show a steady increase with increasing gearing ratios on the right side of the graph. To demonstrate the advantages of higher gearing, Figs. 14(e) and 14(f) shows the simulated response of a WIP to a disturbance of 0.1745 rad/s in pitch rate. Note the magnitude of overshoot of the WIP with a gearing of 200:1 as compared to the WIP with 50:1 gearing.

The analysis presented in this section indicates that if only balancing in position is to be achieved then gearing a low torque motor is an acceptable solution. While the simulation shows that an increase in gearing ratio is a good solution for WIPs, in practice increasing the gearing ratio comes with some associated problems. Primarily, the performance of the balancing system will not be robust as large ratio gear boxes offer significant friction and backlash resulting in limit cycling and backlash chattering. Additionally, if the WIP is designed for applications that require motion, then back-emf and reflected inertia effects will reduce the balancing performance of the WIP. Another result apparent from
the simulation is that once the required torque to balance a WIP is achieved, further increase in actuator torque does not enhance performance. This is inferred from the asymptotic nature of the curves in Fig. 14.

9 Conclusions and Future Work

We have described a number of experiments, analytical simulations, and results in this paper. In this section, we distill our results into design recommendations for WIP design:

(1) From our investigations, we conclude that the selection of tires greatly affects WIP performance. If the WIP is designed to hold position, then soft tires or pneumatic tires inflated to a low pressure are recommended as this contributes greatly to balancing performance. If on the other hand, the WIP is designed for constant motion, then hard tires or pneumatic tires at high pressure are desirable as they offer greater energy efficiency.

(2) The performance of the WIP is affected by the frequency content in the pitch rate and wheel velocity signals. We recommend equal filter cutoffs for both these signals as this will result in superior balancing performance. Specifically, we have seen that a low cutoff frequency for the pitch rate and high cutoff frequency for the wheel velocity results in an unstable or limit cycling WIP.

(3) We introduce a limit cycle compensation algorithm for WIPs that is simple in structure and easy to implement. The algorithm is robust to parameter variations and automatically minimizes limit cycle behavior.

(4) We have presented results indicating that voltage control of DC motors in WIPs offers the same balancing performance as current control for a lower design complexity/cost. We also describe the case of WIPs designed for high speeds where back-emf effects may make current control preferable.

(5) We have shown that increasing the motor gearing ratio as a method for achieving balancing torque is a feasible solution. However, we also note that it is a less robust solution as it is prone to backlash chattering and limit cycling.

While our results do not constitute rigorous mathematical proofs, we hope that through our simulations and experiments we can offer some insight into important aspects of WIP design. Our final aim is to assist the designer of a new WIP system faced with numerous design decisions in making choices about various subcomponents faster and with adequate knowledge of tradeoffs inherent in any engineering design.

In the future, we wish to explore other aspects of WIP design. For example, backlash chattering in WIP gearboxes is a phenomenon that limits the maximum achievable stable gain. Additionally, we believe that the structural bandwidth of the WIPs plays a role in determining balancing behavior. Knowledge of structural bandwidth can determine the optimal placement of the accelerometer and rate-gyro sensor. We hope to address these research questions in the future.

Fig. 14  (a) Pitch gain variation with gearing ratio, (b) wheel position gain with gearing ratio, (c) pitch rate gain with gearing ratio, (d) wheel velocity gain with gearing ratio, and (e) and (f) simulation of WIP response to a disturbance of 0.1745 rad/s in pitch rate with gearing ratios $N = 50$ and $N = 200$. 
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Appendix: WIP Mode and Linearized State Equations

The dynamics for the WIP have been covered in a number of papers [5,28,29] and hence we do not present the full derivation. Equations (A1) and (A2) are derived from the Lagrangian equations of the system illustrated in Fig. 15. The definitions of various parameters in Fig. 15 are described in Table 4. The table also contains values of other numerical parameters used in analytical simulations.

Linearized state matrices used in Sec. 4 are given by Eq. (A3). These equations are used to determine effect of soft tires on stability. Linearized state matrices used in Sec. 7 are given by Eq. (A5) for voltage control.

\[ \begin{align*}
-gL_M R \sin(\theta) + \dot{\theta}(J_b + L^2M_b) + T &= 0 \quad \text{(A1)} \\
gL^2 R M_b^2 \sin(\theta) \cos(\theta) + (J_b + L^2M_b) \left( \dot{\phi} \left( R^2 (M_b + M_w) + J_w \right) - T \right)
\times -L R M_b \left( \dot{\theta}^2 \sin(\theta) (J_b + L^2M_b) + T \cos(\theta) \right) &= 0
\end{align*} \tag{A2} \]

\[ F_{15} \quad \text{WIP model} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
J_b, M_b \\
n \\
\theta \nu \tau \\
J_w, M_w \\
R \\
L \\
\end{align*} \]

![Figure 15 WIP model](image)

Table 4 Simulation parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M_b</td>
<td>Mass of body</td>
<td>4.5 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_w</td>
<td>Mass of wheel</td>
<td>50 × 10^{-3} kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Distance from center of mass of wheel</td>
<td>19.2 × 10^{-2} m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Radius of wheel</td>
<td>45 × 10^{-3} m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J_b</td>
<td>Inertia of body: $M_b \times (L + R)^2$</td>
<td>25.28 × 10^{-3} kg m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J_w</td>
<td>Inertia of wheel: $M_w \times R^2/2$</td>
<td>5.0625 × 10^{-3} kg m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J_n</td>
<td>Inertia of rotor</td>
<td>5.0625 × 10^{-3} kg m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_t = K_e</td>
<td>Torque and voltage constants for motor</td>
<td>2.694 × 10^{-3} ASV rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_s</td>
<td>Sampling time</td>
<td>0.01 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\Theta</td>
<td>Angle between the WIP and vertical or pitch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\phi</td>
<td>Angle between wheel and vertical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\dot{\theta}</td>
<td>Rate of change of \theta or pitch rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\dot{\phi}</td>
<td>Wheel velocity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Torque exerted between the body and the wheel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \begin{bmatrix} a_{21} & a_{22M1} & a_{24M1} & b_{21} \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & a_{41} & a_{42M1} & a_{44M1} \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \tag{A3} \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} a_{21} & a_{22M2} & a_{24M2} & \frac{K_t}{R_{a}b_{21}} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \tag{A4} \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} a_{21} & a_{22M2} & a_{24M2} & \frac{K_t}{R_{a}b_{41}} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \tag{A5} \]