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Abstract
Robots often switch from highly dynamic motion to delivering high torques at low speeds. The actuation requirements for these two regimes are very different. As a consequence, the average efficiency of the actuators is typically much lower than the efficiency at the optimal working point. A potential solution is to use multiple motors for a single motor joint. This results in a redundant degree of freedom, which can be exploited to make the system more efficient overall. In this work, we explore the potential of kinematically redundant actuators in dynamic applications. The potential of a kinematically redundant actuator with two motors is evaluated against a single-motor equivalent in terms of operating range, maximum acceleration and energy consumption. We discuss how the comparison is influenced by the design of the actuator and the way how the power is distributed over the input motors. Our results support the idea that kinematically redundant actuators can resolve the conflicting torque-speed requirements typical of robots.
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1 Introduction

Mobile robots and wearable robotic devices are gradually entering our everyday lives. Such devices should have a long-lasting autonomy, without paying the price of carrying a heavy and bulky battery pack. The best way to achieve this is to reduce the energy consumption of the robot itself. Fortunately, electric motors, one of the prominent actuation technologies, offer very high efficiencies at their nominal working point. A motor’s efficiency, however, varies strongly with speed and torque (Tucker and Fite 2010; Verstraten et al. 2015). This is an issue in robotics, where actuators are required to operate at a wide range of working points. As a result, their motors tend to be used very inefficiently. In the MIT Cheetah robot, for example, up to 68% of the total energy was consumed by heating of the motor windings (Seok et al. 2013). Designs focusing on the reduction of motor losses can significantly improve the overall efficiency of a device. With such an approach, Brown and Ulsoy (2013) managed to decrease the energy consumption of a passive-assist device by 25%. No less than 90% of the energy savings was attributed to a more efficient use of the motor.

A well-chosen transmission can help by mapping the expected working points as closely as possible to energy-efficient part of the motor’s operating range. Nevertheless, transmissions with fixed reductions can only do so much when the working points are widely spread over the operating range. This is a typical problem of robots interacting with their environment. Tasks such as turning knobs or manipulating high payloads often require high torques from the robot’s actuators at low output speeds. As a consequence, the actuators will consist of strong motors with high reductions. When the payload is removed and the manipulator is brought back to its initial position, however, the requirement changes to delivering high speeds at low torques. The speed with which the arm can move will then be limited by the high reflected inertia resulting from the high-torque design (Babin et al. 2014).

The conflicting torque-speed requirements resulting from a loaded and a no-load phase are also a problem in legged robotics. During the stance phase, the leg needs to carry the robot’s weight, requiring high motor torques. When the foot is lifted from the ground (swing phase), the required motor torque drops considerably since the leg is now only moving its own inertia, but the motors need to work at higher speeds. This has serious consequences for the sizing and energy efficiency of the actuators. A human ankle requires hardly any power during the swing phase of walking gait, but when a motor performs the same motion, it displays considerable peak powers in this phase, even if springs are used to alleviate the requirements (Hitt et al. 2010; Verstraten et al. 2017).

A potential solution to these problems is to use variable transmissions (Sugar and Holgate 2013) or, more generally, to actuate a joint with not one, but two motors. The second motor then creates an additional, redundant, degree
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of freedom, which can be exploited to distribute the power requirements among both motors in the most energy-efficient way. With a proper design and proper control, the overall quasi-static efficiency of such an actuator can be better than that of a single motor with gear reducer (Verstraten et al. 2018). In dynamic tasks, however, the inertia of the drivetrain has a strong influence on the power flow through the motor (Verstraten et al. 2016) and may lead to high Joule losses (Plooij and Wisse 2012). This issue is very relevant for redundant actuators, considering that it consists of not one, but at least two motors. Still, the important but difficult question of how this affects their energy consumption and the ideal power distribution between the motors, is yet to be answered. This work contributes towards solving this pertinent issue by providing several insights from theory and experiments on a kinematically redundant actuator.

We start the paper by giving an overview of different types of redundant actuators, focusing on previous research on kinematically redundant actuators (Section 2). Next, we establish the equations for a kinematically redundant actuator and its optimal control (Section 3). We then discuss the design of such an actuator in terms of operating range, reflected inertia, maximum acceleration and energy consumption in a dynamic task (Section 4). In Section 5, we experimentally validate the dynamic model of the actuator by forcing harmonic oscillations onto an inertial load. Optional control is used to distribute the required speed over both motors in an energy-optimal way. The findings of the work are summarized in an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of the DMA (Section 6). We finish by concluding that kinematically redundant actuators can provide a solution for conflicting torque-speed requirements (Section 7).

2 Types of redundant actuators

Redundancy on robot-level is a well-studied topic, with a vast array of literature on over-actuated robotic arms. Redundancy on joint-level has received little attention in comparison. In this section, we provide an overview of existing concepts for redundant actuators. We divide them into four classes: statically redundant actuators, kinematically redundant actuators, Variable Stiffness Actuators and actuators with Variable Transmissions.

2.1 Statically redundant actuators

In a statically redundant actuator, an infinite number of input motor torques result in the same output torque (Müller 1982). This can be achieved in a very simple way, by coupling multiple motors to the same driveshaft. In such an arrangement, the output torque is the sum of both motor-gearbox torques. The torque that can be delivered by a motor increases with its mass to the power 1.25 (Haddadin et al. 2012). Consequently, using one large motor will generally lead to a more compact and lightweight design than two smaller motors on the same driveshaft.

Despite their unfavorable scaling with mass, statically redundant actuators may have benefits in terms of control performance and energy consumption. In the Parallel-Coupled Micro-Macro actuator concept proposed by Morrell and Salisbury (1998), a small motor is coupled directly to the load, in addition to a larger motor coupled through a compliant transmission. This actuator exhibited a good force control bandwidth and excellent force fidelity. Peak impact force, force distortion and backdrivability were also found to be better than a single-motor actuator. When combined with springs and locking mechanisms, statically redundant actuators can also offer considerable benefits in terms of energy consumption. An example is the +SPEA actuator proposed by Mathijssen et al. (2016), which consists of four motors with series springs, connected to a single output shaft. Controllable brakes allow the motors to be locked, such that springs in series with the motors act as parallel springs on the output shaft. In a blocked output experiment, this actuator managed a fourfold decrease in energy consumption compared to a single-motor alternative.

2.2 Kinematically redundant actuators

An actuator is kinematically redundant if its output speed is not uniquely determined by the speeds of the input motors (Müller 1982). One way of achieving this is to couple two motors to a single output through a differential. In this case, the output speed \( \dot{\theta}_o \) is a linear combination of the input speeds \( \dot{\theta}_1 \) and \( \dot{\theta}_2 \):

\[
\dot{\theta}_o = R_1 \dot{\theta}_1 + R_2 \dot{\theta}_2
\]

with coefficients \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) depending on the design of the differential. The static output torque, however, is divided over both inputs in a fixed ratio, determined by design.

In principle, any type of differential can be chosen to couple both motors. Differential mechanisms that have been proposed include a bevel gear differential (Hu et al. 2015; Fumagalli et al. 2014), a two-stage planetary gear differential (Fauteux et al. 2010; Gao et al. 2016) and a differential based on harmonic drives (Tagliamonte et al. 2010; Wolf and Hirzinger 2008). The most common concept by far is one that employs a planetary differential. Here, the output and the two inputs of the actuator can be assigned to any of the three output shafts of the differential. Assuming that the motors are grounded, this can be done in three possible ways. If one of the motors is allowed to be mounted to a movable component, however, 12 more actuator topologies can be created (Babin et al. 2014).

To the authors’ knowledge, the first roboticists to suggest the use of a kinematically redundant actuator were Ontaño Ruiz et al. (1998), with the aim of reducing stiction. Here, the carrier and the sun of the planetary differential were used as inputs, and the load was coupled to the output. Several important theoretical contributions about this specific configuration were made by Rabindran and Tesar. In their analysis of power flows and efficiency (Rabindran and Tesar 2008), they concluded that the efficiency of this type of actuator decreases when the reduction ratio of the planetary differential increases. Furthermore, they found that the reflected inertia of the actuator has no upper bound, while it can never be lower than the inertias of both input actuators. Another study (Rabindran and Tesar 2007) discussed the cross-coupling in the inertia matrix. The authors argued that the coupling should be minimized by design, because it causes the actuators to fight each other’s acceleration. In addition to these theoretical works, Rabindran and Tesar
Another configuration places the load on the carrier, and uses the sun and ring as inputs. This topology was used for the first time by Kim et al. (2007, 2010), where one motor was used to control the output position and the other to control the stiffness. Later, Lee and Choi (2012) explored the possibility of shaping the actuator’s operating range more favorably than that of a regular motor. In their concept, worm gears were used to prevent the motors from being backdriven. This makes their concept unsuitable for applications in robotics. More recently, Girard and Asada (2015) presented a similar actuator where the worm gears were replaced by controllable brakes. For this actuator, they developed several control strategies to divide the required power over the motors and to deal with the holding brakes (Girard and Asada 2016, 2017). Much work has also been done on impedance control (Nagai et al. 2009). A problem with these actuators in impedance control is that, in order to obtain high bandwidths, motors are required that are able to deliver high torques, but have low inertias. In order to meet these contradicting requirements, Nagai et al. (2010) proposed to equip one of both motors with a parallel spring. Nevertheless, the usage of springs in kinematically redundant actuators is quite rare, with the exception of variable stiffness actuators.

### 2.3 Variable Stiffness Actuators

Variable Stiffness Actuators (VSAs) are a variant of Series Elastic Actuators, where the stiffness can be varied. In case of a rotational actuator, they can be represented by following idealized equation:

\[ \theta_{\text{out}} = \theta_1 + \frac{T_{\text{out}}}{k(\theta_2)} \]

where \( \theta_{\text{out}} \) and \( T_{\text{out}} \) represent the output position and torque, and \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) are the input positions of the primary and secondary motor. Equation (2) shows that variable stiffness \( k(\theta_2) \) changes the kinematic relationship between the primary motor and the output. The variable stiffness \( k(\theta_2) \) is thus the redundant degree of freedom. Although exceptions exist, it is regulated by a secondary motor in the vast majority of cases (Groothuis et al. 2016).

VSAs can be classified as kinematically redundant actuators if the output torque uniquely defines the torques required from the input motors. For most VSA designs, this is not the case. For an extensive overview of VSA designs and their advantages, we refer to the excellent review papers by Vanderborght et al. (2013) and Tagliamonte et al. (2012).

### 2.4 Variable transmissions

Another way to add a redundant degree of freedom is to use a variable transmission. The actuator can then be described with following equations:

\[ \theta_{\text{out}} = \frac{\theta_1}{n(\theta_2)} \]  
\[ T_{\text{out}} = n(\theta_2)T_1 \]

In this type of actuator, the variable gear ratio – which we assume to be controlled by a secondary motor – creates the redundant degree of freedom. The variable gear ratio affects both the torque and speed, resulting in coupled kinematic and static redundancy.

Over the years, variable transmissions have proven their potential to reduce the energy consumption of cars (Carbone et al. 2001) and wind turbines (Mangialardi and Mantriota 1994). These results have sparked interest from researchers in robotics. Variable transmissions show great potential in the field of legged locomotion, prosthetics and exoskeletons. They can be used to shape a motor’s speed-torque curve more favorably for its use in ankle prostheses, enabling a more compact actuator design (Sugar and Holgate 2013). Combined with energy buffers such as springs (Stramigioli et al. 2008) or flywheels (Dresscher et al. 2015), they can also form very efficient actuation units. Simulations have shown that a knee actuator consisting of an IVT with a flywheel could reduce the actuator’s energy consumption by 85% in walking (Aló et al. 2015). Similar reductions have been reported for an IVT combined with a spring (Mooney and Herr 2013). In addition to the improved energy efficiency, variable transmissions can also help to reduce the weight of knee prostheses (Lenzi et al. 2017).

The most common CVT types, belt and chain CVTs and toroidal CVTs, tend to have issues with rapid changes in gear ratio (Srivastava and Haque 2009), while also being heavy and bulky (Everarts et al. 2015). Small-size CVTs exist, but often have the disadvantage of having a limited range of motion. Furthermore, they are often friction-based, limiting their torque transmission capability (Everarts et al. 2015). Consequently, the search for the ideal CVT for robotics is still an ongoing research topic (Belter and Dollar 2014; Everarts et al. 2015; Lenzi et al. 2017; Kembaum et al. 2017; Dresscher et al. 2017).

### 3 Equations

In this work, we study a kinematically redundant actuator with planetary differential, which we will refer to as “Dual-Motor Actuator” (DMA) in accordance with Verstraten et al. (2018). A schematic is depicted in Fig. 1. The planetary differential is essentially the same as a planetary gearbox, but the ring is used as a secondary input instead of being fixed to ground. Just like in a regular planetary gearbox, the output shaft is connected to the carrier, and the sun is used as a second input. Other configurations of input and output shafts are possible, but this specific configuration offers the highest reductions.

#### 3.1 Kinematics

The relationship between the output speed \( \dot{\theta}_o \) and the input speeds \( \dot{\theta}_S \) and \( \dot{\theta}_R \) of the sun and ring motor, respectively, is given by (Müller 1982)

\[ \dot{\theta}_o = J \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\theta}_S \\ \dot{\theta}_R \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ J = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n_S} & \frac{1}{n_R} \\ \frac{1}{n_S r_S} & \frac{1}{n_R r_R} \end{bmatrix} \]

with \( n_S \) and \( n_R \) the additional reductions provided by the planetary gearboxes in the ring and sun drivetrain (see Fig. 1). The dimensionless ratio \( \rho \) in Eq. (5) is defined as

\[ \rho = \frac{r_R}{r_S} \]
\[ T_{oR} = \frac{r_R}{r_S} T_{oS} = \rho T_{oS} \] (12)

In order to model the losses, we introduce the efficiency function of the planetary gear differential:
\[ C_{PG} = \frac{\eta_{PG}}{\eta_{PG}} \] (13)

where \( \eta_{PG} \) denotes the meshing efficiency of the sun and ring gear with the planets. The efficiency functions of the gearboxes are given by
\[ C_\lambda = \frac{1}{\eta_{\lambda}} \text{sgn}(T_{oR} \dot{\theta}_\lambda) \] (14)

where \( \eta_{\lambda} \) represents the catalog efficiency of the respective gearbox (\( \lambda = R, S \)). Defining the input vector in dual-motor operation as \( T_{2m} = (T_{mS}, T_{mR})^T \), with \( T_{mS} \) and \( T_{mR} \) the motor torques of the sun and ring motor, respectively, we can write
\[ T_{2m} = A \dot{x} + B \text{sgn}(x) + C (T_o + T_{CC} \text{sgn}(J \dot{x})) \] (15)

where \( T_o \) is the output torque, \( x \) the state vector
\[ x = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\theta}_S \\ \dot{\theta}_R \end{bmatrix} \] (16)

and
\[ A = \begin{bmatrix} J_S & 0 \\ 0 & J_R \end{bmatrix} + J_C D \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n_S} & \frac{1}{n_S} & 1 + \rho \\ \frac{1}{n_R} & \frac{1}{n_R} & 1 + \rho \end{bmatrix} \] (17)

\[ B = \begin{bmatrix} \nu_S & 0 \\ 0 & \nu_R \end{bmatrix} + \nu_C D \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n_S} & \frac{1}{n_S} & 1 + \rho \\ \frac{1}{n_R} & \frac{1}{n_R} & 1 + \rho \end{bmatrix} \] (18)

\[ C = \begin{bmatrix} T_{CS} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{CR} \end{bmatrix} \] (19)

\[ D = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{C_{F}}{J_{mS}} (\rho C_{PG} + 1)^{-1} \\ \frac{C_{F}}{J_{mR}} (\rho C_{PG} + 1)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \] (20)

The parameters are defined in Table 1 and 2. The inertia of the planetary differential’s planets is assumed to be negligible compared to that of the sun, ring and carrier, which have an entire drivetrain attached to them. Friction is accounted for in Eq. (15) by Coulomb friction terms \( C \text{sgn}(x) \) (friction at input) and \( T_{CC} \text{sgn}(J \dot{x}) \) (friction at output) and a viscous friction term \( Bx \) (for both input and output). This classical model captures the main effects of friction in mechatronic systems (Olsson et al. 1998). Friction coefficients were obtained experimentally in previous work (Verstraten et al. 2018). A full derivation of the matrix \( D \), which contains the gearbox efficiency function \( C_{PG} \), can also be found in this work.

### 3.3 Motor equations

The motor currents \( I_\lambda \) and voltages \( U_\lambda \) can be calculated with following motor model:
\[ I_\lambda = \frac{1}{k_{T\lambda}} T_{m\lambda} \] (21)

\[ U_\lambda = k_{T\lambda} \dot{\theta}_\lambda + R_\lambda I_\lambda \] (22)

---

**Figure 1.** Schematic of the kinematically redundant actuator with planetary differential. (a) Overview of the complete actuator. (b) Planetary differential with definitions of angular velocities and torques.
with $k_T\lambda$ the torque constant and $R\lambda$ the winding resistance of the respective motor ($\lambda = R, S$). The electrical powers $P_{elec,\lambda}$ of the sun and ring motor are given by

$$P_{elec,\lambda} = U_{\lambda} \cdot I_{\lambda}$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

Finally, the total electrical power $P_{elec}$ is the sum of the sun and ring motor powers:

$$P_{elec} = P_{elec,S} + P_{elec,R}$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

### 3.4 Constraints

Defining the maximum motor speed $\dot{\theta}_{\lambda_{\max}}$, the maximum peak current $I_{\lambda_{\max,peak}}$ and the maximum continuous torque $T_{\lambda_{\max,cont}}$ ($\lambda = R, S$), we can write following constraints:

$$|\dot{\theta}_{\lambda}| < \dot{\theta}_{\lambda_{\max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

$$|I_{\lambda}| < I_{\lambda_{\max,peak}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$\text{rms} (T_{\lambda}) < T_{\lambda_{\max,cont}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

The maximum motor speed and maximum continuous torque can be found in the motor datasheets supplied by the manufacturer. The peak current is limited by short-term heating of the motor windings, but also by the maximum current output of the controller’s power stage. We will take the latter to define $I_{\lambda_{\max,peak}}$. Furthermore, the supply voltage $U_{\lambda_{\max}}$ puts a limit on the speeds that can be achieved at a certain torque:

$$k_T\lambda \dot{\theta}_{\lambda} + R\lambda I_{\lambda} < U_{\lambda_{\max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

### 3.5 Optimal control

As explained in Section 2.2, the actuator’s kinematic redundancy implies that the speeds of the two input motors can be chosen freely, even if the output speed is defined. This property can be used to fulfill a secondary objective in addition to the primary objective of, e.g., tracking a desired output force or position.

In this work, more specifically in Section 4.4, the primary objective is to track an output speed, while the secondary objective is to minimize the actuator’s electrical energy consumption. This requires solving an optimal control problem (OCP) which can be formulated as:

$$\min_u \left( J_F = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} g(x, u, t) \, dt \right)$$

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u, t)$$

$$h(x, u, t) = 0$$

$$c_{\min} \leq c(x, u, t) \leq c_{\max}$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

where

$$c(x, u, t) = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ Ku \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

contains, respectively, the maximum motor speeds, maximum motor torques, and maximum output voltages (see 3.4). The vectors $c_{\min}$ and $c_{\max}$ are given by

$$c_{\max} = -c_{\min} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\theta}_{S_{\max}} \\ \dot{\theta}_{R_{\max}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{U_{\text{max}}^2}{R_S}} T_{S_{\max,cont}} \end{bmatrix}$$

Generally speaking, the goal is to find the control set $u = (I_S, I_R)^T$ which minimizes the cost $J_F$, defined as the integral of a cost function $g(x, u, t)$ over a time interval $[t_0, t_f]$, with the state vector $x$ defined previously by Eq. (16). In this work, we wish to optimize the efficiency of the DMA with respect to a reference drivetrain. The cost function is thus the total electrical power, which can be written as the sum of the mechanical power $x^T Ku$, which includes all friction losses, and the Joule losses $u^T Ru$:

$$g(x, u, t) = x^T Ku + u^T Ru$$

Although simpler cost functions based on motor torque (Uemura and Kawamura 2009; Roozing et al. 2016; Girard and Asada 2016) or mechanical power (Grimmer et al. 2014; Paryanto et al. 2015; Mohammed et al. 2016) may also lead to close-to-optimal behavior in terms of energy consumption (Verstraten et al. 2017), Eq. (30) ensures the highest accuracy in terms of reducing the actual electrical energy consumption. This claim was validated in Remy et al. (2012), where different cost functions were used in an optimal control formulation to generate running gaits for a one-legged robotic hopper.

The system has two constraints. First, there is the dynamics of the system, which can be expressed as a set of differential equations $\dot{x} = f(x, u, t)$. The dynamics of the system were given by Eq. (15) and can be rewritten as

$$\dot{x} = A^{-1} (Ku - Bx - C\text{sgn}(x) - D(T_o(t) + T_{\text{CC}}\text{sgn}(Jx)))$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

Second, a path constraint is $h(x, u, t) = 0$ is introduced. It forces the output of the DMA to track the imposed output speed $\dot{\theta}_{\nu}$, which is the primary objective of the controller.

The path constraint is derived from Eq. (5), which describes the kinematics of the DMA:

$$h(x, u, t) = \dot{\theta}_{\nu}(t) - \left[ \frac{1}{n_{g1}(1+p)} \frac{n_{\rho}}{n_{g2}(1+p)} \right] x = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

Finally, we would like to ensure that the control set does not lead to saturation of the actuator. We will thus add inequality constraints of the form

$$c_{\min} \leq c(x, u, t) \leq c_{\max}$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)
Equation (33) ensures that constraints (25), (27) and (28) are respected. To apply constraint (27) it was assumed that the motor torque follows a sinusoidal trajectory. In that case, the peak torque will be $\sqrt{2}$ times higher than the rms torque. Therefore, by limiting the motor torques to $\sqrt{2} \cdot T_{\lambda_{\text{max,cont}}, \text{ref}}$, we effectively limit the rms torque to $T_{\lambda_{\text{max,cont}}, \text{ref}}$. As we will show in Section 5, the assumption of a sinusoidal motor torque (current) is justified. Finally, constraint (26) is, in this specific case, less strict than constraint (27), which is why it is not a part of the inequality (33).

The OCP was solved using GPOPS-II (Patterson and Rao 2014). This software transcribes the OCP into a large scale nonlinear programming problem (NLP) and then solves the problem by using the NLP solver IPOPT (Biegler and Zavala 2009).

### 4 Design analysis

In previous work, we showed that the DMA could statically deliver high torques (20 Nm) at high speeds (100 rpm) while being lighter and more compact than a traditional motor with gear reducer (Verstraten et al. 2018). But how does the actuator perform in dynamic applications? In order to answer this question, we compare a specific DMA design to reference drivetrain composed of a motor with gear reducer. The DMA has a 150W DC motor with 15:1 reduction (sun) and a 90W DC motor with 129:1 reduction (ring) as inputs. The reference drivetrain, a 250W DC motor with 35:1 gear reduction, is designed to cover approximately the same steady-state operating range while respecting the constraints listed in Section 3.4. The supply voltage $U_{\text{max}}$ is assumed to be 30V for both motors. Parameters of the drivetrains are listed in Table 2. The parameters of the planetary differential used in the DMA are listed in Table 1.

Unlike in Girard and Asada (2015) and Verstraten et al. (2018), the DMA analyzed in this work does not feature brakes or other non-backdrivable mechanisms such as the worm gears in Lee and Choi (2012). In these designs, the operating range of the DMA can be turned into an L-shape, i.e. with a high-speed low-torque region and a high-torque low-speed region (Lee and Choi 2012). Such an L-shaped operating range is particularly useful for robotic ankles. Here, motors either provide high torques or high speeds, but never reach their maximum power output (Sugar and Holgate 2013). By using a DMA with brakes, the unused part of the operating range can be eliminated. As a result, the DMA can be composed of small motors, reducing the overall weight and size of the actuator (Girard and Asada 2015) and improving its energy efficiency over that of a single-motor alternative (Verstraten et al. 2018). However, non-backdrivable mechanisms also have several disadvantages. Firstly, they complicate the control of the actuator, as they introduce discontinuities in the system. If online control is desired, advanced control algorithms will be needed in order to deal with these discontinuities. Second, controllable brakes will require a certain energy input to keep them engaged or disengaged, or to switch between those states. Moreover, they also add weight, volume and cost to the actuation system. Whether the brakes are actually worthwhile therefore depends on the benefit that can be gained from them in terms of energy efficiency, and to what extent they enable a reduction of size and weight of the individual drivetrains. For these reasons, we chose to study a system without brakes, which is more likely to be preferred whenever simplicity and cost are important.

We start this section by comparing the operating ranges of the two motors. Next, we provide a theoretical discussion of the reflected inertia of a DMA and its impact on the maximum output acceleration that can be achieved with the actuator. We conclude the section by comparing the DMA’s efficiency to that of the reference actuator, in a task where sinusoidal oscillations are applied to an inertial load.

#### 4.1 Operating range

The operating range of a drivetrain consisting of a motor and gearbox is limited by the constraints listed in Section 3.4. All of these constraints are a function of speed and torque, which is why the operating range is typically represented on a speed-torque plane. The steady-state operating range of a drivetrain can therefore be defined as all possible combinations of speed and torque for which the motor and gearbox constraints are respected. For the kinematically redundant DMA, the steady-state operating range is defined
Figure 2. Steady-state operating range of the (a) dual-motor actuator, compared to (b) the reference motor. Specifications of the actuators are listed in Tables 1 and 2. The constraints associated with the boundaries are indicated on the figure. The reference drivetrain was designed to cover roughly the same operating range. The dual-motor, however, is capable of delivering high torques at low speeds (dark zone), where the reference drivetrain cannot be used.

by all combinations of speed and torque for which at least one speed ratio $\gamma$ can be found which does not violate the motor and gearbox constraints. In accordance with this definition, Fig. 2 shows the operating range of the DMA and the reference drivetrain it is being compared to.

With non-backdrivable mechanisms, it would be possible to exploit the full torque range of either branch, enabling the construction of the L-shaped operating range described in the introduction of this section. The maximum output torque that can be provided by a DMA without brakes is, however, limited by the weakest branch, in this case the ring branch. This was explained mathematically in Verstraten et al. (2018). In Fig. 2a, many of the operating region’s boundaries are, indeed, determined by the maximum continuous torque of the ring drivetrain.

While previous works (Lee and Choi 2012; Girard and Asada 2015) have reported on the working range in quadrant I, we also offer a view on the negative power quadrants II and IV, which are also of importance in the field of robotics. The main difference between those quadrants is the role of friction and gearbox losses. In the positive power quadrants, these losses increase the torque demanded from the motor. When power is flowing from the load to the motor, however, friction and gearbox losses relieve the motor’s torque requirement by absorbing some of the incoming negative power. For example, due to the gearbox alone, a motor equipped with a gearbox with efficiency $\eta_gb$ can deliver $1/\eta_gb^2$ times more torque in the negative power quadrants II and IV than in the positive quadrants I and III. This is also visible in Fig. 2b where, in the negative power quadrants, the reference motor can reach torques that are approximately $1/\eta_ref^2 = 2$ times higher than in the positive power quadrants.

Because the voltage is sufficiently high, the torque-speed line does not limit the operating range of the reference actuator. As a result, the operating range is square in each of the four quadrants, restricted by only the maximum continuous torque $T_{ref,max,cont}$ and the maximum speed $\dot{\theta}_{ref,max}$. The operating range of the DMA is quite similar in size and shape, except for two additional areas in quadrants I and III, marked in dark grey in Fig. 2a. The appearance of these areas can be understood by looking at the optimal speed ratio (Fig. 3). This figure shows that, in the dark grey areas, the speed ratio $\gamma$ is just below zero. According to Eq. (8), this implies that the ring speed has the opposite sign of the sun and output speeds. Because, according to the definitions in Fig. 1, all torques on the planetary differential have the same sign, a ring speed of opposite sign also indicates a power
flow in the opposite direction. Since, in the dark grey areas in Fig. 2a, power is delivered to the load (output power $T_o\dot{\theta}_o$ is positive), a negative $\gamma$ results in a positive sun power $T_{ms}\dot{\theta}_s$, but a negative ring power $T_{mr}\dot{\theta}_r$. In this case, the load as well as the ring absorb power which they receive from the ring. In other words, there is an internal power flow from the sun to the ring.

So what is the advantage of this internal power flow? In Verstraten et al. (2018), it is shown that the weakest branch – in this example the ring branch – limits the output torque of a DMA. However, as explained before, a drivetrain can sustain higher output torques when it absorbs power (i.e. in the negative power quadrants) because friction takes over part of the output torque. It can therefore be advantageous to control the ring drivetrain to absorb a (small) amount of negative power: this increases the ring drivetrain’s maximum output torque and, consequently, the maximum output torque of the DMA. We thus conclude that the operating range can be enlarged by creating an internal power flow between the sun motor and the ring motor. Although the operating range of kinematically redundant actuators has been analyzed before, this interesting observation has never been reported, because back-driving of motors was prevented by design (Lee and Choi 2012) or simply not considered (Girard and Asada 2015). Nevertheless, we believe that this is an important feature that can potentially be exploited to reduce the need for backdrivable mechanisms or brakes.

### 4.2 Reflected inertia

The inertia of the drivetrain has an important influence on the energy consumption of an actuator performing a dynamic task.

An overview of the inertias of the drivetrain components in the DMA design and the reference drivetrain is given in Table 3. This table shows that the contribution of the planetary differential to the total inertia in the dual-motor drivetrains is negligible since, in both sun and ring branch, it is attenuated by the gear ratios of the gearbox in that branch. Furthermore, the inertias of the sun and ring branch are an order of magnitude lower than that of the reference drivetrain.

The inertias of the individual drivetrains, of course, do not reveal much about the overall performance of the DMA. This is best represented by the reflected inertia w.r.t. the input (motor side) and the output (load side), which are discussed below.

#### 4.2.1 Inertia reflected to motors

The inertia matrix $A$, defined in Section 3.2, contains the inertia reflected to the motors:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} J_S + \frac{C_S}{n_{SR}} \frac{1}{1+jC_{PG}} \frac{1}{1+jC} & \frac{C_{PG}}{n_{SR}} \frac{1}{1+jC_{PG}} \frac{1}{1+jC} \\ \frac{C_S}{n_{SR}} \frac{1}{1+jC_{PG}} \frac{1}{1+jC} & J_R + \frac{C}{n_{SR}} \frac{1}{1+jC_{PG}} \frac{1}{1+jC} \end{bmatrix}$$

(36)

The inertia matrix contains coupling terms. Neglecting gearbox losses, the coupling terms are identical and given by

$$J_{coupling} = \frac{1}{n_{SR} (1 + \rho)^2} J_C$$

(37)

There are several ways to make the coupling terms disappear: $n_{SR} \rightarrow \infty$, $J_C \rightarrow 0$, $\rho \rightarrow 0$ or $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. Considering that, for a single-stage planetary differential, $1 < \rho$, $\rho \rightarrow 0$ is not realistic. Furthermore, the inertia of the load, if any, will need to be included in $J_C$. The carrier inertia $J_C$ can therefore not be neglected either. Consequently, the only practical way to reduce the coupling effect is to use high gear reductions $n_s$, $n_R$ and $\rho$, although $\rho$ cannot exceed a value of 9 for a single-stage planetary differential. High gear reductions, however, come at the cost of a lower efficiency for the respective planetary gearbox, especially if stages need to be added.

Note that the coupling term (37) has the same form as the “dynamic coupling term” proposed by Rabindran and Tesar (2007) for a DMA design similar to the one presented in this work, but with the ring of the planetary differential as output and the carrier as secondary input. The main difference is the dimensionless ratio $\rho$, which is defined differently for the two designs.

#### 4.2.2 Inertia reflected to output

The total inertia reflected to the output can be defined as

$$J_{DMA,refl} = T_o\dot{\theta}_o$$

(38)

i.e., the ratio of output torque to output acceleration. An expression for $J_{DMA,refl}$ can be obtained by imposing $T_{ms} = 0$ in Eq. (15) and neglecting all friction terms:

$$0 = A\dot{x} + DT_o$$

(39)

By combining Eq. (39) with Eq. (5) and performing some simple mathematical operations, we obtain

$$J_{DMA,refl} = (J A^{-1} D)^{-1}$$

(40)

If gearbox losses are neglected ($C_S = 0$, $C_R = 0$, $C_{PG} = 0$) then $D = J^T$, and Eq. (4.2) corresponds to the pseudo kinetic energy matrix defined in Khatib (1987) for kinematically redundant manipulators. In this specific case of a single-output system, $J_{DMA,refl}$ is a scalar given by

$$J_{DMA,refl} = \frac{(1 + \rho)^2}{n_{SR}^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{n_{SR}^2}} + J_C$$

(41)

Note that, if $J_S n_s^2 = 0$ or $J_R n_R^2 = 0$, the reflected inertia $J_{DMA,refl}$ will reduce to $J_C$. In other words, a low inertia in either of both branches will greatly improve the backdrivability of the actuator. Also note that Eq. (41) is independent of the speed ratio $\gamma$. This is explained by the fact that, in the derivation of Eq. (41), the influence of the inertia of the sun and ring branch is attenuated by the gear ratios of the gearbox in that branch.
control input was removed by imposing $T_{2m} = 0$. Eq. (41) therefore does not provide any insights into how the energetic cost of dynamic motions can be minimized by controlling $\gamma$.

To study the influence of the imposed speed ratio $\gamma$, we will calculate an alternative expression for the total reflected inertia to the output. We do this by following the approach suggested by Rabindran and Tesar (2008). Here, the reflected inertia is derived by stating that the sum of the system’s kinetic energies should be equal to the kinetic energy of the reflected inertia rotating at the output speed. In a lossless system, this can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2} J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma) \cdot \dot{\theta}_o^2 = \frac{1}{2} J_C \dot{\theta}_o^2 + \frac{1}{2} J_S \dot{\theta}_S^2 + \frac{1}{2} J_R \dot{\theta}_R^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)

Finding $J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma)$ would require an inversion of Eq. (5). Due to the kinematic redundancy, this is impossible to achieve. As a workaround, we introduced the speed ratio $\gamma$, yielding the inverted relationships (9) and (11). This results in the following expression for the reflected inertia:

$$J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma) = J_C + J_{S,refl}(\gamma) + J_{R,refl}(\gamma)$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)

with

$$J_{S,refl}(\gamma) = n_S^2 (1 + \rho)^2 (1 - \gamma)^2 J_S$$  \hspace{1cm} (44)

$$J_{R,refl}(\gamma) = n_R^2 (1 + \rho)^2 \frac{\rho^2}{\gamma^2} J_R$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)

Equation (43) indicates that the reflected inertia of the dual-motor actuator $J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma)$ is a quadratic function of the speed ratio $\gamma$. The dependence is visualized in Figure 4 for the dual-motor actuator studied in this work. The minimal reflected inertia $J_{tot,min}$ occurs at

$$\gamma^* = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{J_{S,refl}}{J_{S} n_S^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (46)

and is equal to

$$J_{tot,min} = \frac{(1 + \rho)^2}{J_S n_S^2 + J_R n_R^2} + J_C$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

which is exactly the same expression as Eq. (41). In other words, the reflected inertia $J_{DMA,refl} = J_{tot,min}$ corresponds to the minimal value of the $\gamma$-dependent reflected inertia $J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma)$.

Interestingly, the value of $J_{tot,min}$ is lower than $J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma = 0)$, where the speed is completely delivered by the ring motor, and $J_{DMA,refl}(\gamma = 1)$, where the speed is completely delivered by the sun drivetrain. This shows that, in terms of reflected inertia, a dual-motor actuator architecture is not bounded by the inertia of its separate branches. Because the kinetic energy of a drivetrain is proportional to the square of the speed, and the output speed of the DMA is divided linearly over both actuators (Eq. (5)), one would expect the dual-motor architecture to be advantageous in applications where high accelerations are required. This will be studied in Section 4.3.

Nevertheless, even the lowest reflected inertia of the DMA $J_{tot,min}$ is still slightly higher than that of the reference motor ($J_{ref,refl}$). A disadvantage of the DMA is that it consists of more rotating components than a conventional actuator. In particular, the ring gear and the couplings required to attach the motors to the differential all add inertia to the actuator. This is, however, not the reason for the higher reflected inertia, since the contribution of these components to the total inertia is negligible compared to the inertias of the sun and ring drivetrains. The real reason is the additional reduction through the planetary differential. Although the inertias of the branches themselves are smaller than that of the reference drivetrain (Table 3), the reduction from the differential causes their inertia, reflected to the output, to be approximately 4 times (sun) and 2 times (ring) higher than that of the reference drivetrain.

Still, it must be noted that this analysis did not consider the efficiency of the actuator, which also has an impact on the reflected inertia. In this regard, it is important to note that the dual-motor actuator was designed to have a higher average efficiency throughout its operating range (Verstraten et al. 2018). The higher efficiency can compensate somewhat for the increased reflected inertia. Furthermore, the reflected inertia was not considered in the design phase. By doing so, it might be possible to conceive a design with lower reflected inertia, without compromising on efficiency.

### 4.3 Maximum acceleration

So far, we have established that the DMA has a slightly larger operating range, but a higher reflected inertia. We will now discuss how this translates to the maximum achievable output acceleration.

A common metric to assess the acceleration capability is the ratio between the maximum torque $T_{max}$ and the rotor inertia $J_m$. An analysis similar to the one presented in Haddadin et al. (2012) shows that this metric scales with the motor’s length $l_m$ and its radius $r_m$ as

$$\frac{T_{max}}{J_m} \sim \gamma^{1/2} r_m^{-3/2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

This relationship is in line with catalog data, which exhibits a scaling of $T_{max}/J_m \sim r_m^{-1.6}$ (Wensing et al. 2017). A motor’s acceleration capability is thus proportional to its length and decreases with its radius according to $r_m^{-3/2}$.
other words, smaller motors can deliver relatively higher accelerations. This appears to be a favorable situation for the DMA where, in essence, we replaced a large motor with two smaller ones. However, the DMA also links the accelerations and torques of the output to those of the motors, which complicates the discussion. Consequently, a more detailed analysis is required to assess whether a DMA really can really reach higher accelerations.

In accordance with Eq. (5), the maximum output acceleration is simply the sum of the maximum accelerations of the sun and ring branch:

$$\ddot{\theta}_{\text{max}} = J \left[ \dot{\theta}_{S, \text{max}} \dot{\theta}_{R, \text{max}} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)

In order to relate the maximum acceleration to the design, we simplify the motor torque (15) by neglecting friction:

$$T_{2m} = A \ddot{x} + DT_o$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)

There are two contributions to the motor torque that must be taken into account. The first part is related to the accelerations of the motors, which is strongly influenced by $\gamma$. The second part is related to the desired output torque $T_o$. This torque is divided over both motors according to Eq. (15), and consumes current from both motors. The distribution over the motors is determined by the design (parameter $\rho$) and, in contrast to the other term, cannot be influenced by the speed ratio $\gamma$ - except indirectly, through manipulation of the speed-related friction terms.

The maximum acceleration for a specific static output torque is achieved when both motor torques saturate. Defining the vector of saturated motor torques,

$$T_{2m} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{S, \text{max}} \\ T_{R, \text{max}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{TS} S_{\text{max,peak}} \\ k_{TR} R_{\text{max,peak}} \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (51)

Eq. (50) can be rewritten as

$$A^{-1} (T_{2m} - DT_o) = \dot{\theta}_{\text{max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (52)

Left multiplication with $J$, defined in Eq. (6), gives

$$J A^{-1} (T_{2m} - DT_o) = \dot{\theta}_{\text{max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (53)

This equation defines the maximum acceleration $\dot{\theta}_{\text{max}}$ for a specific output torque $T_o$. If we neglect the efficiencies $C_{PG}$, $C_S$ and $C_R$ and assume that both motors are identical ($T_{S, \text{max}} = T_{R, \text{max}} \approx T_{\text{max}}$ and $J_S = J_R \approx J_m$), we find the maximum acceleration

$$\dot{\theta}_{\text{max}} (T_o) = \frac{1}{1+\rho} \left( \frac{1}{n_S} + \frac{\rho}{n_R} \right) T_{\text{max}} - \frac{1}{1+\rho} \left( \frac{1}{n_S^2} + \frac{\rho^2}{n_R^2} \right) J_o$$  \hspace{1cm} (54)

where we replaced the carrier inertia $J_C$ with $J_o$, the combined inertia of the carrier and load:

$$J_o = J_C + J_{\text{load}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (55)

Compare to a regular DC motor with gear reducer:

$$\dot{\theta}_{\text{max}} (T_o) = \frac{1}{2} T_{\text{max}} - \frac{1}{J_m + \frac{\rho^2}{n_R^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (56)

In Eq. (54), it is not the sum of actuator inertias $J_S + J_R \approx 2J_m$ but the inertia of a single motor ($J_m$) that appears. This implies that the maximum acceleration scales favorably with the inertias of the DMA drivetrains. On the other hand, if

$$n = \frac{1}{1+\rho} \left( \frac{1}{n_S} + \frac{\rho}{n_R} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (57)

then

$$n^2 > \frac{1}{1+\rho} \left( \frac{1}{n_S^2} + \frac{\rho^2}{n_R^2} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (58)

The static output torque and load inertia are thus reduced more strongly by the conventional solution of a motor with gear reducer. This means that, if the DMA and the conventional actuator are designed to deliver the same static torque output, the conventional actuator will perform better dynamically at high output torques or with high inertial loads. However, as demonstrated in Table 3, the inertia $J_m$ of the DMA’s motors can be made smaller than that of a single drivetrain. As a consequence, the DMA starts off with a higher acceleration capability, which nonetheless declines more rapidly with increasing $J_o$ and $T_o$, than that of the reference drivetrain. This is visualized in Fig. 5.
4.4 Energy efficiency comparison

In order to evaluate the energy efficiency of the actuator, we calculate the electrical energy consumption in a task where the actuator applies a sinusoidal speed to a variable load. The trajectory is given by

$$\dot{\theta}_{imp} = A_0 \omega \sin(\omega t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (59)

with fixed amplitude $A_0 = 60^\circ$ and variable frequency $\omega$. The variable load consists of a variable static torque $T_0$ and a constant inertial load ($J_{load} = 11.7$ gm²):

$$T_{load} = T_0 + J_{load} A_0 \omega^2 \cos(\omega t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (60)

Based on the inertia matching principle (Pasch and Seering 1984), the reference drivetrain design would be ideal for an inertial load of $J_{load} = 0.17$ kgm². The actual inertial load is more than ten times lower to reflect the problem of performing dynamic motions with drivetrains designed for high torques, explained in the introduction of this article.

By varying the static torque $T_0$ and the frequency $\omega$, we can test the actuator’s dynamic capabilities for different static loads. The results are shown in Fig. 6.

In the absence of a static load, the reference drivetrain is capable of reaching slightly higher frequencies than the DMA, but the difference is rather small. Conversely, the DMA is much more capable of dealing with static torques. In accordance with the results from Section 4.1, the reference drivetrain can only deliver torques of up to 10 Nm at

5 Experimental results

In order to validate the results, an experimental test setup was built. In this setup, depicted in Fig. 7a, a dual-motor actuator (close-up in Fig. 7b) is coupled to a flywheel, which acts as the load. The flywheel has an inertia of $J_{load}=11.7$ gm², the same as in Section 4.4. The DMA is built using only off-the-shelf components, and matches the one studied in Section 4 (parameters in Tables 1 and 2). It consists of a planetary differential, constructed out of a 10:1 Neugart PLFE 064 planetary gearbox with an ordinary spur gear attached to the ring. The sun gear is driven by a 150W Maxon RE40 DC motor with a Maxon GP42C planetary gear reducer of ratio 15:1, and the ring gear by a 90W Maxon RE35 DC motor with a 43:1 reduction provided by a Maxon GP42C planetary gearbox. The ring drivetrain is coupled to the ring by means of a 3:1 spur gear transmission, bringing the total reduction of the ring branch to 129:1. Both motors are equipped with a Maxon AB24 holding brake (24V, 0.4Nm) which adds an inertia of 1 gcm² to the motor.
An ETH Messtechnik DRBK-50 torque sensor is mounted between the actuator and the load. Finally, a US Digital E6 encoder (2000 CPT) measures the output position. The motor positions and speeds are retrieved from Maxon HEDL 5540 encoders (500 CPT) mounted on the motor shafts. The signals from these encoders also serve as feedback for the speed control, which is performed by a Maxon EPOS3 controller (sun motor) and a Maxon MAXPOS 50/5 controller (ring motor), using the built-in profile velocity mode. The electrical power measurement is obtained by multiplying the motor voltage and current. Voltage is sensed with custom-made differential amplifiers, while the current is retrieved directly from the EPOS3 and MAXPOS units.

A sinusoidal speed is imposed at the output, according to the specifications in Section 4.4. Imposed frequencies are 0.25, 0.5, 1 and 1.5 Hz. The imposed input speeds are obtained from optimal control, as explained in Section 3.5.

5.1 High-frequency measurement

We first present a high-frequency measurement in order to gain a better understanding of how the DMA works, and to demonstrate the validity of the model. Figure 8 shows the speed, currents and electrical power consumption for the measurement at 1.5 Hz.

5.1.1 Speed distribution

The speed trajectories of the sun and ring are roughly sinusoidal, their frequency in line with that of the imposed trajectory. Between 0.14-0.2 s and 0.48-0.53 s, the ring speed is capped at approximately 10 000 rpm. This is due to saturation of the voltage, which was limited to 30 V (see Section 3.4). To ensure that the correct output speed is still reached, the sun delivers a slightly higher speed during these time intervals, giving its speed profile a sawtooth-like appearance.

Higher-frequency components are avoided in order to prevent additional accelerations, which are the cause of most of the torque delivered by the motors. This means that the speed ratio $\gamma$ should roughly be constant throughout most of the cycle. Indeed, in Fig. 9, which shows the (imposed) speed ratio over a range of cycles with different frequencies, we observe that $\gamma$ tends to stay close to a single value for most of the cycle. For frequencies of 0.5 Hz and below, $\gamma = 1$ at all times, meaning that the sun is held still and all speed is being delivered by the ring branch – the most efficient branch in the design. Because, at this low frequency, the dynamics can...
be neglected, this result can be found by tracing the required combinations of output torque and speed on the map with the optimal speed ratio (Fig. 3). With a peak output torque of 0.12 Nm and a maximum output speed of 30 rpm for the 0.5 Hz measurement, it is easy to see that the speed ratio $\gamma = 1$ indeed corresponds to the optimal speed ratio according to the map. At higher frequencies, the average value of $\gamma$ decreases towards $\gamma^* = 0.68$, the value that minimizes the reflected inertia $J_{DMA, refl}(\gamma)$, as discussed in Section 4.2. We can therefore conclude that, in highly dynamic motions, the decrease of individual motor speeds and accelerations dominates the choice of the optimal speed distribution.

5.1.2 Current Many of the conclusions in this work are derived from the dynamic model presented in Section 3. The validity of the model is proven by the excellent agreement between the measured currents (blue) and the currents estimated from Eqs. (15)-(21) (red). The currents in both drivetrains are dominated by the inertial torque of the respective drivetrain, and therefore follow their acceleration pattern.

5.1.3 Electrical power and power flows Fig. 8 shows that the peak electrical power in the ring branch is approximately three times higher than that of the sun branch. But how much of this power makes its way to the load, and how much is lost as heat? To gain a better understanding of the power related to the inertia of the load ($\lambda \tilde{\theta}_L \omega$), the power related to the inertia of the drivetrain ($J_\alpha \dot{\theta}_\alpha \dot{\theta}_\alpha$), the Joule losses ($R_S I_\alpha^2$) and the friction losses, which include the power lost through viscous and Coulomb friction, as well as the gearbox losses.

The power flow related to the load is almost negligible compared to the power flows related to the inertia of the branches. In both branches, most of the input power is used to move the inertia of the drivetrain itself. This is a result of using a drivetrain designed for high torques to perform dynamic motion. Such drivetrains are composed of high torque motors and/or high gear reductions, leading to drivetrain inertia which is much higher than the inertia of the robot’s links. When the payload is removed, most power will move back and forth from the motor to the drivetrain inertia.

Inertia acts as an energy buffer, and therefore, the net energy consumption of these power flows, however big they are, is zero. They do, however, have an influence on the required motor torque and, consequently, on the Joule losses. These are much higher in the ring branch, where the acceleration is the highest. The winding resistance in the ring branch ($R_R = 583 \, m\Omega$) is also almost twice as high as that of the sun branch ($R_S = 299 \, m\Omega$).

The other source of losses is friction. Friction losses are related to the speed of the drivetrains, and therefore are not affected by the drivetrain inertia. The losses are similar in the sun and ring branch, but their contribution relative to the total power flow is clearly higher in the sun branch, which has the highest friction coefficients.

5.2 Energetic comparison

The measurements also allow for a direct comparison with the simulated energy consumption in Section 4.4. The calculated average power over a cycle is shown in Figure 11 and compared to the measurements on the setup. The measured values are slightly higher than the predicted values, indicating that there are still some unmodeled losses in the system. Nevertheless, the quantitative behavior is similar. Figure 11 also provides a good visualization of the difference between the reference drivetrain (red) and the DMA (blue). The energy consumption of the reference drivetrain rises much more quickly than that of the DMA. At a frequency of 1.5 Hz, the DMA only consumes 18% of the energy consumed by the reference drivetrain.
6 Discussion

In this section, we briefly summarize and discuss the main advantages and disadvantages of the DMA design, based on the findings presented in this work.

6.1 Extended operating range

In Section 4.1, we made the interesting observation that the DMA was capable of providing high torques at low speeds in the positive power quadrants, whereas the single-motor alternative was not. This was achieved by exploiting internal power flows. If the power flow in the most loaded branch is reversed, friction can be used to absorb a part of the output power, lowering the torque requirement from the motor. This is a very important finding, since internal power flows are generally considered to have an adverse effect on the actuator’s efficiency, and therefore avoided. This explains why, in previous analyses, the benefit of internal power flows in terms of operating range was not discovered. We do, however, consider the extended operating range as a strong potential advantage, even if it comes at a slightly higher energetic cost. The extended operating range may, for example, reduce the need for brakes or non-backdrivable mechanisms which increase the volume, weight and mechanical complexity of the actuator.

6.2 Increased acceleration capability and energy efficiency

The main goal of the study was to gain insight in how the DMA performs in dynamic tasks. In Section 4.2, we concluded that the ratio between the ring speed and output speed, characterized by the variable $\gamma$, can be chosen in such a way that the inertia of the actuator, reflected to the output, is smaller than that of its composing drivetrains. Nevertheless, we also found the minimal reflected inertia of our DMA design to be slightly higher than that of a single-motor alternative. This does not have to be a disadvantage in terms of dynamic performance, though. In Section 4.3, the maximum acceleration of the DMA was shown to be higher than the single-motor reference drivetrain, although the advantage declines with the inertia of the load. The DMA, thanks to its extended operating range, was also able to provide higher accelerations when a static torque was added to the load. Furthermore, its energy consumption is considerably lower than that of its single-motor equivalent. This was evidenced by the calculations in Section 4.4 and the experimental results in Section 5.2.

6.3 Flexibility towards conflicting torque-speed requirements

The optimal speed distribution $\gamma$ depends strongly on the required output torque, speed and acceleration. If the accelerations are low, most power will go through the branch with the least amount of friction. For higher accelerations, the optimal speed ratio tends to move towards the speed ratio that minimizes the reflected inertia. In other words, the speed ratio $\gamma$ of the DMA can be tuned to meet the conflicting torque-speed requirements of loaded and unloaded phases in robotic tasks. The results from Section 5.1.1 suggest that this adaptation should be performed relatively slowly with respect to the motion. In all our trials with sinusoidal output speeds, $\gamma$ remained fairly constant, indicating that rapid changes in $\gamma$ should be avoided because of the additional energetic costs that would result from the high accelerations related to the high-frequency motion.

6.4 Trade-offs and further opportunities

Kinematically redundant actuators also have an obvious disadvantage: the redundant drivetrains lead to a higher total number of components. This gives rise to increased investment costs and entails additional complexity in terms of design, assembly and control. Intuitively, one would also expect the volume and weight of the DMA to be larger than that of a single-motor alternative. This is, however, not necessarily true, since a kinematically redundant design may be composed of smaller and lighter motors in combination with smaller, more efficient gearboxes. The results in Verstraten et al. (2018), for example, indicate that a DMA design can actually be made lighter than a single-motor alternative having the same operating range, provided that its composing drivetrains are selected in a smart way. With integrated designs, where the motors and the planetary differential are combined in a single housing (Girard and Asada 2015), the actuator’s volume and weight can be further reduced. Even greater advantages may be achieved by adding non-backdrivable elements to the design, as they allow shaping the working range of the actuator to fit the application more closely. However, as discussed in the introduction of Section 4, the reduction in size and weight of motors and gearboxes must be assessed against the volume, weight and complexity added by the non-backdrivable mechanisms. This work, where the optimal usage of a simple DMA without brakes was studied, can serve as a baseline for comparison.
7 Conclusion

In this work, we explored the potential of kinematically redundant actuators by studying its most common embodiment: two electric motors coupled by a planetary differential. To assess its qualities, this actuator, which we named “Dual-Motor Actuator” (DMA), was evaluated against a single-motor alternative capable of spanning roughly the same operating range. Our results indicate that a DMA can, indeed, be used as an energy-efficient alternative to a classic drivetrain consisting of a motor with speed reducer. Its capability of providing higher torques at low speeds, combined with its ability to divide the acceleration over two motors, makes it a very suitable solution for applications which require a wide range of torques, speeds and accelerations.
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