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This paper presents an objective comparison of two closed-loop steering feel control concepts in an electric power assisted steering (EPAS) system. The closed-loop methods, torque- and position-control, aim to compensate the EPAS motor inertia in an effective manner as compared to the open loop (feed-forward) solution. For a given steering feel reference, the feedback controllers are developed in a sequential manner ensuring coupled stability. Linear system theory is used for the analysis. For a comparable reference tracking and stability margin, higher haptic controller bandwidth is achieved in torque-control. The position controller stability and performance are limited due to feedback control filtering and high system inertia (from EPAS motor and driver arms), which further makes it more sensitive towards muscle co-contraction. Moreover, torque-control offers better road disturbance attenuation for low and high frequency spectrum, whereas position-control is better for mid-frequency range.
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1 INTRODUCTION

In a typical mechanical-assisted system, the motor inertia contributes to an additional impedance. Due to this shortcoming, the system bandwidth is reduced as compared to its passive characteristic. Without compensating the additional impedance, the high frequency tracking or system dynamics is compromised [1]. This is in analogy for the system under consideration, rack mounted electric power assisted steering (EPAS) system. The effect is further amplified by the mechanical gear ratio between the electric motor and steering hardware, see [2, 3]. Subsequently, it results in a fundamental difference to the passive response (or high bandwidth) of the hydraulic assisted system.

The straightforward EPAS control method is open loop. Various feed-forward functions including non-linear basic assist, inertia compensation, active damping, etc. are implemented to fulfill the purpose of a good steering feel, refer [4, 2]. The aim is to replicate the hydraulic assisted system. This is achieved typically for lower frequencies, but the dynamics is affected due to the above mentioned reason. The potential of feed-forward inertia compensation is limited due to model uncertainties [5]. As a result, the measurement noise might get amplified during the differentiation and can raise stability concerns especially for high impedance. The foremost motivation of compensating the EPAS motor inertia by developing a closed-loop approach is investigated in this paper.

The closed-loop approach have two distinct variants depending on the feedback control variable; torque or position/velocity. Position- and velocity-control are considered under the same category of controlling the motion state. Torque- and position-control methods are in a sense inverse to each other. For reference position, torque disturbance is required and position disturbance for torque reference. The research on haptic controllers has been done for mechanical systems where the actuator interacts directly with the human, see [1, 6]. For EPAS systems, there is a mechanical connection between the state variables, rack position and steering angle (which is different than disconnected systems, e.g. Steer-by-Wire). Although there are examples of EPAS closed-loop steering feel controllers as discussed in [7, 3], but there is no objective comparison between the two methods in the existing literature. Therefore, the differences in tracking performance, stability and disturbance attenuation for the two approaches are studied in this paper. With a closed-loop solution, the controller can decouple the system from the external load disturbance (originating from the environment). Similarly, the closed-loop steering feel controller attenuates the road disturbance and generates a feedback based on the reference generator.

Besides steering feel, the control algorithm should incorporate the external intervention from lateral vehicle control (active safety) functions. These functions, such as Lane Keeping Aid, Pilot Assist [8], etc. increase the vehicle automation level. They aim to maintain the reference vehicle position; and the suitable control variable is steering rack position. In an open loop architecture, these functions could be in isolation to the steering feel functionality and merged at the motor torque request similar to [4]. For driver acceptance, it is crucial that the intervention is perceived consistent and intuitive. Hence, the external intervention is realized via the proposed steering feel controllers.

As a first step, the controllers are designed with classical control theory. A driver model is necessary to develop a stable human coupled interaction. With a defined stability margin, the reference tracking is evaluated. In this regard, a fixed steering feel reference at a given vehicle speed is based on virtual dynamics considering the driver excitation. The closed-loop controllers attenuate the road disturbances and mimic the virtual dynamics. The paper focuses on the feedback control and therefore, the road feedback content is not considered in the reference for a simplified analysis. The comparison is done in classical measures of bandwidth, loop gain phase margin, etc. Finally using the same control law (from reference tracking), road disturbance attenuation and external intervention are briefly discussed.

2 SYSTEM DYNAMICS

This section introduces an overview of the implemented mechanical models, steering feel reference generator and system identification scheme for steering rack parameter estimation.

2.1 EPAS and Driver Model

In an EPAS system, the interaction of the motor with the driver is not completely direct due to the mechanical connection with the
road. The steering torque, $M_s$, translates to the steering rack via torsion bar compliance ($c_{tb}$, $k_{tb}$), refer Fig. 1 and (1)–(3). Pinion angle ($\delta_{pin}$) is mechanically constrained to rack position ($x_r$), such that $\delta_{pin} = x_r \frac{2 \pi}{\pi f}$. Equation (1) and (2) represent the force balance on the steering wheel and rack respectively. The front axle lateral tire force generating the rack force, $F_r$, is obtained from the single-track vehicle model, see [9]. Coulomb friction is not considered for the controller development assuming high amplitude excitations within sliding friction regime.

\[
(J_s + J_{arm}) \ddot{\delta}_s(t) + b_s \dot{\delta}_s(t) = M_s(t) - M_{tb}(t) \quad (1)
\]

\[
m_{tb} \ddot{x}_r(t) + k_{tb} \dot{x}_r(t) = M_{tb}(t) \tau_{tp} + M_{mot}(t) \dot{\imath}_{mot} - F_r(t) \quad (2)
\]

\[
k_{tb} (\dot{\delta}_s(t) - \dot{\delta}_{pin}(t)) + c_{tb} (\delta_s(t) - \delta_{pin}(t)) = M_{tb}(t) \quad (3)
\]

\[
k_{arm} (\dot{\delta}_{req}(t) - \dot{\delta}_s(t)) + c_{arm} (\delta_{req}(t) - \delta_s(t)) = M_s(t) \quad (4)
\]

The driver model is a second-order system. This simplified model is easy to analyze coupled stability, further discussed in section 3. The arm inertia ($J_{arm}$) couples to the steering wheel ($J_s$). The muscle co-contraction (intrinsic stiffness, $c_{arm}$, and damping, $k_{arm}$) generates the required steering torque, refer (4). Because force/torque is an input to a mechanical system and motion state/s such as position/velocity becomes the feedback. The driver model parameter values are taken from [10]. The motor current controller and sensors (for torsion bar torque and rack position) have fast dynamics. But a first-order transfer function representing their bandwidth ($G_{s,M_{mot}}, G_{s,M_{tb}}$ and $G_{s,x_r}$) is used for the simulation. Their bandwidth are assumed as 2kHz, 1kHz and 1kHz respectively. A time delay of 2ms is also considered from the request to actual EPAS motor torque.

### 2.2 Steering Feel Reference

This section introduces the reference generator. The given reference model is considered to be a good steering feel representation. It is objectified in terms of torsion bar torque ($M_{tb}$) to rack position for the existing feed-forward system. For the feedback controller, the derived reference defines the virtual dynamics. The rack motion is controlled in a straightforward manner because both the variables $M_{tb}$ and $x_r$ act on the rack itself. Moreover, the rack dynamics cause the fundamental difference between an electric- and hydraulic-rack assisted steering system. For the analysis, the reference at 75km/h (vehicle speed) is used.

The reference transfer function ($S$) is proper, since $M_{tb}(s)$ acts as an input and $X_r(s)$ as an output. The two eigenfrequencies represent yaw ($\approx 1 - 2$Hz) and steering rack ($\approx 2 - 3$Hz) dynamics. However, the reference inverse ($X_r$) is improper and requires a second-order filter (with damping ratio $D_f$ and cut-off frequency $\omega_f$), further discussed below. The requirement of reference inverse and reference is for torque- and position-control (outer loop) respectively, refer Fig. 2.

\[
G_{ref} = \frac{X_r(s)}{M_{tb}(s)} = \frac{b_s s^2 + b_1 s + b_0}{a_4 s^4 + a_3 s^3 + a_2 s^2 + a_1 s + a_0} \quad (5)
\]

\[
G_{ref}^{-1} = \frac{M_{tb}(s)}{X_r(s)} = \frac{1}{G_{ref} s^2 + 2D_f \omega_f s + \omega_f^2} \quad (6)
\]
3 HAPTIC FEEDBACK CONTROL

The feedback control objective is to track the reference by compensating the rack impedance. The design methodology for the closed-loop possibilities is discussed in this section. For the final (numerical and simulation) results, the rack force is considered to be given by a single-track vehicle model. However for simplicity, the analytical expressions in the following equations is achieved considering the rack stiffness \( (C_r) \), such that the rack force becomes, \( F_r(t) = C_r x_r(t) \). The combined EPAS system and vehicle model is called the plant, see Fig. 2. The plant model has different parameters (such as tire cornering stiffness, yaw inertia, etc.) as compared to the reference. The controller is designed in a stepwise manner; coupling of the feedback control to the plant, coupling the reference/reverse inverse and human/driver coupling. The worst-case scenario is assumed for the controller design, rigidly coupled driver arm inertia to the steering wheel with high muscular arm stiffness. The phase margin at each step has been evaluated and the gain margin is fixed to infinite. For a robust performance, the phase margin of each loop gain is set between 30° - 60° [11]. In simulation, the controller stability was maintained at all times and the EPAS motor torque never exceeded its saturation limit (57Nm).

3.1 Torque Control

This architecture requires reference inverse in the outer loop and torque feedback in the inner loop as shown in Fig. 2(a). The strategy is termed on the basis of feedback control variable (i.e. torsion bar torque). The reference torque \( (9) \) is requested to the feedback control, which results in (10) for the motor torque.

\[
M_{th,ref}(s) = G_{ref}^{-1} X_r(s) \tag{9}
\]

\[
M_{mot}(s) = F_M(M_{th,ref}(s) - M_{th}(s)) \tag{10}
\]

Using (2) and above mentioned equations, the tracking and reference transfer functions are given as (11) and (12) respectively.

Consider a proportional feedback, \( F_M = -K_{p,M} \), without the outer loop. As a result, the steering rack impedance in (11) is reduced by a factor of \( (1 + K_{p,M} \chi_{pass}) \), where \( \chi_{pass} = \chi_{mot}/\chi_{rp} \) and \( K_{p,M} > 0 \). This can also be proved using the initial value theorem on (12) for a given (simplified) reference inverse in (13). Therefore, the requirement of proportional gain in torque-control for the given plant is essential to overcome the mechanical impedance. This is necessary to compensate the motor inertia.

\[
X_r(s) = \frac{\chi_{rp}}{M_{th}(s)} = \frac{M_{mot}(s)}{F_M(M_{th,ref}(s) - M_{th}(s))} \tag{11}
\]

\[
M_{th}(s) = (m_s s^2 + k_s s + c_s) - G_{ref}^{-1} F_M \tag{12}
\]

\[
M_{th,ref}(s) = \frac{m_r s^2 + k_r s + c_r}{G_{ref}^{-1}(\chi_{rp} - F_M \chi_{mot})} \tag{13}
\]

The integral part is required for reference tracking. This is proved using the final value theorem on (11) which shows the steady state error. Considering \( F_M = -K_{i,M}/s \), a step disturbance in rack position, \( \Delta x_r \), at \( t = 0 \) results in steady state torque, \( \Delta M_{th} \), as shown in (14). For minimum stationary error at lower frequencies, \( K_{i,M} > 0 \) should be large. The quantification of \( K_{p,M} \) and \( K_{i,M} \) is explained under stability analysis.

\[
\Delta M_{th} = \lim_{s \to 0} \frac{M_{th}(s)}{X_r(s)} \Delta x_r = \lim_{s \to 0} \left[ \frac{c_r f + \chi_{mot}}{1 + \frac{\chi_{mot}}{K_{i,M} \chi_{pass}}} \right] \frac{\Delta x_r}{\chi_{rp}} \tag{14}
\]

The ideal torque-control law should consist of proportional and integral gains as defined in (15). The feedback control is designed such that it is independent of reference/reverse inverse with high inner loop bandwidth. The open loop transfer function from motor torque to torsion bar torque (obtained from (1) - (3) in Laplace domain) has a zero at the origin. Using the integral feedback gain results in a pole/zero cancellation. Despite that, the closed-loop LTI system remains reachable and observable (for rack position on the outer loop).

\[
F_M = -(K_{i,M}/s + K_{p,M}) \tag{15}
\]

The stability property of the inner loop is investigated at first. The inner loop gain becomes (16) with control law (15). Open transfer function signifies the (open loop) plant behavior using (1)-(3). The feedback controller governs the inner loop stability. Higher \( K_{p,M} \) ensures lower mechanical impedance and higher (inner loop gain) phase margin; whereas higher \( K_{i,M} \) is required for reference tracking but at the cost of a reduced phase margin. The constraint (17) must be satisfied for the inner loop stability as a necessary and sufficient condition. For a given \( K_{p,M} \), \( K_{i,M} \) has an upper bound limiting the tracking performance. This has been analytically derived (and numerically verified) by neglecting the small terms with respect to high torsion bar stiffness as an assumption. With reducing stiffness, the upper bound increases. Increasing \( K_{p,M} \) gives a higher upper bound on \( K_{i,M} \). But \( K_{p,M} \) is also limited by the time delay in motor torque request for stability. \( K_{i,M} \) upper bound is primarily dependent on \( K_{p,M}, \chi_{mot} \) and \( \chi_{rp} \). Although it is somewhat dependent on the driver arm inertia (\( \chi_{arm} \)), the inner loop performance (in terms of bandwidth) is not compromised as seen in Fig. 4(a). Hence, the inner loop (controller) performance is almost insensitive to \( \chi_{arm} \) variation. Lower torque sensor bandwidth reduces the phase margin, which is undesirable for stability and robustness.

\[
L_{in,M} = F_M \left( \frac{M_{th}(s)}{M_{mot}(s)} \right) \tag{16}
\]

\[
K_{i,M} < \frac{1}{\chi_{pass}} \left\{ \left( \frac{(a k_b + \frac{k_r}{\chi_{rp}})(a + \frac{c_r}{\chi_{mot}})}{m_r/\chi_{rp}^2} + \frac{2 \alpha k_b}{J_a + J_{arm}} \right) \right\}; \text{ where, } \alpha = 1 + K_{p,M} \chi_{pass} \tag{17}
\]

The next step is to integrate the reference inverse on the outer loop. The resulting loop gain is shown in (18). There are two possibilities for the integration; either the feedback control is given and the reference inverse needs to be designed or vice versa. The reference impedance parameters, \( m_{ref} \) and \( k_{ref} \), do not affect the stability. But the reference stiffness, \( c_{ref} \), limits the outer loop performance. At first, consider a torque controller to be given with a bandwidth, \( \omega_{in} \), such that \( T_s = 1/{\omega_{in}} \). The valid (non-negative) solution of the quadratic equation (19) gives the upper bound on \( c_{ref} \). But if the inequality constraint (20) holds true, then the outer loop is stable \( \forall c_{ref} > 0 \). In the second possibility (focus of the paper), the outer loop is stable \( \forall c_{ref} > 0 \), if the constraint (21) holds. Typically \( c_{ref} < c_r \), because the purpose of EPAS is to reduce the plant stiffness (or steering effort). \( m_{ref} \) and \( k_{ref} \) are implemented as feed-forward (with a suitable
filter) in the reference inverse. The inverse filter time constant ($T_f = 1/\omega_f$) should be low for a good tracking performance. On the contrary, it is constrained by the controller sampling rate to prevent numerical instability. For the given reference inverse, $T_f = 5\text{ms}$ with critical damping ratio, $D_f = 0.707$, provides $60^\circ$ phase margin for (18).

\[
L_{o,M} = F_M \left[ \frac{M_{th}(s)}{M_{mot}(s)} \bigg| \text{open} \right] - G_{r,ref} \left[ \frac{X_r(s)}{M_{mot}(s)} \bigg| \text{open} \right]
\]  

(18)

\[
c_{r,ref}^2 + c_{th}c_{rp}^2 \left( 2 + \frac{b_s T_s}{J_s + J_{arm}} - \frac{c_{th} T_s}{b_s} \right) c_{r,ref} + \left( 1 + \frac{b_s T_s}{J_s + J_{arm}} \right) (c_{th}c_{rp})^2 > 0
\]

(19)

\[
\omega_m > (c_{th} - b_s^2/(J_s + J_{arm}))^2 / 4b_s c_{th}
\]

(20)

\[
K_{i,M} < K_{p,M}(k_r + (1 + K_{p,M}c_{pa})k_{th}c_{rp}^2)/m_r
\]

(21)

\[
L_s = G_1^{-1} \frac{\delta_s(s)}{M_s(s)} \bigg| \text{closed}
\]

(22)

Finally, stability of the torque controller depends on its interaction with the driver. Coupled instability of haptic controllers during human interaction is a common phenomenon [12]. The driver admittance is defined as the ratio of steering angle to torque, $\delta_s/M_s$, which represents the human interaction. Coupled instability depends on $J_{arm}$ and $c_{arm}$. The inner loop maintains the required stability and performance irrespective of varying $J_{arm}$ satisfying constraint (17). The effect of muscle co-contraction is understood using the root locus plot. For this, the loop gain of the closed-loop system is (22), where $G_{open}^{-1} = c_{arm} + k_{arm} s$, as derived from (4). Following this stepwise controller design approach, the closed-loop admittance ensures a stable human coupling. It is evident from the admittance root locus plot as shown in Fig. 4(b). With increasing $c_{arm}$, the poles (especially the dominant one defined by $J_{arm}$) stay in LH.3.

The controller is designed analytically at first and then verified in simulation. The controller bandwidth is approximately $20\text{Hz}$ (for rigidly coupled hands-on situation). With reducing $J_{arm}$, it remains almost same. The simulation result can be seen in Fig. 5(a). The reference tracking of torsion bar torque to rack position is well matched. The haptic bandwidth (defined by the ratio of reference to actual control variable) stays close to 1 within the driver’s steering excitation range as shown in Fig. 5(b).

\[
3.2 \text{ Position Control}
\]

The position-control approach has reference (5) in the outer loop and position feedback in the inner loop as shown in Fig. 2(b). The reference steering rack position is derived using the torsion bar torque as (23). The resulting motor torque request is given in (24). Considering (2), the (position-control) tracking and reference transfer functions are given as (25) and (26) respectively.

\[
X_{r,ref}(s) = G_{ref} M_{th}(s)
\]

(23)

\[
M_{mot}(s) = F_M (X_{r,ref}(s) - X_r(s))
\]

(24)

\[
X_r(s) = \frac{F_2 (X_{r,ref}(s) - X_r(s))}{(m_r s^2 + k_r s + c_r) + F_2 i_{mot}}
\]

(25)

\[
\frac{X_r(s)}{F_2 i_{mot}} = \frac{G_{ref} F_2 i_{mot}}{(m_r s^2 + k_r s + c_r) + F_2 i_{mot}}
\]

(26)

The position feedback control ($F_2$) is derived using the torque feedback control law, $F_M$. The criteria is to place the closed-loop poles at the same location in the complex plane. This implies some characteristic equation ($G_{char} = 1 + L_{o,M}$) for the closed-loop plant. The final result is shown in (27). For manipulating the haptic feedback (torque) using the position-control method, the inner loop requires a higher order transfer function to reduce the error in steering rack speed and acceleration. This is motivated in (28), as derived from (13) and (27). The resulting feedback control law becomes (29) using (15). The feedback controller gains ($K_{d,z}, K_{i,x}, K_{p,z}, K_{d,x}$) should be quantified independent of reference parameters. For practical reasons, the derivative and double-derivative terms require filtering. With this, the closed-loop LTI system is reachable and observable since no pole/zero cancellations take place.

\[
G_{char,M} = G_{char,x} \implies F_x = -F_M G_{ref}^{-1}
\]

(27)

\[
F_x = -F_M (m_{ref} s^2 + k_{ref} s + c_{ref}) / i_{vp}
\]

(28)

\[
F_x = K_{d,x} s^2 + K_{d,z} s + K_{p,x} + K_{i,x} s
\]

(29)
proportional gain in torque-control compensates the mechanical impedance, the double-derivative gain ($K_{d2,x}$) in position-control fulfills that purpose. The initial value theorem on (30) proves this claim as shown in (33) for a step position request, $\Delta x_{r,ref}$, at $t = 0$. Higher $K_{d2,x}$ is desirable to overcome the rack mass (which is a primary motive), but the phase margin limits the upper bound due to the second-order derivative filter. Another important reason for smaller $K_{d2,x}$ is that the double-derivative amplifies the sensor noise incredibly. The torque-control filter for reference inverse is used here for an unbiased comparison between the two methods. The quantification of $K_{i,x}$ and $K_{d2,x}$ is explained in the stability part.

\[
\frac{X_r(s)}{X_{r,ref}(s)} = \frac{F_i}{m_r s^2 + k_r s + c_r + F_x} \quad (30)
\]

\[
\frac{X_r(s)}{M_{ib}(s)} = \frac{i_{rp}}{m_r s^2 + k_r s + c_r + F_x} \quad (31)
\]

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \int_0^t (X_r(s) \Delta M_{ib}(s)/s) = \frac{\Delta M_{ib}}{K_{i,x} \epsilon_{pas}} \quad (32)
\]

\[
\Delta x_r = \lim_{s \to \infty} \frac{X_r(s)}{X_{r,ref}(s)} \Delta x_{r,ref} = \frac{\Delta x_{r,ref}}{1 + K_{i,x} \epsilon_{pas} M_{ib}(s)} \quad (33)
\]

The feedback control is coupled to the plant for the inner loop. The stability is defined by the loop gain (34). $K_{i,x}$ defines the stiffness of the closed-loop position-control plant, whereas $K_{d2,x}$ represents the dynamics. To ensure stability of the inner loop, (35) must be satisfied (necessary and sufficient condition). This analytical result does not include controller derivative filter for simplicity. There are two key aspects for the constraint. For a given $K_{d2,x}$, there exists an upper bound on $K_{i,x}$ or vice versa. Ideally both the gains should be higher but the constraint limits the inner loop performance. Increasing $K_{d2,x}$ lowers $K_{i,x}$ upper bound. This is contrary to the torque-control constraint in (17). Also, higher $m_r$ or $J_{arm}$ limits the inner loop performance and stability margin such that the upper bound on either $K_{i,x}$ or $K_{d2,x}$ decreases noticeably. As seen in Fig. 6(a), the inner loop bandwidth changes with and without $J_{arm}$ keeping the same feedback control. As a consequence, the position-control inner loop phase margin is set higher than torque-control because of its sensitivity towards varying $J_{arm}$.

\[
L_{in,x} = F_3 \left[ \frac{X_r(s)}{M_{mot}(s)} \right]_{open} \quad (34)
\]

\[
K_{i,x} \leq \left[ \frac{b_s + (k_{i,x} + k_{mot})}{J_{arm} + (m_r + k_{d2,x} + k_{mot})} \right] \left[ \frac{c_r}{i_{mot}} + K_{p,x} \right] \quad (35)
\]

In the next step, the reference is introduced on the outer loop and coupled to the position controlled plant. The loop gain is given as (36). Considering the two possibilities for the inner and outer loop integration. In the first case, the choice of reference admittance parameters $k_{ref}$ and $c_{ref}$ does not affect the controller stability for a given feedback control. But the admittance mass, $m_{ref}$, cause the limitation because it defines the reference dynamics. With an inner loop bandwidth ($\omega_n$) defined by the feedback control, $m_{ref}$ lower bound is given as (37) such that $T_s = 1/\omega_n$. It is possible to have fast reference dynamics (which implies lower $m_{ref}$) either by decreasing the inertia ($J_s + J_{arm}$) or increasing $\omega_n$. However, the inner loop bandwidth is also dependent on the inertia as shown above. The other possibility is feedback control design for a given reference. The stability holds, if the lower bound condition on $K_{d,x}$ obtained by solving (38) is fulfilled. The simplified resulting constraint primarily depends on the system inertia and $m_{ref}$. For lower $m_{ref}$ and higher $J_{arm}$ or $m_r$, $K_{d,x}$ lower bound increases for the outer loop stability. This is in conflict with phase margin. Because as $K_{d,x}$ increases, the inner loop gain phase margin decreases.

\[
L_{o,x} = F_x \left[ \frac{X_r(s)}{M_{mot}(s)} \right]_{open} - G_{ref} \left[ M_{ib}(s), M_{mot}(s) \right]_{open} \quad (36)
\]

\[
L_{in,x} = \frac{F_3}{J_{arm} + (m_{ref} + k_{d2,x} + k_{mot})} \quad \left[ \frac{c_r}{i_{mot}} + K_{p,x} \right] \quad (37)
\]

\[
K_{d,x}^2 + \frac{1}{i_{mot}} \left[ \frac{m_{ref} - 1}{(J_{arm} + M_r) \epsilon_{pas} K_{i,x} \epsilon_{pas}} k_{tb} \left( \frac{s}{J_{arm} + M_r} + \epsilon_{pas} \right) \right] \quad (38)
\]

\[
K_{d,x}^2 + \frac{1}{i_{mot}} \left[ \frac{m_{ref} - 1}{(J_{arm} + M_r) \epsilon_{pas} K_{i,x} \epsilon_{pas}} k_{tb} \left( \frac{s}{J_{arm} + M_r} + \epsilon_{pas} \right) \right] > 0
\]

The effect of muscle co-contraction is analytically explained using (22) as the loop gain for the coupled interactions. If the above constraints hold true, then the closed-loop admittance could be made stable independent of $c_{arm}$. This ensures contact stability for human coupled interactions in position controlled systems [12, 6]. Fig. 6(b) presents the driver admittance root locus plot for the muscle co-contraction level. With increasing $c_{arm}$, the closed-loop admittance poles remain in LHP. The dominant pole defined by $J_{arm}$ (although stays in LHP) move towards the $jw$–axis (marginal stability) with increasing gain. This would cause contact instability, if the haptic position controller is not designed properly. Hence, this method is not only sensitive to $J_{arm}$ variation but to the muscle co-contraction as well, especially if the plant has high inertia or $m_r$.

The haptic position controller bandwidth is defined by the inner loop. For generic parameters, the bandwidth achieved is approximately 11Hz and 6Hz without and with driver-in-the-loop (or $J_{arm}$) respectively. The reference tracking from simulation result can be seen in Fig. 5(a). Frequency response of torsion bar torque to rack position is similar to torque-control with some deviations at higher frequencies due to filtering of the higher order derivative/s in the inner loop. The haptic control variable (function) is shown in Fig. 5(b), which stays close to 1 as desired.

### 3.3 Road Disturbance Attenuation

After a similar tracking performance for haptic controllers, the next point of comparison is disturbance rejection with their respective control law. This is obtained by grounding $\delta_{ref} = 0$ and adding an external road input ($F_{ext}$) on the steering rack, see Fig. 1. The resulting disturbance attenuation (closed-loop) frequency response is shown in Fig. 7(a). For low frequency disturbances (< 1Hz), torque-control has better attenuation. Because the steering rack stiffness is high and the torque controller performs better with stiffer environments as mentioned in [13]. For high frequencies (> 5Hz), torque-control again provides more disturbance rejection than position-control. Higher arm inertia is desirable for high frequency noise attenuation. But position-control (with $J_{arm} \neq 0$) shows less damping around
10Hz at the steering wheel eigenfrequency due to increase in system inertia and limited feedback control performance. Subsequently, the oscillations in position-control steering torque response for a disturbance step, \(F_{\text{r, dist}} = 1\text{kN}\), can be seen in Fig. 7(b). High system inertia causes limitation in position-control for high frequency disturbance rejection. This requires further improvement in the feedback control especially for the higher order derivative/s to control high system inertia. Within mid-frequency range \((1-5\text{Hz})\), the steering rack stiffness (which is a function of front axle lateral slip) drops and the position controller offers better attenuation for softer environments, see [13]. The controller performance is closely matched analytically. Hence, they will be compared in reality both objectively and subjectively as next steps.

4 MERGING LATERAL CONTROL REQUEST

Lateral vehicle control functions are based on steering rack position request. As shown in Fig. 2, the external request can be added directly to the inner loop before the feedback control in the position controller as a straightforward solution. In case of torque-control, the position request is subtracted from the actual rack position in the outer loop before the reference inverse. Both methods provide a comparable performance in hands-on/off conditions with a bandwidth 1.5Hz and similar stability margin. This external intervention performance is only sufficient for low frequency requests, e.g. in Lane Keeping Aid, etc. Higher bandwidth might be achievable with other controller layouts, but it would require additional tuning.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, the closed-loop haptic feedback control methods for an EPAS system are investigated. The objective is to compensate the motor impedance on the steering rack and track the desired reference defining the steering feel. In torque-control, the proportional gain is necessary to overcome the mechanical rack impedance. Whereas in position-control, the double-derivative term fulfills the same purpose. The higher order derivatives in position feedback control (with suitable filtering) are required to overcome the inertia and achieve an acceptable reference tracking. As a consequence of the filtering and stability constraint, the position-control inner loop bandwidth is limited. Increasing the system inertia hampers stability and high frequency tracking. Moreover, increasing the driver arm inertia further deteriorates the position-control inner loop stability and performance. On the contrary, the torque-control inner loop is almost insensitive to the arm inertia variation. However, the torque-control outer loop limits the reference tracking due to filtering without causing controller stability issues. For human coupled interactions, the position controller is more sensitive to the muscle co-contraction. Following the controller design procedure outlined in the paper, it is possible to realize a similar reference tracking performance (within the driver’s steering excitation range) and stability margin in both the cases. Subsequently, the resulting torque controller haptic bandwidth is higher than the position controller.

For road disturbance attenuation, the torque controller offers better performance in low frequency range due to higher system stiffness. As the stiffness reduces with increasing frequency, the position controller performs better (for mid-frequency range). However at higher frequencies, the position feedback control has limited performance due to high system inertia. As a result, the torque controller provides higher attenuation. For external rack position request, the controllers have similar performance in both hands-on/off conditions. Experiments in vehicle will be performed to evaluate the steering feel and external lateral vehicle control intervention for the controllers under different conditions and driver excitations.
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