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Heterogeneous Leg Stiffness and Roll in Dynamic Running

Samuel Burden†, Jonathan Clark‡, Joel Weingarten‡, Haldun Komsuoglu‡, Daniel Koditschek‡
†Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, USA
‡Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

Abstract—Legged robots are by nature strongly non-linear, high-dimensional systems whose full complexity permits neither tractable mathematical analysis nor comprehensive numerical study. In consequence, a growing body of literature interrogates simplified “template” [1], [2] models—to date almost exclusively confined to sagittal- or horizontal-plane motion—with the aim of gaining insight into the design or control of the far messier reality. In this paper we introduce a simple bounding-in-place (“BIP”) model as a candidate frontal plane template for straight-ahead level ground running and explore its use in formulating hypotheses about whether and why rolling motion is important in legged locomotion. Numerical study of left-right compliance asymmetry in the BIP model suggests that compliance ratios yielding lowest steady state roll suffer far longer disturbance recovery transients than those promoting greater steady state roll. We offer preliminary experimental data obtained from video motion capture data of the frontal plane disturbance recovery patterns of a RHex-like hexapod suggesting a correspondence to the conclusions of the numerical study.

I. INTRODUCTION

As our understanding of the dynamics of running animals has increased, so has our ability to develop fast and stable running robots. Particularly important has been the development of the Spring-Loaded Inverted Pendulum (SLIP) model [3], [4], which captures the center of mass motions and ground reaction forces for a wide range of animals. Understanding how animal legs act like springs [5]—absorbing kinetic energy during touchdown and restoring it at liftoff—has encouraged [6] or led directly [7], [8] to the design of many dynamic runners. More recently, the development of the Lateral-Leg Spring (LLS) model [9], [10] has given insight into how the lateral forces exhibited by running animals can act to stabilize the lateral and yaw motions in the horizontal plane [11]. These models can be combined to suggest many salient features of legged locomotion dynamics.

In addition to oscillations in the sagittal and horizontal planes, animals and dynamic robots of various morphologies typically exhibit rolling motions not captured in either the SLIP or LLS model. The observation of a roll component in legged locomotion has a long history in robotics, stretching back at least two decades [12], and contemporary empirical research seems to confirm [13] the seeming inevitability of a substantial roll-pitch synchrony in legged trotting. More analytically inclined investigations of passive (downhill, gravitationally-driven) bipedal walking [14], [15] have shown that roll oscillation is unstable in spatial instances of these gaits [16]. Simple pelvic [17] or step-placement [16] feedback (the latter reminiscent of observed human gait control mechanisms [18]) can be shown to stabilize roll, but these “energetically natural” controllers do not seem to diminish its magnitude, notwithstanding the apparent energetic inefficiency it harbors through the exercise of seemingly inessential but inevitably lossy degrees of freedom. Beyond its seeming energetic inefficiency there are “higher level” objections to roll in steady state legged gaits. Such motion makes exteroceptive and even proprioceptive sensing more difficult. Visual data incurs a significant rotational overlay that necessitates extra processing; gyroscopic effects are harder to measure; and even tactile sensing by antennae or legs is complicated by alterations in touch-down timing arising from roll. From these perspectives, any design change that would reduce roll might seem to make the control of the robot more straightforward.

However, our intuition and experience with legged robotic systems leads us to an opposing hypothesis. In our previous work tuning RHex [21] and Sprawlta [22] it has always seemed that the best gaits incur significant roll dynamics. We suspect that these frontal plane oscillations actually confer significant dynamic benefit. In particular, we suspect that the attractors (hybrid limit cycles) associated with alternating tripod gaits in hexapedal runners have speedier restorative time constants in rough correspondence with the magnitude of their in-phase roll component.

In this paper we seek to investigate that hypothesis. To explore the effect of leg design on the frontal plane dynamics of running we introduce a candidate template—the bounding-in-place (“BIP”) model. We explore nume-
Fig. 2. Bounding-in-place (“BIP”) model for legged rolling motion. In general, \( k_1 \neq k_2 \). We set \( B_1 = B_2 = 0 \) when we wish to study a conservative model.

We model the alternating aspect of the gait by exchanging the spring and damping constants—\((k_1, k_2, B_1, B_2) \leftrightarrow (k_2, k_1, B_2, B_1)\)—when the body transitions from full flight to partial stance.

The BIP model bears a striking schematic resemblance to Buehler’s bounding model [23], but differs significantly in that Buehler’s model allows the legs to rotate and the body to translate horizontally. As we will demonstrate, these differences are significant enough to eliminate the passive stability properties observed in the Buehler model.

A. Conservative BIP Model

Motivated by the discovery in the LLS model [9] and Buehler’s bounding model [23] of stable open-loop gaits in a conservative model, we begin with no energy dissipation or addition in our model. We choose to describe the system’s equations of motion in terms of the height of the block’s center-of-mass \( h \) and its rotation \( \theta \). Straightforward analysis yields the governing equations,

\[
\begin{align*}
\ddot{h}(t) &= \frac{1}{M} \left[ -gM + (\gamma - h(t))(\tilde{k}_1 + \tilde{k}_2) + w \sin(\theta(t))(\tilde{k}_1 - \tilde{k}_2) \right], \\
\ddot{\theta}(t) &= -\frac{1}{J} \cos(\theta(t)) \left[ (\gamma - h(t))(\tilde{k}_1 - \tilde{k}_2) + w \sin(\theta(t))(\tilde{k}_1 + \tilde{k}_2) \right],
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \tilde{k}_i := \sigma_i k_i \) and \( \sigma_i \) is a Boolean variable set to 1 or 0 depending upon whether leg \( i \) is in stance or in flight.

Transitions between states are detected using threshold equations, which we’ll describe using the leg displacement coordinates given by

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &= \gamma - (h - w \sin \theta), \\
x_2 &= \gamma - (h + w \sin \theta).
\end{align*}
\]

In particular, a necessary condition for a transition to occur is that a leg either touches down or leaves the ground,

\[
x_1 = 0 \text{ or } x_2 = 0.
\]

When this condition is triggered, the pair \((\sigma_1, \sigma_2)\) transitions according to certain functions of state. Specifically, let \( z = (x_1, \dot{x}_1, x_2, \dot{x}_2)^T \) be the system state and let \( H(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)(z) \) be the transition function out of the pair \((\sigma_1, \sigma_2)\) so that when (3) is triggered, \((\sigma_1, \sigma_2) := H(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)(z)\).

\[
H(0,0)(z) = \begin{cases} 
(1,1) \text{ if } x_1 = 0, \ x_1 \leq 0, \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad x_2 = 0, \ x_2 \leq 0; \\
(1,0) \text{ if } x_1 = 0, \ x_1 \leq 0, \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad x_2 \neq 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_2 > 0; \\
(0,1) \text{ if } x_1 \neq 0, \ x_1 > 0, \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad x_2 = 0, \ x_2 \leq 0; \\
(0,0) \quad \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]
of mass roughly traces out a sinusoid; see Fig. 4). A full-flight phase and allows the derivative of the height to change sign only once during stance (i.e. the system’s center-of-mass trajectory by adding energy to the system in a manner that most closely mimics EduBot’s. The EduBot-like gait has a full-flight phase and allows the derivative of the height to change sign only once during stance (i.e. the system’s center-of-mass roughly traces out a sinusoid; see Fig. 4). A full-flight phase and allows the derivative of the height to change sign only once during stance (i.e. the system’s center-of-mass roughly traces out a sinusoid; see Fig. 4). A full-flight phase and allows the derivative of the height to change sign only once during stance (i.e. the system’s center-of-mass roughly traces out a sinusoid; see Fig. 4).

\[ \mathcal{H}_{(1,1)}(z) = \begin{cases} (0,0) & \text{if } x_1 = 0, \dot{x}_1 > 0, \\ (1,0) & \text{if } x_1 \neq 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_1 \leq 0, \\ (0,1) & \text{if } x_1 = 0, \dot{x}_1 > 0, \\ (1,1) & \text{if } x_2 \neq 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_2 \leq 0; \end{cases} \]

\[ \mathcal{H}_{(1,0)}(z) = \begin{cases} (0,1) & \text{if } x_1 = 0, \dot{x}_1 > 0, \\ (0,0) & \text{if } x_1 = 0, \dot{x}_2 > 0, \\ (1,1) & \text{if } x_2 \neq 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_2 > 0; \end{cases} \]

\[ \mathcal{H}_{(0,1)}(z) = \begin{cases} (1,0) & \text{if } x_1 = 0, \dot{x}_1 \leq 0, \\ (0,0) & \text{if } x_1 \neq 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_1 > 0, \\ (1,1) & \text{if } x_2 \neq 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_2 \leq 0; \end{cases} \]

Recall our statement that when the body transitions from full flight to partial stance its spring constants are exchanged; \((k_1, k_2) \mapsto (k_2, k_1)\). In terms of the transition functions defined above, this means the transitions \(\mathcal{H}_{(0,0)} = (1,0)\) and \(\mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} = (0,1)\) trigger the exchange.

An analytical account of this hybrid, tightly coupled, nonlinear dynamical model promises to be very complicated and lies well beyond the scope of the present paper. Instead, we turn to numerical simulations to study the system’s behavior.

We used numerical simulations of the flow defined by (1), (3), and (4)) to generate system trajectories from a variety of initial conditions (see Appendices A, B). In particular, we searched for equilibrium gaits (defined as periodic orbits of the hybrid dynamical system defined by (1), (3), and (4)). We found several such gaits and chose to analyze the one that most closely mimics EduBot’s. The EduBot-like gait has a full-flight phase and allows the derivative of the height to change sign only once during stance (i.e. the system’s center-of-mass roughly traces out a sinusoid; see Fig. 4).

Using an iterative algorithm, we estimated the touchdown state—the body state when one leg touches down from flight—associated with the desired gaits to within one part in one million. We do this by computing the touchdown-to-touchdown Poincaré map \(\mathcal{P}\) at points with equal energy; periodic gaits are determined by the fixed points of this map. Because the system is conservative, given \(h, \theta\), and one of \(h\) or \(\theta\), the other can be determined. Also, given either \(h\) or \(\theta\) at touchdown, the other is determined by (3). Thus we need only search, for instance, over an interval in \(h\)-\(\theta\) space to estimate the locations of the fixed points of \(\mathcal{P}\). At each step in our search algorithm, we compute the magnitude of \(\mathcal{P}\) on a grid in some rectangular region of \(h\)-\(\dot{h}\) space, then shrink the rectangle around the point \((\dot{h}^*, \dot{h}^*)\) corresponding to the smallest value of \(|\mathcal{P}(z) - z|\). Assuming there is only one fixed point of \(\mathcal{P}\) in the initial region, this algorithm will estimate the touchdown state of the desired equilibrium gaits to arbitrary precision.

No matter how stringent our error tolerances, however, we always found these gaits to be unstable, as Fig. 3 illustrates. This is interesting because it is not a priori unreasonable to imagine that the conservative model’s hybrid dynamics could have generated an asymptotically stable gait (as occurs in the LLS and Buehler models). However, given that errors on the order of \(1 \times 10^{-6}\) in the touchdown state estimate cause large trajectory deviations after only a few strides, we consider this a poor model to study stability properties of EduBot’s gait, and introduce damping to try to capture the robot’s stable periodic behavior.

**B. Dissipative BIP Model**

In an effort to make the equilibrium gaits of this model attracting, and to better approximate the physical system, we add viscous damping to the conservative model, so that the equations of motion include a term proportional to the negative of the velocity of the point of attachment of each spring. The constants of proportionality are the damping constants \(B_1\) and \(B_2\), which we fix at \(k_2/70\), smaller than that measured in EduBot’s legs. Even using this rough approximation to the complex physical interactions that drive EduBot’s motion, we observe qualitative agreement between body trajectories in the model and EduBot trajectories (see Fig. 4).

Since energy is continually removed from the system with the addition of damping, we restore the possibility of a periodic trajectory by adding energy to the system in a manner similar to that employed by Koditschek and Buehler [24] in analyzing one-dimensional hopping. When a leg spring reaches maximum compression in the model, we temporarily...
increase its spring constant, thus increasing the energy stored in the spring. This actuation scheme was chosen because it is easy to implement and can facilitate analysis better than many other methods. Maximum compression is detected when a leg’s velocity goes to zero from below,

\[ \dot{x}_1 \uparrow 0 \text{ or } \dot{x}_2 \uparrow 0. \]  

At that instant, the leg’s spring constant is increased by a factor \( \eta > 0 \) chosen to yield gaits qualitatively similar to the physical robot. When a leg leaves the ground in simulation, its spring constant is reset to its initial value.

For the case of our tripod-based runner we increase \( \eta \) twice as much for the stiffer (double support) leg, reflecting our observation that in the physical system each of EduBot’s legs imparts a roughly equal vertical force on the ground during stance. This observation is consistent with the biological literature [26], and is qualitatively corroborated by the profile of the vertical ground reaction forces exerted on EduBot’s front, rear, and middle legs (see Fig. 5).

As we demonstrate in the next section, adding damping to the model indeed produces the expected stable equilibrium gaits (isolated period-one attracting orbits). This removes the necessity to use an iterative method when searching for periodic orbits, since we can simply allow the simulation to settle into equilibrium and record the touchdown state at that point.

### III. Design Modifications and Stability

Having established our model for rolling dynamics, we proceed to investigate modifications that eliminate roll and the effect of these modifications on the stability of equilibrium gaits. Our model was designed assuming that roll is introduced primarily by a difference in effective leg stiffness between the two sides of EduBot. Thus we investigate the effect that stiffening the softer leg has on roll. In the model, we fix \( k_2 \), start with \( k_1/k_2 = 0.25 \), and increase that ratio to 1. In the physical system, we affix middle legs of varying stiffness to the robot.

Fig. 6 displays the roll and its velocity at touchdown for the equilibrium gait associated with different values of \( k_1 \) when all other parameters are held fixed \((k_2 = 1440 \text{ N/m})\). Because there is no energy loss in flight the roll velocity at touchdown is a reasonable measure of the roll velocity magnitude averaged over an entire orbit. Hence, the plot suggests that roll magnitude at touchdown is a surrogate for the intensity of the rolling associated with a given equilibrium gait. As \( k_1/k_2 \to 1 \), both roll and its velocity at touchdown increase monotonically, passing near the origin at \( k_1/k_2 \approx 0.7 \) \((k_1 \approx 1010 \text{ N/m})\). Thus the model predicts that as EduBot’s middle legs are made stiffer, the robot’s roll magnitude will decrease until the ratio of stiffnesses is near \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \); then increase as the ratio increases to

![Fig. 4](image1.png)

**Fig. 4.** Typical height and roll trajectories from EduBot and from the dissipative model. Both data sets were sampled at 120 Hz and filtered with a 5-sample median filter as described in Section IV. The model deviates in magnitude and precise shape in both coordinates, but qualitatively captures some of the distinctive behavior exhibited by the robot. We attribute the difference in the shape of the roll trajectories largely to EduBot achieving a smaller flight phase than the model.

![Fig. 5](image2.png)

**Fig. 5.** Vertical ground reaction force profile for EduBot’s left side. Measured with a commercial force plate [27], sampled at 200 Hz, averaged over 12 trials.
steady state for numerical as well as dynamical reasons. The legs would have to repeatedly achieve maximum compression at precisely balanced legs, the relevant periodic gait (associated with zero roll) is seen in the figure, recovery time reaches a minimum around $k_1/k_2 = 0.38$.

Note the zero crossing occurs well before $k_1/k_2 = 1$ since with evenly balanced legs, the relevant periodic gait (associated with zero roll) is unstable in consequence of our simplified energy restoration model. The intensity of the rolling associated with a given equilibrium gait.

A. Stability Prediction

Based on our experience with EduBot and RHex, we hypothesize that increasing $k_1/k_2 \rightarrow 1$ makes the robot’s gait less dynamically stable. We investigate the effect of this parametric change on stability in two ways: first, we test the time to recover from a disturbance; second, we numerically compute the Jacobian of the touchdown-to-touchdown Poincaré map [24] and use the magnitude of the eigenvalues of this matrix as a stability metric, as in [23], [28].

1) Disturbance Response: We allow the body to settle into an equilibrium gait, then disturb it by applying an instantaneous vertical force and angular torque at touchdown; this is qualitatively similar to the disturbance applied experimentally (see Section IV-C) and produces qualitatively similar response trajectories (see Figs. 7 and 8), though we do not have a quantitative comparison. We record the disturbance recovery time as the time between the disturbance and the next stable touchdown. When the body touched down on its left leg spring, its vertical velocity was increased by 0.75 m/sec and its roll velocity was decreased by 3 rad/sec. We define a stable touchdown as having the property that the average touchdown state over the subsequent five half-strides is within 0.3% of the equilibrium touchdown state.

We then estimate the partial derivative of the stride map with respect to the $j^{th}$ component as

$$\partial \mathbf{z} / \partial z_j = \mathbf{J}$$

model predicts that as EduBot’s middle leg is made stiffer, it will become less dynamically stable until $k_1/k_2$ exceeds $\approx 0.7$, at which point the stability will increase again, though the gait will still be less stable than it was when $k_1/k_2 $ decreases to within a desired tolerance $\epsilon$ in each coordinate; here $\epsilon \leq 1 \times 10^{-5}$. Then we compute the system’s trajectory for a half-stride starting from two points $z^+ + \delta_j$, $z^- + \delta_j$, a small displacement $1 \gg \delta_j \gg \epsilon$ ahead of and behind the fixed point in the $j^{th}$ coordinate. We then estimate the partial derivative of the stride map with respect to the $j^{th}$ component as

Fig. 6. Body roll and its velocity at touchdown as $k_1/k_2 \rightarrow 1$. This plot suggests that the roll magnitude at touchdown is a reasonable surrogate for the intensity of the rolling associated with a given equilibrium gait.

Fig. 7. Simulation results: trace of the dissipative model height and roll variables over time taken from a typical disturbance run.

Fig. 8. Experimental results: trace of the physical robot’s body height and roll variables over time taken from a typical disturbance run.

1) Note the zero crossing occurs well before $k_1/k_2 = 1$ since with evenly balanced legs, the relevant periodic gait (associated with zero roll) is unstable in consequence of our simplified energy restoration model. The legs would have to repeatedly achieve maximum compression at precisely the same moment in order to preserve the gait—clearly unsupportable at steady state for numerical as well as dynamical reasons.
the "dependent" variable, submatrix that excludes the row and column associated with reduced quality of dynamic stability as $k_1/k_2 \to 1$. The apparent discontinuity in this figure occurs at the same value of $k_1/k_2$ as caused the touchdown state to cross the origin in Fig. 6. This discontinuity is explained by the fact that the two sides of the origin correspond to two qualitatively different gaits in simulation.

3) Summary: By adding viscous damping to the conservative model of Section II-A, equilibrium gaits in the system become stable. By increasing the ratio $k_1/k_2$ in the dissipative model, the body’s roll decreases to nearly zero at $k_1/k_2 \approx 0.7$, but increases as that ratio is increased further. In addition, as $k_1/k_2 \to 1$ from 0.5, gait stability decreases significantly, and this result was demonstrated using two different stability metrics. The fact that the minimum touchdown roll doesn’t occur when $k_1/k_2 \approx 1$ seems to be an artifact of our energy addition scheme, and may not appear when other schemes are used.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In order to evaluate the dissipative model’s relevance to the robot and to check whether the relationship between the magnitude of the roll and the stability of the rolling motions holds for the robot, we perform experiments to investigate the effect increasing $k_1/k_2$ has on EduBot’s gait. Specifically, we collect trajectory data to compute the average rotational displacement as well as EduBot’s disturbance response as $k_1$ is increased.

A. Experimental Methods

Our experimental platform is EduBot [19], a RHex-like hexapedal robot. EduBot measures approximately 30 cm long and 11 cm wide, its legs are 8 cm long, and its mass is approximately 1.4 kg. Similarly to RHex, EduBot’s legs are semicircular and revolve about their hips and the robot employs an alternating-tripod gait, where the front and back legs on one side of the robot cycle in phase with the middle leg on the other side. In contrast to RHex, EduBot’s legs are made from polyurethane resins, affording easy experimentation with a variety of leg stiffnesses. We tune the robot’s gait by adjusting a variety of parameters as in [21], and use the same gait parameters for all experiments. The particular gait we selected has a duty cycle of less than 50%, meaning all the robot’s legs leave the ground for a short time during a stride. We call this a jogging gait.

Trajectory measurements for the robot were recorded with a video-based motion capture system that uses Vicon 6 strobed cameras. The system treats EduBot as a rigid body in $\mathbb{R}^3$, recording the robot’s position and rotation along three axes at approximately 120 Hz with sub-millimeter accuracy. Occasionally the motion capture system loses track of the robot for up to five samples; in this case, we interpolate linearly across the lost samples. We then apply a 5-sample median filter to smooth jump discontinuities in the data that appear to be introduced by noise. This filter has the effect of rounding cusps in the roll trajectory data, but otherwise alters the data minimally.


B. Gait Trajectory

We allowed the robot to settle into an equilibrium jogging gait over 6-20 strides and recorded its trajectory using the motion capture system described above. We then extracted the roll trajectory data and computed the average roll displacement over several experiments. Table I shows that the average roll decreases by 50% from 4.1 to 1.9 degrees as \( k_1 \rightarrow k_2 \).

C. Disturbance Response

We disturb the robot in a manner similar to simulation. First, EduBot runs across a four-foot-long platform until it achieves an equilibrium jogging gait. Then, when it crosses the middle of a platform, we manually actuate a see-saw platform segment, lifting and retracting the platform under one side of EduBot several centimeters in approximately a half a second, imparting a vertical force and angular torque; Fig. 8 presents the sample traces of body height and roll recorded during a typical disturbance experiment. Since EduBot’s trajectory is not as consistent as that of the simulation, a coarser stability metric is required. Specifically, we use the period of EduBot’s gait as a discrete unit of time and count the number of full leg cycle periods required for the robot to return to an equilibrium gait; we identify equilibrium gaits visually.

We performed two sets of these disturbance experiments, one with \( k_1/k_2 \approx 0.5 \) and the other with \( k_1/k_2 \approx 0.10 \). The results are summarized in Table II. As can be seen in that table, our preliminary results suggest that disturbance response time increases as the fraction \( k_1/k_2 \) is increased from \( \frac{5}{20} \) to \( \frac{6}{70} \), which is consistent with the result from the model.

V. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have begun to explore the function of roll in dynamic legged locomotion. We have hypothesized that oscillatory roll motion will prove to play a significant role in the overall stability of the system. We have developed a novel, greatly simplified, hence, tractable model of the roll component in a running hexapod. Numerical results from this model match reasonably closely preliminary experiments on our physical robotic platforms, that demonstrated the strong effect of varied relative leg stiffness on the characteristic roll dynamics. More interestingly, the simulations corroborate (and the few preliminary experiments do not contradict) our hypothesis that as the magnitude of the periodic roll motion goes to zero, the system’s ability to reject disturbances is reduced.

As stated, the results of experimentation on the physical system are preliminary. In particular, more systematic empirical work may reveal that the very simple energy restoration strategy introduced in this model may diminish the quality of more symmetrically sprung roll oscillations as an artifact of simulation along the lines of the observation in footnote 1. In the near future we will conduct more exhaustive experimentation on our systems to further probe the central hypothesis. We will examine the correlation between reduced roll and the energy efficiency and other dynamics of the system as well as the system’s ability to traverse rough or broken terrain as roll dynamics are altered. Finally, we hope to work with biologists to verify these results on biological systems.
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APPENDIX

A. Model Parameters

The model parameters were chosen to approximate those of EduBot, with: \( w = 10.75 \text{ cm} \), \( M = 1.2 \text{ kg} \), \( J = \frac{1}{3} M w^2 \) \( \text{kg m}^2 \), \( \gamma = 8 \text{ cm} \), \( k_2 = 1440 \text{ N/m} \), \( k_1 \) varies between 360 and 1420 \( \text{N/m} \), \( B_1 = B_2 = k_2/70 \), and \( \eta = 2500 \text{ N/m} \); these values roughly match the robot’s, though the moment of inertia is computed as if EduBot were a uniform rod and \( \eta \) is chosen to make the model behave qualitatively similar to the robot.

B. Numerical Methods

We use the Matlab ode45 solver to compute the flow of (1) that advances the state until a transition event (3) is flagged by the Matlab root solver [29]. The transition function (4) is then applied and we return to the computation of (1).
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