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Abstract—In the field of robotics the energy spent for actuation is always an issue. It is often the case that some desired motions cannot be achieved by the robot due to limitations in actuation power. We suggest a simple solution to the problem: complement the actuators by some configuration of mechanical springs which delivers a torque profile that is well-tuned for the desired robot motion. As a result, the control effort for the original actuator will be reduced. In this case study we consider an underactuated planar two-link robot for experimental demonstration of the concept. The virtual holonomic constraints approach serves as analytical tool to parameterize, plan, and stabilize desired periodic motions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Motion planning and feedback controller design are key issues in robotics. The application area of today's robots is broad: it covers manipulation tasks for standard robot arms, legged locomotion of mechanically sophisticated machines, robotic prosthetics and exoskeletons, etc. Naturally, the achievable performance of feedback controlled robots depends to a large extent on the power of available actuators. However, the actuators are normally chosen according to constraints in the construction, such as limited space, minimal mass, and power consumption. It means that many motions planned analytically based on appropriate models and confirmed throughout simulations might not be realizable in experiments. There are always some desired motions that require actuation power which is hardly feasible for the robot. That is why we are interested to answer the following question. Is it possible to improve the actuation range by introducing some passive mechanical elements in parallel to the original actuator?

Springs are simple mechanical devices that offer great functionality at low cost. They are commonly applied in machines to exert force, to provide flexibility, and to store or absorb energy [4]. Therefore, springs are particularly attractive to be used as complementary source of torque. The main task is to design a spring configuration that gives a torque profile somewhat close to the one that is required for a particular motion. As a result, the original actuator is mainly stabilizing this motion while the springs generate most of the nominal torque required.

This paper shows how to take advantage of mechanical springs to complement a comparably weak DC motor. The aim is to generate periodic motions of an underactuated planar two-link robot, the so-called Pendubot. Motion planning and control design of underactuated systems is clearly more challenging compared to the case when all degrees of freedom are actuated. Here, the main objective is to reduce the control efforts by augmenting the actuation with contributive spring torques. The Pendubot and the installed spring assembly are depicted in Fig. 1. Corresponding system dynamics as well as properties of the spring assembly are presented in Section II and Section III.

Fig. 1. Pendubot with spring assembly from Umeå University. The robot was designed and built by A. Sandberg and S. Elmå.

The virtual holonomic constraints approach, recently developed in [6], is used in Section IV and Section V as analytical tool to parameterize, plan, and stabilize desired periodic motions for the Pendubot. The underlying theory has been already applied in [1]. However, in this paper the focus lies on the contribution of springs complementary to the actuator which plays a role in the motion planning as well as in the feedback control action. Experimental results for a particular periodic motion are finally shown in Section VI and conclusions are drawn in Section VII.
II. PENDUBOT DYNAMICS

The dynamics of the planar two-link manipulating robot with actuation only on first link $q_1$ and a non-actuated link $q_2$ is given by [8]

$$M(q) \begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_1 \\ \dot{q}_2 \end{bmatrix} + C(q, \dot{q}) \begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_1 \\ \dot{q}_2 \end{bmatrix} + G(q) = \begin{bmatrix} \tau \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

with the inertia matrix

$$M(q) = \begin{bmatrix} p_1 + p_2 + 2p_3 \cos(q_2) & p_2 + p_3 \cos(q_2) \\ p_2 + p_3 \cos(q_2) & p_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

the matrix corresponding to Coriolis and centrifugal forces

$$C(q, \dot{q}) = \begin{bmatrix} -p_3 \sin(q_2) \dot{q}_2 & -p_3 \sin(q_2) (\dot{q}_1 + \dot{q}_2) \\ p_3 \sin(q_2) \dot{q}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and the gravitational torque vector

$$G(q) = \begin{bmatrix} p_4 \cos(q_1) + p_5 \cos(q_1 + q_2) \\ p_5 \cos(q_1 + q_2) \end{bmatrix}.$$ 

The physical model parameters, given in Table I, are combined to

$$p_1 = m_1 l_1^2 + m_2 l_1^2 + J_{c1} = 0.0319 \text{kg m}^2,$$

$$p_2 = m_2 l_2^2 + J_{c2} = 0.0092 \text{kg m}^2,$$

$$p_3 = m_2 l_1 r_2 = 0.01 \text{kg m}^2,$$

$$p_4 = (m_1 r_1 + m_2 l_1) g = 1.2954 \text{Nm},$$

$$p_5 = m_2 r_2 g = 0.3915 \text{Nm}.$$ 

Lengths, masses, and distances to the respective centers of mass are measured, while corresponding inertias are identified experimentally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
<th>PHYSICAL PARAMETERS OF THE SETUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>First Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>$l_1 = 0.25$ m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>$m_1 = 0.374$ kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to CoM</td>
<td>$r_1 = 0.198$ m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertia about CoM</td>
<td>$J_{c1} = 0.0027$ kg m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravitational constant</td>
<td>$g = 9.81 \text{m/s}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring assembly</td>
<td>$r_1 = r_4 = 0.045$ m, $r_2 = r_3 = 0.03$ m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actuator in our setup is quite weak, with a maximum torque of 0.22 Nm, compared to the rather big masses to be accelerated. We will clearly face performance problems for some desired motions. Therefore, a spring assembly is installed in parallel to the motor to enhance the overall actuation. However, the spring configuration must be well-tuned for a particular motion.

III. SPRING ASSEMBLY

Numerous compression springs can be installed in the spring assembly as shown in Fig. 2. The torque about the first link joint that is delivered by the individual springs on the bottom $\{c_{1B}, c_{2B}, c_{3B}, c_{4B}\}$ and on the top $\{c_{1T}, c_{2T}, c_{3T}, c_{4T}\}$ is computed as follows

$$\tau_{c}(\varphi) = \begin{cases} 
\tau_{c_{1T}}(\varphi) + \tau_{c_{2T}}(\varphi) \\
\tau_{c_{3B}}(\varphi) + \tau_{c_{4B}}(\varphi) \\
-\tau_{c_{1B}}(\varphi) - \tau_{c_{2B}}(\varphi) \\
-\tau_{c_{3T}}(\varphi) - \tau_{c_{4T}}(\varphi)
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{for } \varphi < 0$$

$$\begin{cases} 
\tau_{c_{1B}}(\varphi) + \tau_{c_{2B}}(\varphi) \\
\tau_{c_{3T}}(\varphi) + \tau_{c_{4T}}(\varphi) \\
-\tau_{c_{1T}}(\varphi) - \tau_{c_{2T}}(\varphi) \\
-\tau_{c_{3B}}(\varphi) - \tau_{c_{4B}}(\varphi)
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{for } \varphi > 0$$

where for $i = 1, 4$

$$\tau_{c_{1(B,T)}(\varphi)} = F_{c_{1(B,T)}}(\varphi) \cos (|\varphi|) + \frac{1}{2} \cos (\frac{L_0 - \sin(|\varphi|) r_i}{s_{1(B,T)}(\varphi)}) r_i,$$

$$F_{c_{i(B,T)}}(\varphi) = c_{1(B,T)}(L_0 - s_{1(B,T)}(\varphi)),$$

$$s_{1B}(\varphi) = \sqrt{(L_0 - \sin(|\varphi|) r_i)^2 + (r_i (1 - \cos(\varphi)))^2},$$

$$\{s_{1T} = s_{4B}, s_{2T} = s_{3B}, s_{3T} = s_{2B}, s_{4T} = s_{1B}\}.$$

In the coordinate system of the Pendubot, the angle $\varphi$ is given by $\varphi = \pi/2 + q_1$.

The generated torque w.r.t. the angle $\varphi$ is shown in Fig. 3 exemplified for a configuration of some standard springs $c_{1B} = c_{4B} = 471$ N/m and $c_{2B} = c_{3B} = 471$ N/m, respectively. Note that installing the same springs at the top of the spring assembly instead of the bottom results in the same torque function.

It is clear that the dynamics of our original system (1) changes by installing some springs acting on the first link. It is basically the same as introducing an additional potential torque, i.e. the gravitational torque vector changes accordingly to

$$G_c(q) = G(q) - \begin{bmatrix} \tau_c(q_1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This fact does not influence motion planning for our mechanical system, presented in the next section, but it necessarily plays some role in the feedback control action.
IV. MOTION PLANNING
A. Concept of Virtual Holonomic Constraints

The virtual holonomic constraints approach is a generic tool for motion planning and control, especially for under-actuated systems. The main idea is to reparameterize any somewhat coordinated motion as a geometric function of the generalized coordinates. If this function is preserved by some control action along solutions of the closed-loop system\(^1\), it is called virtual holonomic (geometric) constraint. In particular, one has to choose a coordinate or possibly a scalar function of coordinates (for instance path length) as an independent variable \(\theta\) that parameterizes the motion with respect to time.

Then, the virtual holonomic constraint takes the form

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
q_1 \\
q_2 \\
\vdots \\
q_n
\end{bmatrix} = \Phi(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix}
\phi_1(\theta) \\
\phi_2(\theta) \\
\vdots \\
\phi_n(\theta)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

with \(n = \dim q\). Note that the function \(\Phi(\theta)\) can be shaped either by observation of some real motion or by some analytical design procedure.

Suppose that there exists a control law \(u_\ast\) for the controlled input torques \(B(q)u\) of the underactuated Euler–Lagrange system that makes the virtual holonomic constraint (4) invariant, then, the overall closed-loop system can be represented by reduced order dynamics\(^2\) of the form

\[
\alpha(\theta) \ddot{\theta} + \beta(\theta) \dot{\theta}^2 + \gamma(\theta) = 0.
\]

Hence, solutions of that virtually constrained system define achievable motions of the robot with precise synchronization given by (4). It means that the whole motion is parameterized by the evolution of the chosen configuration variable \(\theta\).

The smooth functions \(\alpha(\theta), \beta(\theta), \gamma(\theta)\) of the reduced dynamics (5) can be computed as follows from [6, Prop. 2]:

\[
\alpha(\theta) = B^\perp M (\Phi(\theta)) \Phi'(\theta) \\
\beta(\theta) = B^\perp \left[ C (\Phi(\theta), \Phi'(\theta), \Phi''(\theta)) + M (\Phi(\theta)) \Phi''(\theta) \right] \\
\gamma(\theta) = B^\perp G (\Phi(\theta)),
\]

where \(B^\perp\) is associated with the non-actuated coordinate of the given system—in case of the Pendubot \(B^\perp = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\).

Note that the reduced order dynamics (5) is always integrable, provided \(\alpha(\theta) \neq 0\), which is a useful property. Specifically, the integral function

\[
I(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\theta}_0, \dot{\theta}_0) = \int_0^\theta \left(-2 \int_{\theta_0}^{\theta} \frac{\beta(\tau)}{\alpha(\tau)} d\tau\right) \dot{\theta}_0^2 \\
+ \int_{\theta_0}^\theta \exp \left(-\int_s^{\theta_0} \frac{\beta(\tau)}{\alpha(\tau)} d\tau\right) \frac{2 \gamma(s)}{\alpha(s)} ds
\]

\[
(6)
\]

\(^1\)Provided that initial conditions \(q_0\) are chosen to satisfy the constraint.

\(^2\)The dimension depends on the degree of underactuation; the differential equation is scalar in the case of underactuation degree one where \(\dim u = 1\).

preserves its zero value along a solution \(\theta(t)\) of (5), initiated at \((\theta(0), \dot{\theta}(0)) = (\theta_0, \dot{\theta}_0)\) [7]. Note that (6) can serve as a measure of distance to a desired trajectory for the reduced system [5].

Eventually, one can also compute the nominal control input \(u_\ast\) required to render a desired solution \(\theta = \theta_\ast(t)\) of (5) assuming perfectly imposed virtual holonomic constraints:

\[
B(q)u = [M(q)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + G(q)] q = \Phi(\theta) \\
\ddot{q} = \Phi'(\theta)\dot{\theta} + \Phi''(\theta)\dot{\theta}^2 + \Phi''(\theta)\dot{\theta} - \tau. 
\]

\[
(7)
\]

B. Periodic Motions of the Pendubot

The procedure to find periodic motions of the Pendubot is described next. The first step is to define some virtual holonomic constraint (4), e.g. polynomial function of some order. Defining a linear relation between the coordinates \(q_1\) and \(q_2\), and choosing \(q_2\) as the independent parameterization variable \(\theta\) gives us

\[
\Phi(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 \\
q_2
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q_{10} + k(\theta - q_{20}) \\
\theta
\end{bmatrix}. 
\]

\[
(8)
\]

For such a choice, existence of small periodic orbits of (5) around a chosen equilibrium \((q_{10}, q_{20})\) has been proved in [7] and is discussed in [1] for the Pendubot.

Let us focus on periodic motions about the downward-downward equilibrium of the Pendubot, i.e.

\[
\begin{bmatrix} q_{10} = -\frac{\pi}{2}, q_{20} = 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

\[
(9)
\]

Such type of oscillation has an apparent resemblance to a swing leg motion during human walking gaits—as an abstraction of the swinging leg, one can view the upper leg being actuated at the hip joint while the lower leg is not or at most weakly actuated by the knee. With the choice of

\[
k = 0.4
\]

\[
(10)
\]

in the linear relation of the virtual holonomic constraint (8), we obtain closed trajectories for the reduced dynamics (5) around the equilibrium (9) as shown in Fig. 4a. All these periodic orbits represent achievable motions of the Pendubot with certain amplitude and period. Not all of those, however, could be easily stabilized by the present actuator. The torque required for any desired motion is simply computed by (7). The torque profiles associated to solutions of the reduced dynamics (depicted in Fig. 4a) are shown in Fig. 4b with respect to the actuated angle \(q_1\)—this representation can be advantageously used to shape the complementary actuation torques of the spring assembly.

Considering the necessary torques for achievable motions requires also a closer look at the available actuation power. In our setup there is a saturation level for the maximum torque of the motor

\[
\tau_{\text{max}} = 0.22 \text{Nm},
\]

i.e. not all motions depicted in Fig. 4 are feasible. Let us choose the following time periodic solution of (5) with
introducing the springs as additional actuator. Looking at the absolute mechanical power (see Fig. 5b) that was used over one period it becomes even more obvious that there has been a remarkable reduction of energy expenditure to

$$P_{\text{red},T}^N = \frac{\int_{T=0}^{T} |\tau_{\text{red}} q_{1*}| \, dt}{\int_{T=0}^{T} |\tau_* q_{1*}| \, dt} = 26\%.$$
V. CONTROL CONCEPT WITH SPRINGS

The design step following the motion planning is the synthesis of a feedback controller with the objective to achieve contraction to the desired trajectory and to diminish effects of disturbances, uncertainties in modeling, errors in parameter estimates, etc. Here, we suggest a controller that is designed based on a transverse linearization along the desired trajectory. The derivations for the feedback control law are shown in the Appendix, where the controlled torque is given as

\[ \tau_k = f(q, \dot{q}, v) . \]

Recall that the dynamics of the Pendubot (1) changes in terms of (3) by installing some springs acting on the first link. In fact, the torque \( \tau_k \) that is generated by springs can be interpreted as mechanical feedback. It means that the controlled torque \( \tau \) to the original dynamics is now composed by

\[ \tau = \tau_c + \tau_k . \] (14)

A general schematic of the control concept with springs is depicted in Fig. 6. Eventually, we expect a significant reduction of mechanical power to be delivered by the motor when the actuation is complemented by some well-tuned springs.

\[ q_1 \quad \text{angle of first link [rad]} \]

\[ q_2 \quad \text{angle of second link [rad]} \]

\[ \hat{\theta} \quad \text{angular position} \]

\[ \tau \quad \text{torque applied to first link [Nm]} \]

\[ \tau^*_c \quad \text{required \tau} \]

\[ \tau^*_r \quad \text{reduced \tau} \]

\[ \tau \quad \text{real \tau} \]

\[ \hat{\theta} \quad \text{desired \theta} \]

\[ \hat{\theta} \quad \text{achieved \theta} \]

\[ \hat{\theta} \quad \text{virtual holonomic constraint} \]

\[ \hat{\theta} \quad \text{achieved phase portrait} \]

\[ \hat{\theta} \quad \text{achieved virtual holonomic constraint} \]

Fig. 6. Schematic of the control concept with mechanical feedback from springs.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The experiment is carried out with a real-time platform of the type dSPACE 1104. The angular positions \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) of the two links are measured by encoders with resolutions of 4096 and 3600 pulses per revolution, respectively. The angular velocities are estimated as \( \dot{q}_1 \) and \( \dot{q}_2 \) based on second order high-gain linear observers [2]. In order to apply the feedback control law (see Appendix) for our desired periodic motion (11), one has to find a stabilizing solution of the dynamic Riccati equation. Such \( R(t) \) was found for the weighting matrices

\[ Q = \text{diag}(1, 1, 0.1) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = 1 . \]

Since there are frictional torques present in the real setup, one has to apply a friction compensation scheme. While there is significant friction in the first link joint, mostly induced by the motor, the friction in the second link joint is assumed to be negligible. In our case we use a static map with estimated Coulomb and viscous properties:

\[ \tau_F = F_C \text{sign}(\dot{q}_1) + F_V \dot{q}_1 , \]

\[ \tau = \tau_c + \tau_k , \]
where the levels of Coulomb friction are different for positive and negative velocities
\[ F_C = \begin{cases} F_{C_{p}} \text{ for } \hat{q}_1 > 0 \\ F_{C_{n}} \text{ for } \hat{q}_1 < 0 \end{cases} \]

The following values were identified in experiments:
\[ F_{C_{p}} = 0.021 \text{ Nm}, \quad F_{C_{n}} = 0.014 \text{ Nm}, \quad F_V = 0.002 \text{ Nm s}. \]

In Fig. 7 the experimental results are shown. The controller was able to stabilize the desired virtually constrained motion (11) utilizing the springs (12) as additional actuator. The applied motor torque shows a hysteresis behavior around the ideally reduced torque which is due to the presence of friction, model uncertainties, delay, etc. However, the springs reduce the motor torque significantly. In fact, the desired motion could not even be achieved in praxi without springs because of the saturation levels of the motor.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we demonstrated the use of mechanical springs as passive actuators in concert with a comparatively weak DC motor to generate periodic motions of an underactuated planar two-link robot. The main objective of reducing the control efforts with contributive spring torques was shown. The virtual holonomic constraints approach serves as analytical tool to parameterize, plan, and stabilize desired motions. The suggested control design procedure is based on a transverse linearization along a desired trajectory. During the motion planning process one can realize a feasible range of motions within given saturation levels of the actuators. By installing a suitable configuration of springs that gives approximately the required torque for the desired motion, it is possible to reduce the control effort and consequently the power consumption of the original actuator significantly. This claim was verified in experiments for a particular periodic motion.

APPENDIX

SUGGESTED STABILIZING CONTROLLER

The key procedure to derive the stabilizing controller for the Pendubot is presented below. The method is based on a transverse linearization along a desired trajectory proposed in [6], [5].

Let us introduce new independent coordinates for the Pendubot (1):
\[ y = q_1 - \phi_1(\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta, \]
where zero value of \( y \) satisfies the virtual holonomic constraints defined in (4) and (8). The first and second time derivatives of \( y \) and \( \theta \) are related to the original coordinates \( q \) and their time derivatives as follows
\[ \ddot{q} = L(\theta, y) \left[ \frac{\ddot{y}}{\dot{\theta}} \right], \quad \ddot{\theta} = L(\theta, y) \left[ \frac{\ddot{y}}{\dot{\theta}} \right] + \dot{L}(\theta, y) \left[ \frac{\dot{y}}{\dot{\theta}} \right] \]
where
\[ L(\theta, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \]

Hence, the dynamics of \( y \) can be written as
\[ \ddot{y} = R(y, \theta, \dot{y}, \dot{\theta}) + N(y, \theta, \dot{\theta}) = v, \]
where
\[ R = [1, 0] L^{-1} M^{-1}(q) \left( -C(q, \dot{q}) \dot{q} - G(q) - L \left[ \frac{\dot{y}}{\dot{\theta}} \right] \right) \frac{q = \Phi(\theta)}{\dot{q} = \dot{\Phi}(\theta)} \]
\[ N = [1, 0] L^{-1} M^{-1}(q) \frac{q = \Phi(\theta)}{\dot{q} = \dot{\Phi}(\theta)} \]
and the feedback transformation
\[ \tau = N^{-1}(y, \theta) \left[ v - R(y, \theta, \dot{y}, \dot{\theta}) \right] \]
results in a virtual control variable \( v \).

Differentiating the integral function (6) along the trajectories of (5), one obtains dynamics transversal to solutions \( \theta(t) \) [6], [5]
\[ \frac{d}{dt} I(\cdot) = \frac{2\theta}{\alpha(\beta)} \left[ g_{\theta}(\cdot) y + g_{\dot{\theta}}(\cdot) \dot{y} + g_{\dot{\dot{\theta}}}(\cdot) v - \beta(\theta) I(\cdot) \right] \]

Eventually, the controller design can be based on the linearization along a desired solution \( \theta_*(t) \)—a linear time-variant comparison system called transverse linearization:
\[ \frac{d}{dt} z = A(\theta_*(t), \dot{\theta}_*(t)) z + b(\theta_*(t), \dot{\theta}_*(t)) v \]

with the time-variant periodic matrix functions
\[ A(\theta(t), \dot{\theta}(t)) = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) & a_{12}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) & a_{13}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ b^T(\theta(t), \dot{\theta}(t)) = [ b_1(\theta, \dot{\theta}) 0 1 ] \]

\[ a_{11}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = -\frac{2\beta(\theta)}{\alpha(\beta)}, \quad a_{12}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = \frac{2\beta g_{\theta}(\theta, \dot{\theta})}{\alpha(\beta)}, \quad b_1(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = \frac{2\beta g_{\dot{\theta}}(\theta, \dot{\theta})}{\alpha(\beta)}. \]

Exponential orbital feedback stabilization will be achieved using a solution of the continuous time-periodic dynamic Riccati equation
\[ \dot{R}(t) + A(t)^T R(t) + R(t) A(t) + Q = R(t) B(t) \Gamma^{-1} B(t)^T R(t) \]
with appropriately chosen weighting matrices \( Q \geq 0 \) and \( \Gamma > 0 \). In order to use such stabilizing solution \( R(t) \) for any \( \theta(t) \) close to the desired trajectory \( \theta_*(t) \), we have to introduce an operator \( \mathcal{P}_T \), that is, projecting points of the phase plane \( (\theta, \dot{\theta}) \) onto a curve \( \mathcal{C}_* \) defined by \( (\theta_*, \dot{\theta}_*) \) of the reduced system:
\[ \mathcal{P}_T : [\theta, \dot{\theta}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_* \]
\[ \mathcal{C}_* = \{ \theta_*(t), \dot{\theta}_*(t) \}, \quad t \in [0, T] \]

Another operator \( \mathcal{T}_T : \mathcal{C}_* \rightarrow [0, T] \)
gives the corresponding time stamp from \([0, T]\) for the point of the curve \( \mathcal{C}_* \). The feedback control law
\[ v(t) = -\Gamma^{-1} b(\theta, \dot{\theta})^T R \mathcal{T}_T \left[ \mathcal{P}_T (\theta, \dot{\theta}) \right] \]
guarantees convergence for the nonlinear system within a vicinity of the desired trajectory [6], [5].
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