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Abstract—To improve the differential performance and lateral stability of distributed drive electric vehicles, this paper proposes an electronic differential control strategy for rear-wheel independent drive electric vehicles based on target torque secondary distribution. Firstly, according to the ideal motion states of the vehicle, the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) is used to calculate the additional required yaw moment, then, the orthogonal experimental method is applied to optimize the LQR parameters, and the target torque is allocated for the first time. Secondly, the target torque is redistributed by designing the functional relationship between the wheel sliding rate and the torque correction coefficient. Finally, the dynamics characteristics of the distributed electric vehicle with electronic differential control is simulated and analyzed in comparison with the traditional mechanical differential. The results show that the proposed electronic differential control strategy can not only achieve differential control well, but also the side slip angle and the yaw angle are reduced by up to 36.3% and 88.8% respectively, compared with the traditional vehicle. The proposed electronic differential control strategy ensures that the wheel sliding rate is always in the optimal sliding rate range, and greatly improves the vehicle lateral stability.
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I. Introduction

Distributed electric vehicles allocate a drive motor to each drive wheel. Compared with traditional centralized drive vehicles, it has the advantages of compact structure, high power transmission efficiency, and rapid response [1]. However, due to the cancellation of the mechanical differential, when the vehicle operates on a curved path, the uncoordinated drive wheel torques can easily lead to serious wheel wear, and even side slip in severe cases. Therefore, for distributed drive electric vehicles, it is particularly important to design an efficient and practical electronic differential control strategy.

Several scholars have conducted research on electronic differential control methods. Folgado et al. imitated the principle of traditional mechanical differential and proposed an electronic differential control strategy based on the equal distribution of torque. Although the differential function could be achieved, the sliding rate of the driving wheels was not monitored, and the running performance of the vehicle under complex road conditions could not be guaranteed [2-4]. Al-Fiky et al. regarded reducing wheel sliding rate and avoiding motor torque oversaturation as constraints, proposing an adaptive electronic differential strategy based on equal torque distribution. Although the wheel sliding rate was...
reduced, a more reasonable driving torque distribution method was not adopted, thus the vehicle lateral stability is poor \[5,6\]. Daya et al. used the Ackermann geometry to determine the target speed of each wheel, using closed-loop control to realize the torque distribution of the driving wheels, then, adjusted the speed to achieve the differential effect. However, this strategy was only suitable for low-speed conditions with no wheel side slip. When the side slip angle was large, the control effect was not effective \[7,8\]. Hua et al. combined the electronic differential and yaw stability control, using the deviation between the yaw rate, side slip angle of the center of mass and the ideal value to design an additional yaw moment controller. At the same time as the differential functioned, the lateral stability had also been improved. However, the research only focused on roads with high adhesion coefficients, and did not consider vehicle operating conditions on roads with low adhesion coefficients \[9-11\]. He et al. used hierarchical strategy to combine the torque control of the vehicle with the sliding rate control, and adjusted the additional yaw moment by real-time estimation of the sliding rate of the driving wheel, then, adjusted the output torque of the drive motor to ensure that the sliding rate could be controlled within the optimal range when turning. This method had improved the performance of vehicle's differential and lateral stability, but the design was complicated, and parameters of control strategy had not been further optimized, so the result couldn’t reach the best effect \[12-14\].

To address the aforementioned questions, a distributed two-rear-wheel independent drive electric vehicle is taken as the research object, and the following three models are generated:

(a) a linear 2-DOF vehicle model;

(b) a permanent magnet synchronous motor (PMSM) model;

(c) a nonlinear model developed using TruckSim.

The PMSM model is generated using Matlab/Simulink to serve as the power source of the distributed electric drive vehicle; with TruckSim software, a virtual distributed vehicle model is constructed, which consists of suspension system, brake system, tire model, etc. Through the interaction between Simulink and TruckSim, the co-simulation model of distributed drive electric vehicle is fabricated. In addition, the linear 2-DOF vehicle model and LQR controller are also generated and designed using MATLAB/Simulink, which are used for the design of the electronic differential control strategy. Based on the deviation between the actual and the ideal value of the vehicle side slip angle and yaw rate obtained by the linear vehicle model, the additional yaw moment is calculated and the torque difference between the two rear wheels is determined to realize the rear wheels’ rotating speed difference. At the same time, the orthogonal test method is used to optimize the LQR parameters to improve the lateral stability of the vehicle.

II. Permanent Magnet Synchronous Motor based Drive System Model

A. Permanent Magnet Synchronous Motor Model

In the PMSM modelling, it is assumed that the saturation of the motor core is negligible; the eddy current phenomenon and hysteresis loss phenomenon in the motor don’t affect the performance of the motor; the three-phase currents of the stator are symmetrical with each other, and have a standard sine wave shape. After coordinate system transformation, the mathematical model under the synchronous rotating coordinate system of PMSM is generated.

The stator voltage is determined by,

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
u_d &= R_s i_d + L_d \frac{d i_d}{dt} - \omega_e L_q i_q \\
u_q &= R_s i_q + L_q \frac{d i_q}{dt} + \omega_e (L_d i_d + \psi_f)
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]  

(1)

The stator flux is given by,

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\psi_d &= L_d i_d + \psi_f \\
\psi_q &= L_q i_q
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]  

(2)

The electromagnetic torque is calculated as,

\[
T_e = 1.5 p_a \psi_f i_q + (L_d - L_q) i_d i_q
\]  

(3)

The dynamic equation of the motor is cast as,

\[
J \frac{d \omega_m}{dt} = T_e - T_L - B \omega_m
\]  

(4)

The notation of formulas (1)-(4) are provided in Appendix I.

B. Vector Control Strategy of Permanent Magnet Synchronous Motor
The basic idea of vector control is to simulate the law of DC motor torque control on a three-phase AC motor, that is, under the rotor field orientation coordinates, through coordinate transformation, the stator current vector \(i_s\) of a three-phase AC motor is decomposed into the excitation current component \(i_q\), which produces the flux and the torque current component \(i_d\), which in turn produces the torque. The two current components are perpendicular to each other and they are independent. By this way, the torque control of the AC motor is transformed into the control of the amplitude and spatial position of the stator current vector, and the three-phase AC permanent magnet synchronous motor can be controlled as easily as the DC motor.

If the value of \(i_d\) is set to 0, then equation (3) could be simplified as,

\[
T_e = 1.5P_n\psi_i l_q
\]

(5)

where \(T_e\) is proportional to the magnitude of \(i_q\). As long as appropriate \(i_q\) is adjusted, the target \(T_e\) could be obtained. The control strategy is simple, clear and easy to be implemented. Therefore, the vector control strategy of \(i_d = 0\) is chosen as the control scheme of PMSM drive system in this paper. The control schematic diagram is shown in Fig.1.

![Vector Control Principle Block Diagram](image)

Fig.1: \(i_d = 0\) vector control principle block diagram.

As can be seen from Fig.1, the system is composed of a double closed-loop control system with an inner current loop and an outer speed loop. It mainly includes: coordinate transformation module, speed current regulator module, SVPWM (stator voltage pulse width modulation?) module and speed position acquisition module.

C. PMSM Response Performance Analysis based on \(i_d = 0\) Vector Control Strategy

Based on the Simulink platform, the \(i_d = 0\) control mode is simulated and analyzed. The rated voltage of PMSM is 220V, the phase resistance R is 0.025Ω, the inductances \(L_d\) and \(L_q\) of the vertical axis are 0.2mH and 0.47mH respectively, the permanent magnet flux linkage \(\psi_f\) is 0.1827, the moment of inertia J is 0.02kg·m², and the number of pole pairs is 4.

The motor starts at a speed of 500r/min with no load, the speed rises to 1000r/min at 0.2s, and the load is suddenly added 30Nm at 0.6s. The simulation time is 1s. And the simulation results obtained are shown in Fig.2.

![Simulation Results](image)

Fig.2: PMSM Response Performance Analysis based on \(i_d = 0\) Vector Control Strategy.

As can be seen from Fig.2(a), the motor is set at 500 r/min before 0.2s, and the speed of about 0.01s follows the set value and maintains stable operation. At 0.2s, the...
target speed suddenly increases to 1000 r/min, and the actual speed also quickly reaches the new stable value. When the load of 30 Nm is suddenly added at 0.6s, the motor speed drops from 1000 r/min to 800 r/min. However, by adjusting the speed, the actual speed quickly recovered and remained stable within 0.04s.

As can be seen from Fig. 2(b), when the motor is started, the starting current is large. This is because in the initial stage, the rotating magnetic field has not yet formed and the induced electromotive force has not been generated in the stator windings. At this time, the external voltage will all act on the smaller stator windings, resulting in a larger current. When the motor begins to enter the stable operation stage, the induction electromotive force begins to form in the stator winding, and the stator current rapidly decreases, and gradually presents a sinusoidal trend. At the time of 0.2s, the target speed increases, however, the rotor speed has not reached the given value, so the current increases largely. The current decreases rapidly after the stable operation of the motor. At the moment of 0.6s, when the load is suddenly added, the motor speed will suddenly drop. In order to keep the speed constant, the current will increase to maintain a new stable state. Overall, the current has a fast response speed and good stability.

As can be seen from Fig.2(c), the direct axis current \( i_d \) is basically 0 due to the control mode of \( i_d = 0 \). From Fig.2(d), the response speed of the electromagnetic torque is fast, and the change of the electromagnetic torque is proportional to the change of the quadrant axis current, which is in line with the theoretical analysis.

According to the above simulation results, it can be seen that without payload, the motor start speed response is faster, the overshoot is small, and the operation is stable. After adding load disturbance, the electromagnetic torque response is fast, and the dynamic performance and anti-interference ability of the system are strong. Therefore, it can be used as the wheel drive motor of electric vehicle.

III. Distributed Electric Vehicle Model

A. 2-DOF Model

In order to obtain the ideal side slip angle and yaw rate of the vehicle at any time during the process of driving, the ideal reference vehicle model should be generated firstly. In this paper, the linear 2-DOF vehicle model is taken as the reference model of two rear-wheel distributed drive electric vehicle.

The 2-DOF model is shown in Fig.3. Let the origin of the vehicle coordinate system be coincident with the center of mass of the vehicle; \( x \) axis points to the front parallel to the ground, \( y \) axis points to the left of the driver, and \( z \) axis points to the top through the center of mass \([15]\).

According to Newton’s second law, the governing equations of motion of the 2-DOF linear vehicle model are generated as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma F_y &= F_{yf}\cos \delta + F_{yr} \\
\Sigma M_z &= aF_{yr}\cos \delta - bF_{yr} \\
\Sigma F_y &= k_1 \left( \beta + \frac{a \omega_z - \delta}{u} \right) + k_2 \left( \beta - \frac{b \omega_z}{u} \right) \\
\Sigma M_z &= ak_1 \left( \beta + \frac{a \omega_z - \delta}{u} \right) - bk_2 \left( \beta - \frac{b \omega_z}{u} \right) \\
((k_1 + k_2) \beta + \frac{1}{u} (ak_1 - bk_2) \omega_r - k_1 \delta) &= m(\dot{v} + u \omega_z) \\
(ak_1 - bk_2) \beta + \frac{1}{u} (ak_1 + bk_2) \omega_r - ak_1 \delta &= l_z \omega_r
\end{align*}
\]

where, the state-space equation is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\beta} \\
\dot{\omega}_r
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{k_1 + k_2}{mu} & \frac{ak_1 - bk_2}{l_z} \\
\frac{-1}{l_z} & \frac{1}{l_z}
\end{bmatrix} 
\begin{bmatrix}
\beta \\
\omega_r
\end{bmatrix} + 
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{k_1}{mu} \\
\frac{l_z}{l_z}
\end{bmatrix} \delta
\]

The notation of Fig.3 are provided in Appendix I

B. TruckSim Model

TruckSim is a commercial software package specifically designed for dynamic simulation of large commercial vehicles, namely VehicleSim (VS) Lisp. It integrates three functions of vehicle modeling, condition simulation and data analysis, and is composed of condition parameter setting, model solving and result post-processing. Different from traditional modeling software based on structural design, vehicle modeling by TruckSim only needs to be defined according to the
performance and characteristic parameters of each system to build a vehicle model with a high degree of fidelity to the actual vehicle.

For the distributed two-rear-wheel independent drive electric vehicle, the configuration of the vehicle can be defined as S_S, where S indicates a solid axle and the underline (_) represents a separation of axle groups. Thus, as the configuration indicated, the distributed two-rear-wheel independent drive electric vehicle consists of two solid axles. VS Lisp takes an input as the description of the distributed two-rear-wheel independent drive electric vehicle configuration, such as force vectors and the body DOF. With that, VS Lisp derives equations of motion in terms of the ordinary differential equations and generates a computer source code (C or Fortran) to solve them.

In this research, the numerical simulations based on the 2-DOF model and the PMSM model are performed using MATLAB software. The virtual distributed two-rear-wheel independent drive electric vehicle was built based on Trucksim software. The PMSM drive model is combined with the virtual distributed drive electric vehicle for co-simulation. The co-simulation model is shown in Fig.4.

![Co-simulation model of distributed electrically drive vehicle](image)

**Fig.4: Co-simulation model of distributed electrically drive vehicle.**

C. Vehicle Model Validation
To ensure that the distributed drive electric vehicle model is basically consistent with the traditional vehicle model in Trucksim software, the result comparisons between the electric vehicle and the traditional vehicle are carried out respectively. Validating conditions are as follows: the vehicle speed is 40km/h, the road adhesion coefficient is 0.85, the step turn maneuvers and fishhook maneuvers are conducted respectively.

a. Step turn maneuver
The steering maneuver starts from the first second and the peak angle is 180deg, the angular ratio of the steering system is 1:25. The responses of yaw rate, side slip angle and trajectory of the center of mass are shown in Figure 5 (a)-(d).

![Steering wheel Angle](image)

(a) Steering wheel Angle

![Yaw Rate](image)

(b) Yaw Rate

![Side Slip Angle](image)

(c) Side Slip Angle

![Trajectory](image)

(d) Trajectory
As can be seen from Fig. 5, under the step turn maneuvers of 40km/h, the yaw rate of distributed drive electric vehicle has a high degree of fidelity, and almost completely coincides with the traditional vehicle after 7th second. In the process of steering wheel alignment, the side slip angle of centroid of a traditional vehicle fluctuates greatly, while the response of the distributed electric vehicle is more smooth due to the cancellation of a series of transmission components. The trajectories of the two vehicles’ center of mass also almost completely overlap. The coincidence degree of side slip angle, yaw rate and centroid trajectory are all above 90%.

b. Fishhook maneuver

The input peak angle of steering wheel is 200deg. The responses in terms of yaw rate, side slip angle and trajectory of the center of mass are shown in Figure 6 (a)-(d).

In summary, the similarity between the distributed drive electric vehicle model and the traditional vehicle model in Trucksim is more than 90%, which has a high reliability and can meet the requirement for developing the electronic differential control strategy.

III. DESIGN OF ELECTRONIC DIFFERENTIAL CONTROLLER
The traditional mechanical differential coordinates the rotations of the planetary gears inside the differential based on the tangential forces between the wheels and the road surface to achieve the differential effect. Similarly, for the electronic differential, although the final expression of the differential falls on the different speeds of the inner and outer wheels, if we want to directly control the speed to achieve the differential, the target speed of each wheel would be controlled by closed loop speed. Although the differential effect could be realized theoretically, the speed of each wheel is strictly constrained by the steering geometry, and they are independent of each other. The control of the driving torque of each driving wheel is also independent of each other, and it is impossible to guarantee the coordinated distribution of the driving torque of the whole vehicle. Therefore, in order to achieve a stable and reliable differential effect, differential control essentially needs to be carried out by perceiving the interaction force between the wheels and the ground and by coordinating the distribution of the driving torque of the inner and outer driving wheels.

The proposed design framework of the electronic differential control strategy is shown in Fig 7, which uses a hierarchical control method using two levels of target torque distribution. In upper level, an additional yaw moment controller is designed using the LQR technique, which calculates the additional yaw moment. Then, an orthogonal experimental method is used to optimize the design of LQR parameters and distributes the target torque of the driving wheels for the first time, making the actual state of the vehicle closer to the ideal state. The torque distribution should not only meet the vehicle’s dynamic demand and differential control, but also take full account of the restriction of road surface adhesion conditions. When the driving torque applied to the wheels is greater than the limit of road adhesion, the wheels will slip greatly, which degrades tractive performance and lateral stability of the vehicle under the conditions of low adhesion coefficient road and high-speed driving. Therefore, the sliding rate of both driving wheels is introduced to allocate the second target torque of the driving motor. In the lower level, the sliding rate controller is fabricated, which aims to keep the sliding rate of the driving wheels in the best sliding rate range. It monitors the sliding rate of each wheel in real time, establishes the functional relationship between the torque correction coefficient and the sliding rate, and adjusts the target torque of the driving wheels to realize the second distribution of torque. The notation of Fig.7 are provided in Appendix 1.

A. Design of Yaw Moment Control Strategy Using LQR
When the longitudinal velocity $u$ of the vehicle remains constant, the vehicle will reach a steady state when $\dot{v} = 0$ and $\dot{\omega}_r = 0$. With the 2-DOF linear vehicle model, the ideal yaw rate and side slip angle can be obtained as:

$$\omega_{rd} = \frac{u\delta}{L(1 + K u^2)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$\beta_d = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where $L$ is the wheelbase, $K$ is the understeer coefficient and $K = \frac{m}{L} \left( \frac{a}{v_2} - \frac{b}{v_1} \right)$. The calculation formula for the lateral acceleration at the center of mass of the vehicle is:

$$a_y = \dot{v} + u \omega_r$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Considering the limitations of road adhesion conditions, the lateral acceleration can’t exceed the maximum lateral
acceleration \( k \mu g \) provided by the ground:
\[
a_y \leq k \mu g, k = 0.85
\]
Thus, the upper limit of the vehicle yaw rate can be determined as:
\[
\omega_{r, \text{max}} = 0.85 \frac{\mu g}{u}
\]
Therefore, the ideal states of the 2-DOF linear vehicle model can be expressed as:
\[
\begin{cases}
\omega_{r, d} = \min \{ \frac{0.85 \mu g}{u}, \omega_r \} \text{sgn}(\omega_r) \\
\beta_{d} = 0
\end{cases}
\]
According to equation (9), the state space equation of the 2-DOF linear vehicle model is given by:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\beta} \\
\dot{\omega}_r
\end{bmatrix} =
A
\begin{bmatrix}
\beta \\
\omega_r
\end{bmatrix} + B \delta
\]
where
\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
k_1 + k_2 & \frac{ak_1 - bk_2}{mu} & \frac{ak_1 - bk_2}{a^2 k_1 + b^2 k_2} - 1 \\
\frac{ak_1 - bk_2}{mu} & \frac{mu^2}{a^2 k_1 + b^2 k_2} & \frac{ak_1 - bk_2}{a^2 k_1 + b^2 k_2}
\end{bmatrix},
B = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{k_1}{mu} \\
\frac{k_1}{mu}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
When the additional yaw moment \( \Delta M_z \) is applied, the formula (16) becomes:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\beta} \\
\dot{\omega}_r
\end{bmatrix} =
A
\begin{bmatrix}
\beta \\
\omega_r
\end{bmatrix} + B \delta + B_1 \Delta M_z
\]
where
\[
B_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
Subtracting formula (16) and formula (17), the state space equations in terms of \( \Delta \beta \) , \( \Delta \omega_r \) can be obtained as follows:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta \dot{\beta} \\
\Delta \dot{\omega}_r
\end{bmatrix} =
A
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta \beta \\
\Delta \omega_r
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
1
\end{bmatrix} \Delta M_z
\]
Assume \( \Delta x = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \beta \\ \Delta \omega_r \end{bmatrix} \), \( u = [\Delta M_z] \), then the equation (18) can be expressed as a general form.
\[
\dot{x} = Ax + B_1 u
\]

The verification shows that the time invariant linear system \( \dot{x} = Ax + B_1 u \) is fully controllable, and its performance index within the infinite time range is defined as,
\[
J = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty [x^T(t)Qx(t) + u^T(t)Ru(t)] dt
\]
where \( R \) is the input vector weight matrix, and \( Q \) is the state vector weight matrix. Assume \( Q = \begin{bmatrix} q_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \) , the element \( q_{11} \) represents the weight coefficient of the vehicle side slip angle, \( q_{22} \) represents the weight coefficient of the yaw rate, and \( r_{11} \) represents the weight coefficient of the additional yaw moment. According to different vehicle velocities and driving conditions, the consideration of the focus of each weight coefficient is different. It is generally believed that when the vehicle is running at low speeds, in order to meet the requirements of maneuverability, it should be as far as possible to maintain zero-mass center side slip angle, \( q_{11} \) should be much larger than \( q_{22} \); while driving at medium and high speeds, the emphasis should focus on improving the lateral stability of the vehicle to reduce for yaw movement, \( q_{22} \) should be greater than \( q_{11} \). The optimal control quantity can be expressed as:
\[
\Delta M_z^* = -K_1 x(t)
\]
where, \( K_1 = R^{-1}B^T P \) is the optimal control feedback coefficient matrix, \( P \) is the solution of Riccati equation \( PA + A^T P - PB R^{-1} B^T P + Q = 0 \) , by calling the function lqr() provided in Matlab to solve the above Riccati equation, the additional yaw moment can be obtained, and the first target torque distribution is completed.

B. Optimization of LQR Parameters based on Orthogonal Experiment Design

Although the LQR weight coefficients designed above can realize differential control, the resulting evaluation parameters of vehicle lateral stability are not optimal. Conventionally, the weighting matrices of LQR controllers are determined using trial and error method, which is a time consuming and tedious process. To address this issue, an optimization method using genetic algorithms (GA) was proposed to find desired weighting matrices for LQR controllers [17-19]. However, the GA-based optimization process is not computationally efficient. In this paper, an alternative, i.e., an orthogonal experimental design method, is proposed for determining the LQR weighting matrices. The LQR controller is a linear controller, and the optimal weighting matrices are
vehicle forward speed dependent. Thus, different weighting matrices need to be considered at different vehicle speeds, in order to find a group of relatively optimal weight coefficients, which can not only realize the differential function, but also improve the lateral stability of the vehicle.

Orthogonal experiment is an experiment optimization technology that studies multiple factors and levels. By arranging the experimental factors at the appropriate level and using a standardized orthogonal table for experimental analysis, the best solution can be found through a few experiments [20].

Under the simulated obstacle avoidance testing maneuver recommended by ISO3888-2:2002, the influence of the three factors, i.e., $q_{11}$, $q_{22}$ and $r_{11}$, on the stability of the vehicle at a speed of 40km/h is investigated. In the orthogonal experiment, we take two levels of each factor. Since the vehicle is running at a low speed at this time, the deviation between the actual value and the ideal value of the vehicle side slip angle is selected as the evaluation index. The factor levels are shown in Table 1. The orthogonal table $L_4(2^3)$ is selected for the experiment, and the form of the table is shown in Table 2. The experimental scheme and result analysis are shown in Table 3.

### Table I: Factor Level Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$A_1(85000)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$A_2(90000)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II: $L_4(2^3)$ Orthogonal Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table III: Experimental Scheme and Result Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>$q_{11}$</th>
<th>$q_{22}$</th>
<th>$r_{11}$</th>
<th>error_Beta(°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A_1(85000)</td>
<td>B_1(0)</td>
<td>C_1(1 \times 10^{-6})</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A_1(85000)</td>
<td>B_1(0)</td>
<td>C_2(1 \times 10^{-7})</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A_2(90000)</td>
<td>B_1(0)</td>
<td>C_1(1 \times 10^{-6})</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A_2(90000)</td>
<td>B_1(0)</td>
<td>C_2(1 \times 10^{-7})</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_1</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_2</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_i</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.1415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IV: Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quadratic Sum $\bar{S}$</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom $f$</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Square $V$</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FactorA</td>
<td>0.000169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FactorB</td>
<td>0.000324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000324</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FactorC</td>
<td>0.011449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.011449</td>
<td>67.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FactorE</td>
<td>0.000169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that $T$ represents the sum of data of all experiments; $T_i$ represents the sum of experimental data at the i-th level of each factor; $T_i$ represents the average; $R$ is the poor of $T_i$; $S$ is the sum of squares, where $S_T$ is the sum of squares of total deviation and $S_E$ is the sum of squares of errors.

The data processing of orthogonal experimental can be divided into two kinds: range analysis and variance analysis. In this research, the variance analysis is adopted. Based on the above experimental results, an analysis of variance table can be listed, as shown in Table 4.
be arranged according to the size of F ratio. The primary
and secondary order of factors are C, B, and A.

The selection of the optimal factor level collocation
is based on the order of factors, we choose the optimal
level for each factor. As can be seen from Table 5, for
factor C, \( C_2(1 \times 10^{-7}) \) is the best; for factor B, \( B_1(0) \)
is the best; for factor A, \( A_2(9000) \) is the best. That is,
the optimal level collocation could be concluded as:
\( C_2(1 \times 10^{-7}), B_1(0), A_2(9000) \). Therefore,
the relative optimal parameters of LQR under this
operating condition should be set as: \( r_{11} = 1 \times 
10^{-7}, q_{11} = 90000, q_{22} = 0 \). Similarly, the relative
optimal parameter values of the vehicle under other
operating conditions can be analyzed.

C. Design of Sliding Rate Control Strategy

Based on the driving wheel torque distributed by the
LQR yaw moment controller, in addition to meet the
power transmission requirements of the vehicle, it is also
necessary to fully consider the constraints of the road
adhesion conditions. When the driving torque applied to
the wheels is greater than the road adhesion limit, the
wheels will slip significantly. Therefore, the sliding rate
of the driving wheels on both sides is introduced for the
lower level target torque distribution of the driving motor,
which not only plays the role of electronic differential,
but also further improves the lateral stability of the
vehicle.

The lower level distribution of the target torque is
manipulated by the sliding rate fed back by wheels. The
torque correction coefficient \( \alpha \) is introduced, and the
relationship between \( \alpha \) and wheel sliding rate \( s \) is shown
in Figure 4.

\[
\alpha = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq s < 15 \\
\frac{1}{30}s - 0.5, & 15 \leq s \leq 30 \\
0.5, & 30 < s \leq 1 
\end{cases} 
\] (22)

When the wheel sliding rate is within a reasonable
slip range, that is, less than 15\%, the torque correction
coefficient \( \alpha \) is 0, and the driving torque on both sides
is not corrected. When the sliding rate is in the range of
[15\%, 30\%], the correction coefficient \( \alpha \) is adjusted to
the driving torque according to the rule of formula (19),
and the target torque is appropriately reduced. When the
slip ratio is greater than 30\%, the correction coefficient \( \alpha
\) is 0.5, which reduces the target torque to half of the
original value. At this time, the power of the vehicle
should be appropriately sacrificed, and the driving safety
should be the primary consideration. Through the lower
level torque distribution, no matter what operating
conditions the vehicle is in, the torque can be corrected
and the lateral stability of the vehicle could be improved.

D. Target Torque Distribution Strategy for Rear
Wheel Drive Motors

After calculating the additional yaw moment
required by the vehicle through the upper level controller,
and monitoring the sliding rate of each drive wheel in
real time, the target torque of each drive motor needs to
be allocated in the lower level controller.

The upper level distribution of the target torque is
implemented as follows: the total demand torque \( T_t \)
is obtained through the driving motor model, and combined
with the additional yaw moment \( \Delta M_Z \), the target torque
of the driving motor on both sides can be calculated.

\[
\begin{align*}
T_{r31} &= \frac{1}{2} (T_t - \Delta M_Z) \\
T_{r41} &= \frac{1}{2} (T_t + \Delta M_Z) 
\end{align*}
\] (23)

When the wheel sliding rate exceeds a reasonable
range, the target torque needs to be adjusted to carry out
the lower level torque distribution.

\[
\begin{align*}
T_{r32} &= T_{r31}(1 - \alpha_3) \\
T_{r42} &= T_{r41}(1 - \alpha_4) 
\end{align*}
\] (24)

To date, high fidelity co-simulations have been
applied to the design and development of active safety
systems of road vehicles \cite{21-22}. To validate the electronic
differential controller, a closed-loop differential control is
implemented and simulated using the TruckSim and
MATLAB/Simulink co-simulation as illustrated in Fig.9.
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To investigate the differential effect of the electronic differential and the improvement of the lateral stability of the vehicle, the vehicles based on the traditional mechanical differential and the electronic differential are simulated under the maneuvers of double lane change and step turn on high and low road adhesion coefficient, and the simulation results of the two strategies are compared.

A. Simulations under DLC maneuver at low speed

To verify the maneuverability and lateral stability of distributed electric vehicles at low speeds based on the electronic differential control strategy, simulations are carried out in the standard operating conditions of double lane change (DLC) maneuvers of ISO3888-2:2002. The DLC maneuvers are set as follows: the simulated vehicle velocity is 40km/h, and the road adhesion coefficient is 0.85. The results are shown in Figure 10.

Due to the torque distribution method based on additional yaw moment, when the vehicle is steering, the...
torque difference between the left and right rear driving wheels of the distributed electric vehicle will be generated, and the torque difference will change with the change of vehicle rotation to meet the maneuverability requirements. However, because of the use of mechanical differential, the driving torques of the left and right sides of traditional vehicles are always consistent. The torque response is shown in Fig. 10(b), and the additional yaw moment response is shown in Fig. 10(a). It can be seen from Table VI that under the 40km/h DLC maneuver, the vehicle side slip angle and yaw rate based on the traditional mechanical differential are relatively large, and the lateral stability is poor. Since the vehicle can adjust the driving torque on both sides in real time, it can make full use of the attachment conditions of the road to improve vehicle stability under the premise of realizing the differential function. Compared with the mechanical differential, the rate of change of the vehicle side slip angle reaches -63.7 %, improved from 0.33deg to 0.12deg. The yaw rate has also been reduced from 10.1deg/s to 9.7deg/s.

Fig. 10(e) shows the electromagnetic torque curves of the two rear-wheel drive motors of the vehicle. Due to the additional yaw moment, the electromagnetic torque outputs of the left and right motors have a torque difference. In combination with Fig. 11 (e) and (a), it could be seen that the difference between the left and right electromagnetic torques is equal to the additional yaw moment. In addition, it could be seen from Fig. 11 (e) and (b) that the variation trend of the electromagnetic torque is the same as that of the driving wheel torque. Since the reduction ratio of the wheel-side reducer in this research is set as 8, the driving torque is 8 times of the electromagnetic torque.

B. Simulations under DLC maneuver at middle speed

In order to verify the middle-speed handling stability of the distributed drive electric vehicle based on the electronic differential control strategy, simulations are also carried out in accordance with the standard operating conditions of DLC maneuvers of ISO3888-2:2002. Simulation conditions are set as follows: the vehicle speed is 90km/h, and the road adhesion coefficient is 0.85. The results are shown in Figure 11.
Electromagnetic Torque of Rear Wheel

Fig. 11: Simulation result comparisons of electronic differential control strategy under double lane change maneuver at middle speed.

TABLE VII: Comparisons of Simulation Results of Different Strategies under DLC Maneuver at 90km/h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation Parameters</th>
<th>Mechanical differential</th>
<th>Electronic differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{\text{max}}$ (deg)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{\text{rmax}}$ (deg/s)</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Fig. 11, under the 90km/h DLC maneuvers, both side slip angle and yaw rate of vehicle based on electronic differential are improved. From table VII, compared with the traditional mechanical differential, the change rate of vehicle yaw angular velocity based on electronic differential reaches -11.2%, which improves from the original 11.6deg/s to 10.3deg/s, and the side slip angle improves from the original 1.93deg to 1.91. The lateral stability of the vehicle is improved. Fig. 11(e) is the electromagnetic torque curves of the two rear-wheel drive motors of the vehicle. With the increase of the additional yaw moment, the output electromagnetic torque of the motor increases, and the difference between the left and right electromagnetic torque is equal to the value of the additional yaw moment.

C. Simulations under DLC maneuver at high speed

To verify the maneuverability and handling stability of distributed electric vehicles at high speeds based on the electronic differential control strategy, simulations are carried out in the standard operating conditions of DLC maneuvers. Test conditions are set as follows: the vehicle velocity is 120km/h, and the road adhesion coefficient is 0.85. The results are shown in Figure 12.
TABLE VIII: Comparisons of Simulation Results of Different Strategies under DLC Maneuver at 120km/h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation Parameters</th>
<th>Mechanical differential</th>
<th>Electronic differential</th>
<th>Rate of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β_{max}(deg)</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω_{rmax}(deg/s)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>-0.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.12 shows the vehicle motion states caused by two differential speed strategies under the 120km/h DLC, respectively. Fig.12(b) shows the trend of the driving torque under different strategies. The torque of the rear wheels based on the electronic differential strategy changes with the fluctuation of the additional yaw moment. As can be seen from Fig.12 (c) and (d), when the vehicle is running at high speed, the improvement of the lateral stability of the vehicle is not as obvious as that of the vehicle at medium and low speed, and the variation trend of the side slip angle and yaw rate of the vehicle brought by the electronic differential is almost the same as that of the traditional vehicle. This is because the rear wheel drive torque has reached the peak torque that PMSM could output after adjusting the additional yaw moment, and the motor has reached the maximum load. However, it can still achieve better differential effect.

D. Simulations in Step turn maneuver at middle speed

To verify the anti-skid performance of the electronic differential control strategy on the road with low adhesion coefficient, simulations are carried out with a step turn maneuver. The simulation conditions are set as follows: the vehicle velocity is 60km/h, the road adhesion coefficient is 0.13. The simulation analysis of the vehicle based on the electronic differential and the traditional mechanical differential are performed. The results are shown in Figure 13.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Aiming at the electronic differential problem of distributed drive electric vehicles, this paper designs an electronic differential control strategy based on LQR torque distribution, and compares it with traditional mechanical differentials. The results show that:

(a) When the distributed drive electric vehicle is driving stably on a road with good adhesion coefficient, the LQR controller based on orthogonal experiment optimization can calculate the additional yaw moment according to the driver's intention, and adjust the torque...
of the driving wheel in real time, which can achieve the differential effect while also improving the mobility and lateral stability of the vehicle.

(b) The sliding rate control strategy and torque distribution control strategy are designed based on the optimal sliding rate range. When the electric vehicle is running on a low adhesion coefficient road and is in an unstable state, the sliding rate controller can pass the feedback wheel sliding rate, quickly adjust the torque of the driving wheels until the vehicle returns to a stable state to restrain the vehicle from side slip.
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# Appendix 1. Notation and description of parameters of the thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$u_d$</td>
<td>Stator voltage of the direct axis</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_q$</td>
<td>Stator voltage of the quadrature axis</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$</td>
<td>Resistance of the stator</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_d$</td>
<td>Stator current of the direct axis</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_q$</td>
<td>Stator current of the quadrature axis</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_d$</td>
<td>Inductive component of the direct axis</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_q$</td>
<td>Inductive component of the quadrature axis</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_e$</td>
<td>Electrical angular velocity</td>
<td>rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_m$</td>
<td>Angular velocity of rotation</td>
<td>rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_f$</td>
<td>Permanent Magnet Flux Linkage</td>
<td>Wb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_d$</td>
<td>Stator flux linkage of the direct axis</td>
<td>Wb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_q$</td>
<td>Stator flux linkage of the quadrature axis</td>
<td>Wb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_e$</td>
<td>Electromagnetic Torque</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_L$</td>
<td>Load Torque</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_n$</td>
<td>The number of pole-pairs</td>
<td>kg · m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>Moment of Inertia</td>
<td>kg · m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>Damping Factor</td>
<td>N · m · s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_1$</td>
<td>Cornering stiffness of the front axle</td>
<td>N/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_2$</td>
<td>Cornering stiffness of the rear axle</td>
<td>N/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>Longitudinal distance from the CG of the vehicle whole mass to the front axle</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Longitudinal distance from the CG of the vehicle whole mass to the rear axle</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_r$</td>
<td>Yaw rate at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Side-slip angle at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>Total mass of the vehicle</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_z$</td>
<td>Moment of inertia of the vehicle about yaw axis</td>
<td>kg · m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>Steer angle of the front wheels</td>
<td>rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>Longitudinal speed at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v$</td>
<td>Lateral speed at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_d$</td>
<td>Desired side-slip angle at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{rd}$</td>
<td>Desired yaw rate at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \beta$</td>
<td>The error between $\beta$ and $\beta_d$</td>
<td>rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \omega_r$</td>
<td>The error between $\omega_r$ and $\omega_{rd}$</td>
<td>rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_x$</td>
<td>Longitudinal speed at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_x'$</td>
<td>Desired speed at the CG of the vehicle</td>
<td>m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta M_z$</td>
<td>Additional yaw moment</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{fl}$</td>
<td>Rotating speed of the front left wheel</td>
<td>rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{fr}$</td>
<td>Rotating speed of the front right wheel</td>
<td>rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{rl}$</td>
<td>Rotating speed of the rear left wheel</td>
<td>rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{rr}$</td>
<td>Rotating speed of the rear right wheel</td>
<td>rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{rl}$</td>
<td>Slip rate of the rear left wheel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{rr}$</td>
<td>Slip rate of the rear right wheel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{rl}$</td>
<td>Torque correction coefficient of the rear left wheel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{rr}$</td>
<td>Torque correction coefficient of the rear right wheel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{rl1}$</td>
<td>The target torque of the first assignment of the rear left wheel</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{rr1}$</td>
<td>The target torque of the first assignment of the rear right wheel</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{rl2}$</td>
<td>The target torque of the second assignment of the rear left wheel</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{rr2}$</td>
<td>The target torque of the second assignment of the rear right wheel</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{rl}$</td>
<td>The target torque of the rear left wheel</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{rr}$</td>
<td>The target torque of the rear right wheel</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>