

On robotic manipulators with time-dependent inertial parameters: From physical consistency to boundedness of the mass matrix

Tom Kaufmann and Johann Reger*

December 2, 2025

Abstract

We generalize the robotics equation describing the dynamics of an open kinematic chain to include the effect of time-dependent change of inertial parameters as well as the effects of its cause, i.e. time dependency of the distributions of mass originating from parasitic movements of mass-carrying particles. The results generate insight that allows linking the novel concepts of uniform physical consistency and upper boundedness of inertial parameters—ruling out approaching the edge to physical inconsistency or to diverge—with the existence of finite, positive uniform bounds of the mass matrix.

1 Introduction

Classical approaches [2, 9, 4] to adaptive control of robotic manipulators are concerned with the design of feedback to enable tracking when some parameters Θ of the manipulator are not known. Usually, adaptive structures include an update law that provides suitable estimates $\hat{\Theta}$ of the unknown parameters leading to tracking by means of a control law τ that uses these estimates instead of the unknown parameters. A specific type of parameters describing any robotic manipulator that received some detailed attention are the inertial ones, where works like e.g. [12, 8, 1] building on the pioneering contributions [6, 5] enforce physical consistency [10, 11] of the estimates in addition to facilitate tracking. This is done with the promise that physical consistency of the estimates will yield more refined control action. Anyhow, before being applicable safely in practice, such adaptive schemes should be evaluated for their robustness against unintended uncertainties such as e.g. disturbance w or time-dependent change of the supposedly constant unknown parameters, i.e. $\dot{\Theta}(t) \neq 0$ for some $t \geq 0$. This makes it necessary to scrutinize them with respect to a model that describes sufficiently well the effects of these unintended uncertainties on the dynamical behavior of the robotic manipulator. Starting from the classical robotics equation

$$M(q, \Theta)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta)\dot{q} + G(q, \Theta) = \tau + w \quad (1)$$

that describes the dynamics of the robotic manipulator when Θ is constant, the authors of [7] provide a more detailed model

$$M(q, \Theta)\ddot{q} + (C(q, \Theta) + \mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta}))\dot{q} + G(q, \Theta) = \tau + w \quad (2)$$

*The authors are with the Control Engineering Group, Technische Universität Ilmenau, P.O. Box 10 05 65, D-98684 Ilmenau, Germany.

of this behavior when Θ depends on time. This model can be obtained by application of the Lagrange formalism with respect to the kinetic Energy \mathcal{T} and the potential energy \mathcal{U} of the robotic manipulator, taking into account that possibly $\dot{\Theta}(t) \neq 0$ for some $t \geq 0$, but using the same structure of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{U} as if Θ were constant. This is a suitable approach when investigating the influence of general parameters on the robotic manipulator. However, since many adaptive approaches are concerned with inertial parameters specifically, the model should also include the effect of the cause for their time dependency, i.e. time-dependent change of the distributions of mass, originating from movements of mass-carrying particles that otherwise would remain standing still when deriving the classical robotics equation (1). As we will show, these movements introduce new terms to the kinetic energy, which are ignored in [7], thereby leading to a more involved version of the robotics equation compared to (2) when deriving the dynamical behavior by means of the Lagrange formalism.

1.1 Contribution and outline

After introducing the style of notation in Section 1.2, we highlight in Section 2 the intrinsic relationship between the distribution of mass and the inertial parameters of a rigid body—showcasing the fact that time dependency of the inertial parameters is not possible without time-dependent change of the distribution of mass—and reiterate the concept of physical consistency. Then, we derive in Section 3 a generalization of the robotics equation that includes all relevant effects associated with time-dependent change of the inertial parameters, answering to the need for realistic testing by providing a testbed for robustness of adaptive algorithms concerned with counteracting imprecise knowledge of inertial parameters. We explain assumptions to be made such that the dynamics result in an ODE, allowing analysis with similar Lyapunov tools as are typically used when working on the classical robotics equation (1) and therefore striking a middle ground between complexity and realism. As it turns out, this approach describes the effect of time-dependent change of the mass distributions of end-effectors without any restriction from the imposed assumptions, thus enabling analysis of robustness against loading processes without resorting to a PDE machinery, i.e. alleviating computational and analytical cost. In Section 4, we use the insight from the modeling to reveal structural properties of the generalized robotics equation starting with some inherent properties regarding skew symmetry and decomposition into regressor form. Afterwards, the notion of physical consistency of inertial parameters of rigid bodies, i.e. constant ones, as established in Section 2 serves as fundament for the findings in Section 4.1 on the boundedness of the mass matrix $M(q, \Theta)$ depending on the physical consistency of the inertial parameters. We arrive at generalizations of statements existing in the literature for constant Θ to the time-dependent case, where we introduce the concepts of *uniform* physical consistency and upper boundedness of inertial parameters that allow to obtain desirable finite, positive *uniform* bounds of the mass matrix. These results are interesting in their own right—regardless whether the inertial parameters of a given robotic manipulator are constant or not—because they pave a way to ensure the existence of finite, positive uniform bounds of the estimated mass matrix $\hat{M}(q) = M(q, \hat{\Theta})$ by means of physically consistent adaptation as proposed in [6] or subsequent, related work [12, 8, 1]. Next, we leverage in Section 4.2 the structural insight from the modeling to derive conditions under which other components in the generalized robotics equation that originate from movements of mass-carrying particles are bounded. Specifically, this leads to statements connecting such movements, their rate of change and the rate of change of the inertial parameters to safe operation of the robotic manipulator. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 5.

1.2 Notation

The identity matrix of dimension p is written as I_p . Let $\text{sym}(p) = \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : M = M^\top\}$ and $\text{skew}(p) = \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : M = -M^\top\}$. For any $A \in \text{sym}(p)$, its trace is denoted by $\text{tr}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i(A)$ and the extremal eigenvalues are represented by $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$. The maximal singular value of any $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ is

given by $\sigma_{\max}(B) = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(B^\top B)}$. We note matrices and vectors as

$$(r_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, p\}} = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ \vdots \\ r_p \end{pmatrix}, \quad (M_{k_1, k_2})_{(k_1, k_2) \in \{1, \dots, p_1\} \times \{1, \dots, p_2\}} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{1,1} & \dots & M_{1,p_2} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_{p_1,1} & \dots & M_{p_1,p_2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

respectively, define the function $\mathcal{A}_{p_1, p_2}(B) = \text{diag}(B, \quad B, \quad B) \in \mathbb{R}^{3p_1 \times 3p_2}$ for $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ and let

$$\mathcal{S}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -x_3 & x_2 \\ x_3 & 0 & -x_1 \\ -x_2 & x_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{skew}(3) \quad (4)$$

with $x = (x_k)_{k \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\mathcal{S}(x)y = x \times y$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

2 Physical consistency of inertial parameters of rigid bodies

A rigid body is defined by its distribution of mass $\rho(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ in a body-fixed frame with coordinates $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Its ten inertial parameters are the mass $m \in \mathbb{R}$, the first moment of mass

$$h = (h_1 \quad h_2 \quad h_3)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 \quad (5)$$

and the inertia matrix

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} I_{11} & I_{12} & I_{13} \\ I_{12} & I_{22} & I_{23} \\ I_{13} & I_{23} & I_{33} \end{pmatrix} \in \text{sym}(3). \quad (6)$$

for rotation about the origin of the body-fixed frame. These inertial parameters are collected in the vector

$$\Phi^\top = (m \quad h_1 \quad h_2 \quad h_3 \quad I_{11} \quad I_{22} \quad I_{33} \quad I_{12} \quad I_{23} \quad I_{13})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{10} \quad (7)$$

and can be calculated from the mass distribution ρ as follows:

$$m = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(x) dx, \quad h = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(x) x dx, \quad I = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(x) \mathcal{S}(x)^\top \mathcal{S}(x) dx. \quad (8)$$

A rigid body is physically meaningful if it is defined by a nonnegative distribution of mass, i.e. $\rho(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, such that (8) yields $m > 0$. The fact that there are inertial parameters $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ with $m > 0$ for which (8) remains unsatisfied for all nonnegative mass distributions, see [10], motivates the following definition of physical consistency.

Definition 1. A vector $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ with entries according to (7) is called *physically consistent* if there exists a nonnegative distribution of mass, i.e. $\rho(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, such that (8) holds with $m > 0$.

The physical consistency of inertial parameters is exactly characterized by the next statement.

Theorem 1. ([10] and Theorem 3, Eq. (16)-(17) in [11]) A vector $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ with entries according to (7) is physically consistent if and only if $f(\Phi) \succ 0$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^{10} \rightarrow \text{sym}(4)$ is a function with

$$f(\Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma & h \\ h^\top & m \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(I) I_3 - I, \quad (9)$$

and $h \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $I \in \text{sym}(3)$ are structured as in (5), (6), respectively. The inverse transformation reads $I = \text{tr}(\Sigma) I_3 - \Sigma$.

Remark 1. The intrinsic relationship (8) is the reason why, when the rigidity of a body is relaxed, time dependency of Φ necessitates time-dependent change of the distribution of mass ρ . As time dependency of ρ is triggered by movements of mass-carrying particles relative to their body fixed frame, the effects of these movements are included in the model that we derive in Section 3.

3 Generalized robotics equation

We consider a robotic manipulator that consists of an n -degree-of-freedom open kinematic chain of N bodies. In order to describe its dynamical behavior, first, we introduce the model and the kinematics of the robotic manipulator. We discuss the restrictions imposed by the modeling and the standing Assumption 1, that are essential for obtaining an ODE generalization of (2) from [7]. This generalization captures all the relevant effects of time-dependent inertial parameters as well as the causative time dependencies of the distributions of mass originating from relative movements of mass-carrying particles, but exclude other effects that would result from allowing time dependency of kinetic parameters. Subsequently, we derive the kinetic energies \mathcal{T}_l as well as the potential energies \mathcal{U}_l of the individual bodies $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Finally, these energies are reformulated with respect to the specific movement of the robotic manipulator governed by its forward kinematic map and the corresponding Jacobian so that we then obtain the generalized robotics equation describing the dynamical behavior by means of the Lagrange formalism.

Model Let the position $z_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and the angular orientation $\phi_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ describe the pose of the l -th body-fixed frame with respect to the 0-th frame that is fixed to a Newtonian system. All frames under consideration are described by orthonormal bases. The translational velocity of the origin of the frame fixed to the l -th body is denoted as $v_l(t) = \dot{z}_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\omega_l(t) = \dot{\phi}_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the corresponding angular velocity. Further, let $\rho_l(x_l, t) \in \mathbb{R}$ the respective distribution of mass-carrying particles and $\sigma_l(x_l, t) \in [0, 1]$ the portion of these particles moving with velocity $v_l(x_l, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ relative to the l -th body-fixed frame at the position $x_l \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in this frame. The remaining portion $1 - \sigma_l(x_l, t)$ of mass-carrying particles at this position is immobile with respect to the frame that is fixed to the l -th body. Further, let $\mathcal{R}(\phi_l) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ the rotation matrix that allows to calculate the velocity $v_l(x_l, t)$ of mass-carrying particles relative to their body-fixed frames with respect to the 0-th Newtonian frame as $\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)v_l(x_l, t)$. Due to the orthonormality of the bases spanning the considered frames, this rotation matrix is orthonormal, i.e. $\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)^\top \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) = \mathbf{I}_3$. In accordance with (7) and (8), we define the consequently time-dependent inertial parameters $\Phi_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ of the l -th body as

$$\Phi_l = (m_l \quad h_{1,l} \quad h_{2,l} \quad h_{3,l} \quad I_{11,l} \quad I_{22,l} \quad I_{33,l} \quad I_{12,l} \quad I_{23,l} \quad I_{13,l})^\top, \quad (10)$$

where

$$m_l(\cdot) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_l(x_l, \cdot) dx_l \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (11)$$

$$h_l(\cdot) = (h_{1,l}(\cdot) \quad h_{2,l}(\cdot) \quad h_{3,l}(\cdot))^\top = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_l(x_l, \cdot) x_l dx_l \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (12)$$

$$I_l(\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} I_{11,l}(\cdot) & I_{12,l}(\cdot) & I_{13,l}(\cdot) \\ I_{12,l}(\cdot) & I_{22,l}(\cdot) & I_{23,l}(\cdot) \\ I_{13,l}(\cdot) & I_{23,l}(\cdot) & I_{33,l}(\cdot) \end{pmatrix} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_l(x_l, \cdot) \mathcal{S}(x_l)^\top \mathcal{S}(x_l) dx_l \in \text{sym}(3). \quad (13)$$

The vector $\Theta(t) = (\Theta_h(t))_{h \in \{1, \dots, 10N\}} \in \mathbb{R}^{10N}$ with

$$\Theta = (\Phi_1^\top \quad \dots \quad \Phi_N^\top)^\top \quad (14)$$

collects the complete set of inertial parameters describing the robotic manipulator.

Discussion of restrictions imposed by the model The model includes time-dependent change of the distributions of mass and thus time dependency of the inertial parameters by means of

- $v_l(x_l, t) \neq 0$ and $\sigma_l(x_l, t) \in (0, 1]$ or

- $\dot{\rho}_l(x_l, t) \neq 0$

for some $x_l \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t \geq 0$. However, in order to ensure that the dynamical behavior results as ODE, not as PDE, the distributed quantities ν_l , σ_l and $\dot{\rho}_l$ that determine the movements of mass-carrying particles relative to their body-fixed frames are modeled as being independent of z_l, ϕ_l or their time derivatives. This excludes effects like elasticity of the bodies from the model since the time dependency is seen as an external process that might affect the dynamical behavior but is not driven by the movement of the robotic manipulator.

Kinematics The kinematics describe how the N bodies interact when their movements are subject to restrictions imposed by the joints of the robotic manipulator. To capture this effect, we introduce the generalized coordinates $q(t) = (q_k(t))_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since the kinematic chain is *open*, $q(t)$ is a minimal set of *pairwise independent* variables such that a forward kinematic map $F(q, \Theta_{\text{kin}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{6N}$ with

$$(z_1^\top \quad \phi_1^\top \quad \dots \quad z_N^\top \quad \phi_N^\top)^\top = F(q, \Theta_{\text{kin}}) \quad (15)$$

exists for all poses $z_l, \phi_l \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ that are possible during operation of the robotic manipulator. Therein, $\Theta_{\text{kin}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{kin}}}$ are kinematic parameters (lengths and angles describing the poses of the joints in the respective body-fixed frames) defining the kinematic behavior of the robotic manipulator. In general, due to effects like thermal expansion, the kinematic parameters depend on the distributions of mass. That is, there exists a function $D(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{kin}}}$ with

$$\Theta_{\text{kin}} = D(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N) \quad (16)$$

such that, in general, the kinematic parameters inherit time dependency from the mass distributions. However—since our main goal is to highlight the effect of time-dependent inertial parameters as well as the causative time dependency of the mass distributions—we restrict the analysis in this contribution to robotic manipulators that satisfy the following standing assumption:

Assumption 1. *The function $D(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N)$ is constant, i.e. the kinematic parameters remain constant despite possible time-dependent change of the distributions of mass ρ_1, \dots, ρ_N and despite the resulting time dependency of the inertial parameters in Θ . Accordingly, we have*

$$(v_1^\top \quad \omega_1^\top \quad \dots \quad v_N^\top \quad \omega_N^\top)^\top = J(q)\dot{q}. \quad (17)$$

with the Jacobian

$$J(q) = \frac{\partial}{\partial q} F(q, \Theta_{\text{kin}}), \quad (18)$$

where we dropped its dependency on the kinematic parameters for better readability.

Discussion of the standing Assumption 1. In order to understand the prerequisites for the standing Assumption 1, consider the following: Usually, the origins of the body-fixed frames are chosen at the joints between the bodies. Then, the Assumption 1 is fulfilled if the forward kinematic map F and therewith the poses of the joints relative to each other are independent of the distributions of mass of the bodies that are linking them. That is, time dependency of the inertial parameters while Assumption 1 holds and with the body-fixed frames located at the joints, can be understood as the effect of time-dependent change of the distributions of mass of the links between the joints that neither does affect the positions nor the orientations of the joints relative to each other. As a remarkable consequence of this, provided that the body-fixed frames are located at the joints, arbitrary change with time of the distribution of mass of an end-effector does not interfere with the validity of the standing Assumption 1, since end-effectors do not serve as links between joints.

Calculation of the energies. The kinetic energies of the individual bodies $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ read as

$$\mathcal{T}_l = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left((1 - \sigma_l(x_l, t)) \rho_l(x_l, t) \|v_l + \omega_l \times x_l\|^2 \right. \quad (19)$$

$$\left. + \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \|v_l + \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) v_l(x_l, t) + \omega_l \times x_l\|^2 \right) dx_l$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left((1 - \sigma_l(x_l, t)) \rho_l(x_l, t) \|v_l - \mathcal{S}(x_l) \omega_l\|^2 \right. \quad (20)$$

$$\left. + \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \|v_l + \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) v_l(x_l, t) - \mathcal{S}(x_l) \omega_l\|^2 \right) dx_l$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\rho_l(x_l, t) \left(\|v_l\|^2 - 2v_l^\top \mathcal{S}(x_l) \omega_l + \|\mathcal{S}(x_l) \omega_l\|^2 \right) \right. \quad (21)$$

$$\left. + \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \left(\|\mathcal{R}(\phi_l) v_l(x_l, t)\|^2 + 2(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l) v_l(x_l, t))^\top (v_l - \mathcal{S}(x_l) \omega_l) \right) \right) dx_l$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_l(x_l, t) \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ \omega_l \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_3 & -\mathcal{S}(x_l) \\ -\mathcal{S}(x_l)^\top & \mathcal{S}(x_l)^\top \mathcal{S}(x_l) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ \omega_l \end{pmatrix} dx_l \quad (22)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \|v_l(x_l, t)\|^2 dx_l + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ \omega_l \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) \\ \mathcal{S}(x_l) \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) \end{pmatrix} v_l(x_l, t) dx_l.$$

In order to separate the time-dependent part from the pose-dependent part in the last addend of the right-hand-side of (22), we utilize Lemma 4 from Appendix and obtain $\omega_l^\top \mathcal{S}(x_l) \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) v_l(x_l, t) = -\omega_l^\top \mathcal{S} \cdot \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)) T \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x_l) v_l(x_l, t)$. Since $\sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x, t)$ is scalar, it commutes with $\omega_l^\top \mathcal{S} \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)) T$, leading to $\sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x, t) \omega_l^\top \mathcal{S}(x_l) \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) v_l(x_l, t) = -\omega_l^\top \mathcal{S} \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)) T \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x, t) \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x_l) v_l(x_l, t)$ and thus resulting in

$$\mathcal{T}_l = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ \omega_l \end{pmatrix}^\top Z(\Phi_l) \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ \omega_l \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} v_l(t) + \begin{pmatrix} v_l \\ \omega_l \end{pmatrix}^\top \mathcal{Q}(\phi_l) \psi_l(t) \quad (23)$$

for $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ with

$$Z(\Phi_l) = \begin{pmatrix} m_l \mathbf{I}_3 & -\mathcal{S}(h_l) \\ -\mathcal{S}(h_l)^\top & I_l \end{pmatrix} \in \text{sym}(6), \quad (24)$$

$$v_l(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \|v_l(x_l, t)\|^2 dx_l \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(\phi_l) = \text{diag}(\mathbf{I}_3, -\mathcal{S} \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)) T) \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 12}, \quad (26)$$

$$\psi_l(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sigma_l(x_l, t) \rho_l(x_l, t) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_3 \\ \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x_l) \end{pmatrix} v_l(x_l, t) dx_l \in \mathbb{R}^{12} \quad (27)$$

Next, by presupposing that the robotic manipulator operates in a constant gravitational field $g \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with respect to the 0-th Newtonian frame, we receive the potential energies of the individual bodies $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ as

$$\mathcal{U}_l = m_l g^\top (z_l + \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) c_l) \quad (28)$$

$$= g^\top (m_l z_l + \mathcal{R}(\phi_l) h_l), \quad (29)$$

where $c_l(t) = m_l(t)^{-1} h_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the location of the center of mass of the l -th rigid body in its body-fixed frame.

We proceed by reformulating these energies with respect to the specific movement of the bodies possible during operation of the robotic manipulator by using its kinematics. By means of (23) and (17),

the overall kinetic energy of the open kinematic chain can be expressed in dependence of the generalized coordinates, i.e. with respect to the movement of the robotic manipulator, as

$$\mathcal{T}(q, \dot{q}, \Theta, t) = \sum_{l=1}^N \mathcal{T}_l = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^\top M(q, \Theta) \dot{q} + \frac{1}{2} v(t) + \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q) \Psi(t), \quad (30)$$

where the mass matrix results as

$$M(q, \Theta) = J(q)^\top \mathcal{Z}(\Theta) J(q) \quad (31)$$

with

$$\mathcal{Z}(\Theta) = \text{diag}(Z(\Phi_1), \dots, Z(\Phi_N)) \in \text{sym}(6N) \quad (32)$$

such that $M(q, \Theta) = (M_{k,j}(q, \Theta))_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \in \text{sym}(n)$ is linearly dependent on the inertial parameters in Θ because they appear linearly in $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta)$. Consider the decomposition of the forward kinematic map $F(q, \Theta_{\text{kin}}) = (F_{z_l}(q)^\top \ F_{\phi_1}(q)^\top \ \dots \ F_{z_N}(q)^\top \ F_{\phi_N}(q)^\top)^\top$ into $F_{z_l}(q), F_{\phi_l}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Then, the remaining terms in (30) read as

$$v(t) = \sum_{l=1}^N v_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (33)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(q) = \text{diag}(Q(F_{\phi_1}(q)), \dots, Q(F_{\phi_N}(q))) \in \mathbb{R}^{6N \times 12N}, \quad (34)$$

$$\Psi(t) = (\psi_1(t)^\top \ \dots \ \psi_N(t)^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{12N}. \quad (35)$$

In similar fashion, due to (29) and (15), the overall potential energy of the open kinematic chain in dependence of the generalized coordinates, i.e. with respect to the movement of the robotic manipulator, evaluates to

$$\mathcal{U}(q, \Theta) = \sum_{l=1}^N \mathcal{U}_l = g^\top \left(\sum_{l=1}^N m_l F_{z_l}(q) + \mathcal{R}(F_{\phi_l}(q)) h_l \right), \quad (36)$$

which is also linearly dependent on the inertial parameters in Θ , as is evident by its structure.

Lagrange formalism In (30) and (36), we have gathered enough information to write the Lagrangian

$$L(q, \dot{q}, \Theta, t) = \mathcal{T}(q, \dot{q}, \Theta, t) - \mathcal{U}(q, \Theta) \quad (37)$$

which, by virtue of the the Lagrange formalism, leads to the dynamical behavior

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L(q, \dot{q}, \Theta, t)}{\partial \dot{q}_k} \right) - \frac{\partial L(q, \dot{q}, \Theta, t)}{\partial q_k} = \tau_k + w_k, \quad (38)$$

$k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ of the robotic manipulator, where $\tau(t) = (\tau_k(t))_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the torque/force that gets applied at the joints and $w(t) = (w_k(t))_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is some disturbance. Now, as is shown in the Appendix, the dynamical behavior (38) can be rewritten as **generalized robotics equation**

$$M(q, \Theta) \ddot{q} + (C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta) + M(q, \dot{\Theta}) + H(q, \Psi)) \dot{q} + G(q, \Theta) = \tau + w - J(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q) \dot{\Psi}. \quad (39)$$

The matrices in (39) are

$$\Gamma_{i,j,k}(q, \Theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial M_{k,j}(q, \Theta)}{\partial q_i} + \frac{\partial M_{k,i}(q, \Theta)}{\partial q_j} - \frac{\partial M_{i,j}(q, \Theta)}{\partial q_k} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad (40)$$

$$C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{i,j,k}(q, \Theta) \dot{q}_i \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad (41)$$

$$G(q, \Theta) = \left(\frac{\partial U(q, \Theta)}{\partial q} \right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (42)$$

$$H(q, \Psi) = \frac{\partial J(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q) \Psi}{\partial q} - \left(\frac{\partial J(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q) \Psi}{\partial q} \right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}. \quad (43)$$

with the Christoffel symbols of the first kind $\Gamma_{i,j,k}(q, \Theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ building the Coriolis matrix $C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta)$ and $G(q, \Theta)$ representing the influence of gravitation, as is already known from the classical robotics equation (1). However, the generalized robotics equation (39) also includes some effects beyond the scope of its classical counterpart:

- The influence of time dependency of the inertial parameters in Θ is expressed in (39) through the contribution made by $M(q, \dot{\Theta})$. This effect is already represented with $\mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta})$ in the version of the robotics equation (2) from [7]. However, the derivation of the generalized robotics equation in the Appendix reveals $\mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta}) = M(q, \dot{\Theta})$. The description with $M(q, \dot{\Theta})$ offers more insight into the structure of this effect that is made explicit with Theorem 4 in Section 4.2.
- The distributed velocities v_l , $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ of mass-carrying particles relative to their body-fixed frames are lumped into Ψ and their effect on the dynamical behavior appears in (39) via $H(q, \Psi)$.
- The force exerted by mass-carrying particles that experience acceleration $\ddot{\Psi}$ relative to their body-fixed frames in a lumped sense is represented in (39) by $J(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q) \ddot{\Psi}$ and acts like a disturbance.

4 Structural properties

In this section, we exploit insight from the modeling to reveal structural properties of the generalized robotics equation (39) and some of its components. In principle, the following two properties inherent to robotics equations are already known, see [7]. However for the sake of completeness, we state them here in a form tailored to our generalization of the robotics equation. Their derivation is moved to the Appendix and strictly adheres to the model as formulated in Section 3. We have:

1. The matrices $\dot{M}(q, \Theta) - 2C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta) - M(q, \dot{\Theta})$ and $H(q, \Psi)$ are skew-symmetric for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Theta, \dot{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{10N}$, $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{12N}$.
2. The generalized robotics equation (39) is linearly dependent on constant inertial parameters, i.e. there exist regressor functions $R_l(q, \dot{q}, v, a) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 10}$, $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ with

$$M(q, \Theta)a + C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta)v + G(q, \Theta) = \sum_{l=1}^N R_l(q, \dot{q}, v, a) \Phi_l \quad (44)$$

for all $q, \dot{q}, v, a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_N \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$.

The next two subsections are concerned with the derivation of conditions under which components of the generalized robotics equation (39) in some sense are bounded. This is done with the intention to enable analysis for robustness of adaptive algorithms as laid out in the introduction to conclude (ultimate) boundedness of signals in the closed loop when unknown inertial parameters are at risk to depend on time but these conditions are guaranteed to hold.

4.1 Boundedness of the mass matrix

The tracking capabilities of passivity-based control methods for robotic manipulators such as PD control [4] or the approach in [9] are guaranteed by means of Lyapunov functions that in part are formed as a quadratic form of the tracking error with the mass matrix. Therefore, the guarantees of stability of such control algorithms are hinging on the existence of a positive lower uniform bound and a finite upper uniform bound of the mass matrix, rendering conditions for the existence of such finite, positive uniform bounds desirable. Before we highlight challenges arising explicitly from the time dependency of the inertial parameters, we provide some insight into the existence of such bounds in the case of constant, physically consistent inertial parameters: Positivity of a lower uniform bound of the mass matrix necessitates the property in

Definition 2. The Jacobian J is called *normal* if it fulfills $\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\min}(J(q)^\top J(q))\} > 0$.

to be satisfied by the Jacobian J . This can be seen by means of the following counterexample: The inertial parameters $m_l = 1$, $h_l = (0 \ 0 \ 0)^\top$ and $I_l = I_3$ for $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ are constant and physically consistent (this is readily verified via Theorem 1 since $f(\Phi_l) = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{2}I_3, \ 1) \succ 0$) and they lead to $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta) = I_{6N}$, cf. (24), (32). According to (31), the mass matrix with these inertial parameters is $M(q, \Theta) = J(q)^\top J(q)$ such that loss of normality of the Jacobian J causes $\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\lambda_{\min}(M(q, \Theta))) = 0$, i.e. causing the greatest lower uniform bound of the mass matrix to lose its desirable positivity despite the fact that the inertial parameters are chosen physically consistent and constant.

Moreover, it can be shown for constant, physically consistent inertial parameters that a positive lower uniform bound of the mass matrix exists if and only if the Jacobian J is normal (see Lemma 1 from below) and that a finite upper uniform bound of the mass matrix exists if and only if the robotic manipulator meets the specifications listed in [3].

However, when dealing with time-dependent inertial parameters, then their physical consistency for all times, compliance with the specifications listed in [3] and normality of the Jacobian J are not anymore sufficient to guarantee the existence of finite, positive uniform bounds of the mass matrix, as is made evident by another counterexample: Consider a robotic manipulator with $N = 1$ describing the translational movement of a solid uniform sphere with mass $m_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and radius $r > 0$, i.e. $\rho_1(x_1, t) = \frac{3}{4\pi r^3} m_1(t)$ for $\|x_1\| \leq r$ and $\rho_1(x_1, t) = 0$ elsewhere, along the x -axis of the 0-th Newtonian frame. This results in the normal Jacobian $J(q) = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^\top$ and it renders the mass matrix $M(q, \Theta) = m_1$. The other inertial parameters of the sphere besides $m_1(t)$ are $h_1(t) = (0 \ 0 \ 0)^\top$ and $I_1(t) = \frac{2}{5} m_1(t) r^2 I_3$, which leads to $f(\Phi_1(t)) = m_1(t) \text{diag}(\frac{1}{5} r^2 I_3, \ 1)$ and thus shows that they are physically consistent for all times if and only if $m_1(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Thereby, physical consistency for all times neither prevents the greatest lower uniform bound of M from being nonpositive when $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} m_1(t) = 0$ nor the lowest upper uniform bound of M from being infinity when $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} m_1(t) = \infty$ even though this robotic manipulator meets the requirements listed in [3].

To circumvent difficulties that arise when the inertial parameters approach the edge to physical inconsistency or diverge, we introduce some additional properties that rule out such pathological behavior:

Definition 3. The inertial parameters are *upper bounded* if $\sup_{t \geq 0} \{\lambda_{\max}(f(\Phi_l(t)))\} < \infty$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and they are *uniformly physically consistent* if $\inf_{t \geq 0} \{\lambda_{\min}(f(\Phi_l(t)))\} > 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Equipped with the Definitions 2, 3, the standing Assumption 1 allows—provided some technical presuppositions hold—to derive finite, positive uniform bounds for the mass matrix from upper boundedness and uniform physical consistency of time-dependent inertial parameters. Specifically, we discuss the existence of a positive lower uniform bound of the mass matrix and then connect the presuppositions in [3] for the existence of a finite upper uniform bound of the mass matrix for constant inertial parameters to the time-dependent case.

Positive lower uniform bound

Theorem 2. *If the Jacobian J is normal and the inertial parameters are uniformly physically consistent, then the mass matrix is uniformly bounded by a positive lower bound, specifically then $M(q, \Theta(t)) \succeq \alpha_1 \mathbf{I}_n$ for all $t \geq 0$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with any positive constant*

$$\alpha_1 < \underbrace{\min_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \inf_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_{\min}(f(\Phi_l(t))) \right\} \right\}}_{\text{positive due to uniform physical consistency}} \underbrace{\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \lambda_{\min}(J(q)^\top J(q)) \right\}}_{\text{positive due to normality}}. \quad (45)$$

Proof: The statements in this proof are valid for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $t \geq 0$. Suppose, the inertial parameters are uniformly physically consistent, i.e. we find constants $\xi_l > 0$ with $f(\Phi_l(t)) \succ \xi_l \mathbf{I}_4$. Thereby, $\begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_l(t) - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 & h_l(t) \\ h_l(t)^\top & m_l(t) - \xi_l \end{pmatrix} \succ 0$ such that we receive $m_l(t) - \xi_l > 0$ and $\Sigma_l(t) - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 - (m_l(t) - \xi_l)^{-1} h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top \succ 0$ by application of Schur's complement and thus arrive at $\text{tr}(\Sigma_l(t) - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 - (m_l(t) - \xi_l)^{-1} h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \mathbf{I}_3 \succ \Sigma_l(t) - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 - (m_l(t) - \xi_l)^{-1} h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top$. Reorganization gives $\text{tr}(\Sigma_l(t)) \mathbf{I}_3 - \Sigma_l(t) - (m_l(t) - \xi_l)^{-1} (\text{tr}(h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \mathbf{I}_3 - h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \succ \text{tr}(\xi_l \mathbf{I}_3) \mathbf{I}_3 - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 \succ \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3$. Plugging in the inverse transformation from Theorem 1 while using the equality $\mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) = \text{tr}(h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \mathbf{I}_3 - h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top$, which itself is readily verified, leads to $I_l(t) - (m_l(t) - \xi_l)^{-1} \mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) \succ \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3$, i.e. $I_l(t) - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 - (-\mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top)((m_l(t) - \xi_l) \mathbf{I}_3)^{-1} (-\mathcal{S}(h_l(t))) \succ 0$. Application of Schur's complement with respect to the last inequality and $(m_l(t) - \xi_l) \mathbf{I}_3 \succ 0$ reveals $\begin{pmatrix} (m_l(t) - \xi_l) \mathbf{I}_3 & -\mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) \\ -\mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top & I_l(t) - \xi_l \mathbf{I}_3 \end{pmatrix} \succ 0$, i.e. $\lambda_{\min}(Z(\Phi_l(t))) \geq \xi_l$, cf. the definition of the matrix $Z(\Phi_l(t))$ in (24). By means of (31), (32), we arrive at $\dot{q}^\top M(q, \Theta(t)) \dot{q} = \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top \text{diag}(Z(\Phi_1(t)), \dots, Z(\Phi_N(t))) J(q) \dot{q} \geq \beta \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top J(q) \dot{q} \geq \beta \gamma \|\dot{q}\|^2$ for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with the constants $\beta = \min_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \{\xi_l\} > 0$, $\gamma = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\min}(J(q)^\top J(q))\}$. Accordingly, $\lambda_{\min}(M(q, \Theta(t))) \geq \beta \gamma = \alpha_1$, where the constant α_1 is positive if the Jacobian J is normal, i.e. $\gamma > 0$, in addition to the presupposed positivity of ξ_l and β . Moreover, we may rewrite $\alpha_1 = \gamma \min_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \{\xi_l\}$ such that (45) follows by recalling that ξ_l can be chosen arbitrarily in $(0, \inf_{t \geq 0} \{\lambda_{\min}(f(\Phi_l(t)))\})$. ■

The results in Theorem 2 lead to the next statement that provides a characterization of normality of the Jacobian J by means of constant physically consistent inertial parameters:

Lemma 1. *The Jacobian J is normal if and only if the greatest lower uniform bound of the mass matrix is positive, i.e. $\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\min}(M(q, \Theta))\} > 0$, whenever the inertial parameters with $f(\Phi_l) \succ 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ are physically consistent and constant.*

Proof: The sufficient direction represents a special case of Theorem 2. The necessary direction follows when considering the constant physically consistent inertial parameters from the first counterexample with $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta) = \mathbf{I}_{6N}$ because they cause $\inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\min}(J(q)^\top J(q))\} = \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\min}(M(q, \Theta))\}$, cf. (31). ■

Finite upper uniform bound

Assumption 2. *If the inertial parameters are physically consistent and constant, i.e. $f(\Phi_l) \succ 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, then $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\max}(M(q, \Theta))\} < \infty$.*

In [3], Fathi Ghorbel et al. exactly characterize open kinematic chains that possess the desirable property $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\max}(M(q, \Theta))\} < \infty$, provided that the analysis is restricted to constant, physically consistent inertial parameters. More precisely, the joints must appear in a certain order, depending on whether they are revolute or prismatic and the rotations of the rigid bodies must maintain a certain orientation relative to each other for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This means that the specifications listed in [3] put constraints on the poses of the joints relative to each other and therefore—in light of the standing Assumption 1 and provided that the origins of the body-fixed frames are located at the joints—we can evaluate the validity of these constraints by means of information contained in the forward kinematic map F independently of the distributions of mass and thus independently of the inertial parameters. Hence, if all poses of the joints

that are possible during operation of the robotic manipulator for one arbitrary set of constant, physically consistent inertial parameters meet the specifications listed in [3], then the Assumption 2 is fulfilled. This simple way of checking the validity of Assumption 2 opens up the possibility to assess the existence of a finite upper uniform bound of the mass matrix in the case of time-dependent inertial parameters by means of the next result:

Theorem 3. *Suppose, the Assumption 2 is fulfilled. If the inertial parameters are physically consistent for all times and upper bounded, then the mass matrix is uniformly bounded through a finite upper bound, specifically then there exists a constant $0 \leq \alpha_2 < \infty$ with $0 \preceq M(q, \Theta(t)) \preceq \alpha_2 \mathbf{I}_n$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t \geq 0$ that satisfies*

$$\alpha_2 \leq \underbrace{2 \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(f(\Phi_l(t))) \right\} \right\}}_{\text{finite due to upper boundedness}} \underbrace{\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sigma_{\max}(J(q))^2 \right\}}_{\text{finite as per Assumption 2, cf. Lemma 2}}. \quad (46)$$

Proof: Consider inertial parameters with $f(\Phi_l(t)) \succ 0$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(f(\Phi_l(t))) \right\} < \infty$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $t \geq 0$, i.e. they are physically consistent for all times and upper bounded. Since the Assumption 2 is fulfilled and the inertial parameters at $t = 0$ are physically consistent, i.e. $f(\Phi_l(0)) \succ 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we find a constant $0 \leq \zeta < \infty$ with $\zeta \|\dot{q}\|^2 \geq \dot{q}^\top M(q, \Theta(0)) \dot{q} = \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top \mathcal{Z}(\Theta(0)) J(q) \dot{q} \geq \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(0))) \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top J(q) \dot{q}$ for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, cf. (31). Following the argumentation in the proof of Theorem 2, physical consistency of the inertial parameters at $t = 0$ causes $\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{Z}(\Phi_l(0))) > 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and consequently it leads to $\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(0))) = \min_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{Z}(\Phi_l(0))) \right\} > 0$. We arrive at $\dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top J(q) \dot{q} \leq \frac{\zeta}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(0)))} \|\dot{q}\|^2$ for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and thus obtain $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(J(q)^\top J(q)) \right\} \leq \delta$ with the constant $\delta = \frac{\zeta}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(0)))} \in [0, \infty)$. The subsequent argumentation aims to infer upper boundedness of $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(\cdot))$ from the presupposed upper boundedness of the inertial parameters. The remaining statements in this proof are valid for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $t \geq 0$. Due to $\lambda_{\max}(f(\Phi_l(t))) < \infty$, we find constants $\zeta_l \in [0, \infty)$ with $f(\Phi_l(t)) \prec \zeta_l \mathbf{I}_4$, i.e. $\begin{pmatrix} \zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - \Sigma_l(t) & -h_l(t) \\ -h_l(t)^\top & \zeta_l - m_l(t) \end{pmatrix} \succ 0$. According to Schur's complement, this implies $\zeta_l - m_l(t) > 0$ and $\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - \Sigma_l(t) - (\zeta_l - m_l(t))^{-1} h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top \succ 0$, where the latter inequality leads to $\text{tr}(\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - \Sigma_l(t) - (\zeta_l - m_l(t))^{-1} h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \mathbf{I}_3 \succ \zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - \Sigma_l(t) - (\zeta_l - m_l(t))^{-1} h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top$. Re-ordering shows $\Sigma_l(t) - \text{tr}(\Sigma_l(t)) \mathbf{I}_3 - (\zeta_l - m_l(t))^{-1} (\text{tr}(h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \mathbf{I}_3 - h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \succ \zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - \text{tr}(\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3) \mathbf{I}_3 = -2\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3$, which, by taking into account the inverse transformation in Theorem 1 and $\mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) = \text{tr}(h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top) \mathbf{I}_3 - h_l(t) h_l(t)^\top$, rewrites as $I_l(t) + (\zeta_l - m_l(t))^{-1} \mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) \prec 2\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3$. Due to $\zeta_l \geq 0$, the more conservative inequality $I_l(t) + (2\zeta_l - m_l(t))^{-1} \mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) \prec 2\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3$ also is valid, i.e. we obtain $2\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - I_l(t) - \mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top ((2\zeta_l - m_l(t)) \mathbf{I}_3)^{-1} \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) \succ 0$. Applying Schur's complement with respect to the last inequality and the consequence $(2\zeta_l - m_l(t)) \mathbf{I}_3 \succ 0$ of $\zeta_l \geq 0$ and $\zeta_l - m_l(t) > 0$ yields $\begin{pmatrix} (2\zeta_l - m_l(t)) \mathbf{I}_3 & \mathcal{S}(h_l(t)) \\ \mathcal{S}(h_l(t))^\top & 2\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_3 - I_l \end{pmatrix} \succ 0$. This leads to $\mathcal{Z}(\Phi_l(t)) \prec 2\zeta_l \mathbf{I}_6$, cf. the definition in (24), i.e. we have verified upper boundedness of $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(\cdot))$ with $\varepsilon = \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta(t))) \right\} = \sup_{t \geq 0, l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\Phi_l(t))) \right\} \leq \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ 2\zeta_l \right\} \in [0, \infty)$. Hence, the structure of (31) shows $\dot{q}^\top M(q, \Theta(t)) \dot{q} = \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top \mathcal{Z}(\Theta(t)) J(q) \dot{q} \leq \varepsilon \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top J(q) \dot{q} \leq \varepsilon \sigma_{\max}\{J(q)\}^2 \|\dot{q}\|^2 \leq \alpha_2 \|\dot{q}\|^2$ for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\alpha_2 = \varepsilon \sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sigma_{\max}\{J(q)\}^2 \right\} \leq \varepsilon \delta \in [0, \infty)$, revealing the constant α_2 to be nonnegative and finite, as desired. Furthermore, ζ_l can be chosen in compliance with its initial definition as $\zeta_l = \varsigma \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(f(\Phi_l(t))) \right\}$ with any $\varsigma > 1$. Thus, by recalling the structure of α_2 and ε , we obtain $\alpha_2 \leq 2 \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \zeta_l \right\} \sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sigma_{\max}\{J(q)\}^2 \right\} = 2\varsigma \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda_{\max}(f(\Phi_l(t))) \right\} \right\} \sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \sigma_{\max}\{J(q)\}^2 \right\}$ for any $\varsigma > 1$, which implies (46) when choosing ς arbitrarily close to one. ■

The next lemma shows how to check the validity of Assumption 2, i.e. the condition to obtain a finite upper uniform bound for the inertia matrix by means of Theorem 3, without taking a detour via [3] but instead directly using information carried in the forward kinematic map F , specifically its Jacobian J :

Lemma 2. *The Jacobian J is uniformly upper bounded with $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sigma_{\max}(J(q))\} < \infty$ if and only if Assumption 2 holds.*

Proof: First, we verify the sufficient direction of the desired equivalence. The structure of the mass matrix in (31) shows $\dot{q}^\top M(q, \Theta) \dot{q} \leq \sigma_{\max}(J(q))^2 \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta)) \|\dot{q}\|^2$ for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and arbitrary inertial parameters $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{10N}$. This results in $\lambda_{\max}(M(q, \Theta)) \leq \sigma_{\max}(J(q))^2 \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta))$. Since physically consistent, constant inertial parameters trivially are upper bounded, they admit $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\Theta)) \in (0, \infty)$, cf. the proof of Theorem 3, and thus, we receive $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\max}(M(q, \Theta))\} < \infty$ for such inertial parameters if $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sigma_{\max}(J(q))\} < \infty$. Next, in order to show necessity in the desired equivalence, consider rigid bodies with the inertial parameters $m_l = 1$, $h_l = (0 \ 0 \ 0)^\top$ and $I_l = I_3$ for $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $\mathcal{Z}(\Theta) = I_{6N}$. Then, the structure of (31) leads to $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\max}(M(q, \Theta))\} = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\lambda_{\max}(J(q)^\top J(q))\} = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sigma_{\max}(J(q))^2\}$. Accordingly, the physical consistency of these specific inertial parameters, which is confirmed by means of Theorem 1 in view of $f(\Phi_l) = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{2}I_3, \ 1) \succ 0$, shows that validity of Assumption 2 implies $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sigma_{\max}(J(q))\} < \infty$. ■

Irrespective of the way one evaluates the validity of Assumption 2, the summary of the findings on finite, positive uniform boundedness of the mass matrix, i.e. the conjunction of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, presents itself as follows:

Corollary 1. *Suppose, the Jacobian J is normal and the Assumption 2 is fulfilled. If the inertial parameters are upper bounded and uniformly physically consistent, then the mass matrix is uniformly bounded with $\alpha_1 I_n \preceq M(q, \Theta(t)) \preceq \alpha_2 I_n$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t \geq 0$, where $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < \infty$ are suitable constants.*

Further, by conjunction of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we obtain the subsequent result that provides contrast to the time-dependent case described in Corollary 1 when the inertial parameters are constant:

Corollary 2. *The Jacobian J is normal and uniformly upper bounded, i.e. it admits $\beta_1 I_n \preceq J(q)^\top J(q) \preceq \beta_2 I_n$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with some constants $0 < \beta_1 \leq \beta_2 < \infty$, if and only if there exist finite, positive uniform bounds $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < \infty$ of the mass matrix satisfying $\alpha_1 I_n \preceq M(q, \Theta) \preceq \alpha_2 I_n$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever the inertial parameters with $f(\Phi_l) \succ 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ are constant and physically consistent.*

Notably, Corollary 2 is an equivalence. This means that the required normality of the Jacobian J and fulfillment of the Assumption 2—i.e. additional uniform upper boundedness of J , see Lemma 2—for existence of finite, positive uniform bounds of the mass matrix in Corollary 1 are not only sufficient but also necessary for validity of an assertion commonly made implicitly by contributions on robot control, e.g. in [9, 12]: that finite positive uniform bounds for the mass matrix will exist simply because the inertial parameters correspond to physically meaningful rigid bodies, i.e. because they are physically consistent and constant. Thus, if one is willing to assert existence of finite, positive uniform bounds of the mass matrix based purely on rigidity of and physical meaning in the bodies that build a robotic manipulator then Corollary 1 may be invoked to discuss the case of time-dependent inertial parameters without need to impose any further restrictions on the kinematics of such a robot represented by J . Moreover, on the contrary, should a given robotic manipulator break this common assertion because its kinematics lack either normality or uniform upper boundedness of the corresponding Jacobian J , then either Theorem 3 or Theorem 2 still provides the means to assess the opposing uniform bound of the mass matrix by judging either upper boundedness or uniformity of physically consistent inertial parameters, respectively. Thereby, the only case for which none of our results on the boundedness of the mass matrix are applicable is the degenerate one where the common assertion from above breaks because the kinematics of a given robotic manipulator are described by a non-normal Jacobian J that is not uniformly upper bounded.

4.2 Boundedness of other components in the generalized robotics equation

Theorem 4. *Let the Assumption 2 apply. If the time derivatives of the inertial parameters are bounded with $\sup_{t \geq 0} \{\sigma_{\max}(f(\dot{\Phi}_l(t)))\} < \infty$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, then $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \geq 0} \{\sigma_{\max}(M(q, \dot{\Theta}(t)))\} < \infty$.*

Proof: The statements in this proof hold for all $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $t \geq 0$. Consider inertial parameters whose time derivatives admit $\sup_{t \geq 0} \{\sigma_{\max}(f(\dot{\Phi}_l(t)))\} < \infty$, i.e. we can find a constant $\mu \in [0, \infty)$ with $\sigma_{\max}(f(\dot{\Phi}_l(t))) \leq \mu$. Accordingly, the absolute values of the entries in $f(\dot{\Phi}_l(t))$ are bounded by μ , i.e. $|\dot{m}_l(t)|, |\dot{h}_{x,l}(t)|, |\dot{h}_{y,l}(t)|, |\dot{h}_{z,l}(t)| \leq \mu$ and $|e_i^\top \dot{\Sigma}_l(t) e_j| = |\text{tr}(\dot{\Sigma}_l(t) e_i e_j^\top - e_i^\top \dot{I}_l(t) e_j)| \leq \mu$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ when taking into account the consequence $\text{tr}(\dot{I}_l(t)) = 2\text{tr}(\dot{\Sigma}_l(t))$ of the inverse transformation in Theorem 1. Therein, $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the i -th standard unit vector. For $i < j$, we receive $|\dot{I}_{ij,l}(t)| \leq \mu$ for the entries in $\dot{I}_l(t)$ offside its main diagonal. For $i = j$, we obtain $|\text{tr}(\dot{\Sigma}_l(t) - \dot{I}_{ii,l}(t))| \leq \mu$ and $|\text{tr}(\dot{\Sigma}_l(t))| \leq 3\mu$, which necessarily leads to $|\dot{I}_{ii,l}(t)| \leq 4\mu$, i.e. boundedness of the absolute values of the remaining diagonal entries in $\dot{I}_l(t)$. Hence, the absolute values of all entries in $\mathcal{Z}(\dot{\Theta}(t))$ are bounded by $4\mu < \infty$, cf. the definitions in (24), (32), and thus we obtain $\sigma_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\dot{\Theta}(t))) \leq \chi$ with some constant $\chi \in [0, \infty)$. Now, by means of (31), we get $\dot{q}^\top M(q, \dot{\Theta}(t))^\top M(q, \dot{\Theta}(t)) \dot{q} = \dot{q}^\top J(q)^\top \mathcal{Z}(\dot{\Theta}(t))^\top J(q) J(q)^\top \mathcal{Z}(\dot{\Theta}(t)) J(q) \dot{q} \leq \sigma_{\max}(J(q))^4 \sigma_{\max}(\mathcal{Z}(\dot{\Theta}(t)))^2 \|\dot{q}\|^2$ for all $q, \dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. $\sigma_{\max}(M(q, \dot{\Theta}(t))) \leq \chi \sigma_{\max}(J(q))^2$ such that we arrive at the desired $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \geq 0} \{\sigma_{\max}(M(q, \dot{\Theta}(t)))\} < \infty$ by virtue of Lemma 2 since the Assumption 2 is fulfilled. ■

Lemma 3. *$\mathcal{Q}(q)$ is bounded with $\sup_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\sigma_{\max}(\mathcal{Q}(q))\} \leq \sqrt{2}$.*

Proof: Due to (26), (34), the matrix $\mathcal{Q}(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q)$ admits a diagonal block structure, where diagonal entries are I_3 and $\mathcal{M}(\phi_l) = T^\top \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l))^\top S^\top S \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi_l)) T$ evaluated for $\phi_l = F_{\phi_l}(q)$, $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. The orthonormality of $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ shows $\mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi))^\top \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R}(\phi)) = I_9$ and thereby $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\phi)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(S^\top S)$. $\lambda_{\max}(T^\top T) = 2$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^3$, cf. (72). In conjunction with the block structure of $\mathcal{Q}(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q)$, this leads to $\sigma_{\max}(\mathcal{Q}(q)) \leq \max_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^3} \{\lambda_{\max}(I_3), \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{M}(\phi))\}^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, as desired. ■

5 Conclusion

The contribution of this work is twofold. On the one hand, we have derived a generalization of the robotics equation that describes all relevant effects associated with time-dependent change of inertial parameters including these originating from the causative time dependency of the distributions of mass. The modeling provides a clear distinction between effects that are and those that are not described by our generalization, therefore enabling purposeful testing of e.g. adaptive control algorithms by weighing realism and complexity. It is noteworthy that loading processes of end-effectors are inside the scope of our model. On the other hand, we have shown that uniform physical consistency and upper boundedness of (estimated) inertial parameters guarantees finite, positive uniform boundedness of the (estimated) mass matrix. Potentially, this is a powerful result, as we believe that natural adaptation schemes inspired by [6] already provide uniformity and upper boundedness of their physically consistent estimates without calling it out. If this is true or uniformity and upper boundedness could be achieved by minor revision of the approach in [6], then it would elevate natural adaptation from promising in some sense refined control action to providing adaptation with the guarantee to estimate a uniformly positive definite mass matrix, removing a pain point of control for robotic systems with imprecise knowledge of the inertial parameters.

References

- [1] Namhoon Cho, Taeyoon Lee, and Hyo-Sang Shin. Recursive Least Squares with Log-Determinant Divergence Regularisation for Online Inertia Identification. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 12578–12584, May 2024.

- [2] John J. Craig, Ping Hsu, and S. Shankar Sastry. Adaptive Control of Mechanical Manipulators. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 6(2):16–28, June 1987.
- [3] Fathi Ghorbel, B. Srinivasan, and Mark W. Spong. On the uniform boundedness of the inertia matrix of serial robot manipulators. *Journal of Robotic Systems*, 15(1):17–28, 1998.
- [4] R. Johansson. Adaptive control of robot manipulator motion. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 6(4):483–490, August 1990.
- [5] Taeyoon Lee. *Geometric Methods for Dynamic Model-Based Identification and Control of Multi-body Systems*. PhD thesis, Seoul National University, July 2019.
- [6] Taeyoon Lee, Jaewoon Kwon, and Frank C. Park. A Natural Adaptive Control Law for Robot Manipulators. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 1–9, October 2018.
- [7] P.R. Pagilla, B. Yu, and K.L. Pau. Adaptive control of time-varying mechanical systems: analysis and experiments. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 5(4):410–418, December 2000.
- [8] Karishma Patnaik and Wenlong Zhang. Adaptive Attitude Control for Foldable Quadrotors. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:1291–1296, 2023.
- [9] Jean-Jacques E. Slotine and Weiping Li. On the Adaptive Control of Robot Manipulators. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 6(3):49–59, September 1987.
- [10] Silvio Traversaro, Stanislas Brossette, Adrien Escande, and Francesco Nori. Identification of fully physical consistent inertial parameters using optimization on manifolds. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 5446–5451, October 2016.
- [11] Patrick M. Wensing, Sangbae Kim, and Jean-Jacques E. Slotine. Linear Matrix Inequalities for Physically Consistent Inertial Parameter Identification: A Statistical Perspective on the Mass Distribution. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 3(1):60–67, January 2018.
- [12] Xuwei Wu, Annika Kirner, Gianluca Garofalo, Christian Ott, Paul Kotyczka, and Alexander Dietrich. Adaptive Tracking Control With Uncertainty-Aware and State-Dependent Feedback Action Blending for Robot Manipulators. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(4):12307–12314, October 2022.

Appendix

In order to shorten some expressions in the subsequent analysis, we use the following convention: Whenever J , M , $M_{k,j}$, Q , U , L , $\Gamma_{i,j,k}$, C , \mathcal{F} , G are written without arguments, they represent $J(q)$, $M(q, \Theta)$, $M_{k,j}(q, \Theta)$, $Q(q)$, $U(q, \Theta)$, $L(q, \dot{q}, \Theta, t)$, $\Gamma_{i,j,k}(q, \Theta)$, $C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta)$, $\mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta})$, $G(q, \Theta)$, respectively.

Derivation of the generalized robotics equation using the Lagrange formalism

We use (30), (37) and (38) to derive the generalization of the robotics equation (39). To this end, let $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and consider the decomposition of $J = (J_1 \dots J_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{6N \times n}$ into $J_k \in \mathbb{R}^{6N}$. Due to $M \in \text{sym}(n)$ and $\dot{q}^\top J^\top Q = \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{q}_j J_j^\top Q$, we get

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_k} = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n M_{i,j} \frac{\partial \dot{q}_i \dot{q}_j}{\partial \dot{q}_k} \right) + \frac{\partial \dot{q}_j J_j^\top Q \Psi}{\partial \dot{q}_k} \right) \quad (47)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n M_{k,j} \dot{q}_j \right) + J_k^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi \quad (48)$$

and thus obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_k} \right) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{dM_{k,j}}{dt} \dot{q}_j \right) + \frac{d\Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_k}{dt} \quad (49)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n M_{k,j} \ddot{q}_j + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i \dot{q}_j \right) + \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \dot{q}_j \right) \right) + \dot{\Psi}^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_k + \frac{\partial \Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_k}{\partial q} \dot{q} \quad (50)$$

from $J_k^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi = \Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_k$. Further, the structure of the Lagrangian in (37) leads to

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_k} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial M_{i,j}}{\partial q_k} \dot{q}_i \dot{q}_j \right) + \frac{\partial \dot{q}_j J_j^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q_k} \right) - \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_k} \quad (51)$$

such that the equations of motion (38) of the open kinematic chain evaluate to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{j=1}^n M_{k,j} \ddot{q}_j \right) + \Gamma + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \dot{q}_j \right) + \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_k} \\ & - \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_j}{\partial q_k} \dot{q}_j \right) + J_k^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi + \frac{\partial J_k^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} \dot{q} = \tau_k + w_k, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where

$$\Gamma = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial q_i} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial M_{i,j}}{\partial q_k} \right) \dot{q}_i \dot{q}_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{i,j,k} \dot{q}_i \dot{q}_j \quad (53)$$

in view of the definition (40) of the Christoffel symbols of the first kind. Thus, the equation (52) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{j=1}^n M_{k,j} \ddot{q}_j \right) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{i,j,k} \dot{q}_i + \sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \right) \dot{q}_j \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{\partial J_k^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} - \frac{\partial \Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_k}{\partial q_k} \right) \dot{q} + \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_k} = \tau_k + w_k - J_k^\top \mathcal{Q} \dot{\Psi}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Stacking terms on top of each other as in

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial J_1^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} - \frac{\partial \Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_1}{\partial q_1} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial J_n^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} - \frac{\partial \Psi^\top \mathcal{Q}^\top J_n}{\partial q_n} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\partial J^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} - \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\partial J_1^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q_1} \right)^\top \\ \vdots \\ \left(\frac{\partial J_n^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q_n} \right)^\top \end{pmatrix} \quad (55)$$

$$= \frac{\partial J^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} - \left(\frac{\partial J^\top \mathcal{Q} \Psi}{\partial q} \right)^\top \quad (56)$$

reveals the stacked version of (54) for $k = 1, \dots, n$ as

$$M(q, \Theta) \ddot{q} + (C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta) + \mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta}) + H(q, \Psi)) \dot{q} + G(q, \Theta) = \tau + w - J(q)^\top \mathcal{Q}(q) \dot{\Psi}, \quad (57)$$

when taking into account the definitions (41), (42) and (43). In accordance with (54), the matrix $\mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta}) \in \text{sym}(n)$ in (57) reads

$$\mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta}) = \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}(q, \Theta)}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2}, \quad (58)$$

which can be simplified further, as is discussed next: Since the mass matrix $M(q, \Theta)$ is linear in the inertial parameters, we find regressor functions $M_{k,j}^h(q) \in \mathbb{R}$, $h = \{1, \dots, 10N\}$ with

$$M_{k,j}(q, \Theta) = \sum_{h=1}^{10N} M_{k,j}^h(q) \Theta_h \quad (59)$$

for all $k, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. They allow to rewrite

$$\mathcal{F}(q, \Theta, \dot{\Theta}) = \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial \sum_{\ell=1}^{10N} M_{k,j}^{\ell}(q) \Theta_{\ell}}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \quad (60)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} M_{k,j}^h(q) \dot{\Theta}_h \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \quad (61)$$

$$= M(q, \dot{\Theta}), \quad (62)$$

thus shaping the already established (57) into the desired generalized robotics equation (39).

Verification of two inherent properties of the generalized robotics equation

We start by verifying the 1. inherent property, i.e. skew-symmetry of the matrices $\mathcal{N} = \dot{M} - 2C - \mathcal{F}$ and H . First, $H \in \text{skew}(n)$ is an immediate consequence of its definition in (43). Second, due to $\dot{M}, \mathcal{F} \in \text{sym}(n)$, we have $\mathcal{N} \in \text{skew}(n)$ if and only if $\mathcal{N} = -\dot{M} + 2C^\top + \mathcal{F}$, holding, if and only if $\dot{M} - \mathcal{F} = C + C^\top$. Accordingly, we evaluate the validity of the equation $\dot{M} - \mathcal{F} = C + C^\top$: Due to (40) and $M \in \text{sym}(n)$, its right-hand-side

$$C + C^\top = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\Gamma_{i,j,k} + \Gamma_{i,k,j}) \dot{q}_i \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \quad (63)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial q_i} + \frac{\partial M_{k,i}}{\partial q_j} - \frac{\partial M_{i,j}}{\partial q_k} + \frac{\partial M_{j,k}}{\partial q_i} + \frac{\partial M_{j,i}}{\partial q_k} - \frac{\partial M_{i,k}}{\partial q_j} \right) \dot{q}_i \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \quad (64)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \quad (65)$$

equals its left-hand-side

$$\dot{M} - \mathcal{F} = \left(\dot{M}_{k,j} - \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \right) \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2} \quad (66)$$

$$= \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial M_{k,j}}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i \right) + \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}(q, \Theta)}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \right) - \left(\sum_{h=1}^{10N} \frac{\partial M_{k,j}(q, \Theta)}{\partial \Theta_h} \dot{\Theta}_h \right) \right)_{(k,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2}. \quad (67)$$

This results in $\mathcal{N} \in \text{skew}(n)$, as desired.

Next, we back up the 2. inherent property of the generalized robotics equation (39), i.e. its linear dependence on constant inertial parameters as stated in (44). Since the mass matrix $M(q, \Theta)$ as well as the potential energy $\mathcal{U}(q, \Theta)$ are linear in the inertial parameters, we find regressor functions $\mathcal{U}^h(q) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $h = \{1, \dots, 10N\}$ with

$$\mathcal{U}(q, \Theta) = \sum_{h=1}^n \mathcal{U}^h(q) \Theta_h, \quad (68)$$

in addition to the already established regressor functions $M_{k,j}^h(q)$ for $h = \{1, \dots, 10N\}$, $k, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ that allow for the decomposition (59). Accordingly, for any $a = (a_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}}, v = (v_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we obtain $M(q, \Theta)a = R_M(q, a)\Theta$, $C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta)v = R_C(q, \dot{q}, v)\Theta$ and $G(q, \Theta) = R_G(q)\Theta$ by introducing the regressor functions

$$R_M(q, a) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n M_{k,j}^h(q) a_j \right)_{(k,h) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, 10N\}}, \quad (69)$$

$$R_C(q, \dot{q}, v) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial M_{k,j}^h(q)}{\partial q_i} + \frac{\partial M_{k,i}^h(q)}{\partial q_j} - \frac{\partial M_{i,j}^h(q)}{\partial q_k} \right) \dot{q}_i v_j \right)_{(k,h) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, 10N\}}, \quad (70)$$

$$R_G(q) = (\mathcal{U}^1(q) \quad \dots \quad \mathcal{U}^{10N}(q)). \quad (71)$$

Hence, we arrive at $M(q, \Theta)a + C(q, \dot{q}, \Theta)v + G(q, \Theta) = R(q, \dot{q}, v, a)\Theta$ with $R(q, \dot{q}, v, a) = R_M(q, a) + R_C(q, \dot{q}, v) + R_G(q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 10N}$, i.e. the desired equation (44) results from decomposing $R(q, \dot{q}, v, a) = (R_1(q, \dot{q}, v, a) \quad \dots \quad R_{10N}(q, \dot{q}, v, a))$ into $R_l(q, \dot{q}, v, a) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 10}$, $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Auxiliary Statement

Lemma 4. *Let*

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (72)$$

Then, $S(x)\mathcal{R} = -S\mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R})T\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$.

Proof: Take arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and consider the decomposition $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}_1 \quad \mathcal{R}_2 \quad \mathcal{R}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. We obtain $S(x)\mathcal{R} = (S(x)\mathcal{R}_1 \quad S(x)\mathcal{R}_2 \quad S(x)\mathcal{R}_3) = -(S(\mathcal{R}_1)x \quad S(\mathcal{R}_2)x \quad S(\mathcal{R}_3)x)$ from the anticommutativity of the cross product, i.e. $S(x)y = -S(y)x$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Further, the fact $S(y) = S\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(y)$ is readily verified for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and thus leads to $S(x)\mathcal{R} = -(S(\mathcal{R}_1) \quad S(\mathcal{R}_2) \quad S(\mathcal{R}_3))\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x) = -S(\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(\mathcal{R}_1) \quad \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(\mathcal{R}_2) \quad \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(\mathcal{R}_3))\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x)$. Now, since the permutation matrix T admits $(\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(\mathcal{R}_1) \quad \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(\mathcal{R}_2) \quad \mathcal{A}_{3,1}(\mathcal{R}_3)) = \mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R})T$, we arrive at $S(x)\mathcal{R} = -S\mathcal{A}_{3,3}(\mathcal{R})T\mathcal{A}_{3,1}(x)$. ■