

Reihe 12

Verkehrstechnik/  
Fahrzeugtechnik

Nr. 801

Dipl.-Ing. Kai Gerd Schröter,  
Ronneburg/Hüttengesäß

## Brake Steer Torque Optimized Corner Braking of Motorcycles

Bremslenkmomentoptimierte  
Kurvenbremsung von Motorrädern

**FZD**

FAHRZEUGTECHNIK  
TU DARMSTADT



---

**Brake Steer Torque Optimized  
Corner Braking of Motorcycles**  
**Bremslenkmomentoptimierte  
Kurvenbremsung von Motorrädern**

Am Fachbereich Maschinenbau an der  
Technischen Universität Darmstadt  
zur Erlangung des Grades eines  
Doktor-Ingenieurs (Dr.-Ing.)  
genehmigte

**Dissertation**

vorgelegt von

**Dipl.-Ing. Kai Gerd Schröter**  
aus Gelnhausen

Berichterstatter:	Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Hermann Winner
Mitberichterstatter:	Prof. Dr.-Ing. Markus Lienkamp
Tag der Einreichung:	02.12.2014
Tag der mündlichen Prüfung:	04.02.2015

Darmstadt 2016

D 17



# Fortschritt-Berichte VDI

Reihe 12

Verkehrstechnik/  
Fahrzeugtechnik

Dipl.-Ing. Kai Gerd Schröter,  
Ronneburg/Hüttengesäß

Nr. 801

## Brake Steer Torque Optimized Corner Braking of Motorcycles

Bremslenkmomentoptimierte  
Kurvenbremsung von Motorrädern



Schröter, Kai Gerd

## **Brake Steer Torque Optimized Corner Braking of Motorcycles Bremslenkmomentoptimierte Kurvenbremsung von Motorrädern**

Fortschr.-Ber. VDI Reihe 12 Nr. 801. Düsseldorf: VDI Verlag 2017.

280 Seiten, 93 Bilder, 30 Tabellen.

ISBN 978-3-18-380112-1, ISSN 0178-9449,

€ 95,00/VDI-Mitgliederpreis € 85,50.

**Keywords:** Motorcycle – Safety – Corner Braking – Chassis Design – Brake System – Assistance System – Brake Steer Torque (BST) – Brake Steer Torque Avoidance Mechanism (BSTAM) – Bremslenkmoment (BLM) – Bremslenkmomentverhinderer (BLMV)

This thesis deals with the Brake Steer Torque (BST) induced stand-up tendency of Powered Two Wheelers (PTW) and measures to lower the associated risk for running wide on curve accidents with sudden, unforeseen braking. Focus is set on the BST Avoidance Mechanism (BSTAM), a chassis design that eliminates the BST through lateral inclination of the kinematic steering axis. A simple mathematical model is used to identify its main influences on the driving behavior and derive an optimized system layout. Its theoretical potential is evaluated against the standard chassis using different cornering adaptive brake force distributions and riding styles. For the first time ever, a motorcycle with state-of-the-art brake system (Honda CBR 600 RR, C-ABS) is equipped with a BSTAM and tested in corner braking experiments. Compared to the baseline, it is significantly reducing BST related disturbances and improving directional control. The gained insights can be stepping stones to enhance PTW safety by enabling future assistance systems with autonomous corner braking.

### **Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek**

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet unter <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

### **Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Bibliothek**

(German National Library)

The Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie (German National Bibliography); detailed bibliographic data is available via Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

© VDI Verlag GmbH · Düsseldorf 2017

Alle Rechte, auch das des auszugsweisen Nachdruckes, der auszugsweisen oder vollständigen Wiedergabe (Fotokopie, Mikrokopie), der Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, im Internet und das der Übersetzung, vorbehalten.

Als Manuskript gedruckt. Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0178-9449

ISBN 978-3-18-380112-1

---

# Acknowledgements

This thesis presents the results of my work performed as a research assistant at the Institute of Automotive Engineering *FZD* at the Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany. It would not have been possible without the support of many people, to all of whom I would like to express my sincere gratitude.

I am especially thankful to Professor Dr. rer. nat. Hermann Winner, head of *FZD*, for the trust he put in me and for the freedom I was granted working in the field of motorcycle research. His guidance and stimulations, his patience and continuous support despite some hardships along the way were indispensable for the completion of this thesis.

For his interest in the project and his support as my co-examiner, I thank Professor Dr.-Ing. Markus Lienkamp, head of the Institute of Automotive Engineering *FTM* at Technische Universität München, Germany.

I am lacking the words to express my gratitude to Dr.-Ing. Alois Weidele, lecturer for motorcycles at *FZD*, for everything he taught me during our many years of fruitful cooperation, but most of all for his continuous encouragement, inspiring discussions and friendship. As the inventor of the Brake Steer Torque Avoidance Mechanism, the core element of this study, I thank him and his former research team under supervision of Professor em. Bert Breuer, for dreaming and thinking thus far ahead.

To the partners at Honda, in particular Kazuhiko Tani, Yasuhiro Uchiike, and Oliver Fuchs, I am thankful for giving these dreams wings in many ways, not only by funding the core research project and sponsoring the base motorcycle, but also for the numerous beneficial discussions and unbureaucratic support with whatever was needed.

Concerning the equipment of the research motorcycle, I am grateful to FAG/Schaeffler Technologies for providing a pair of unique steering head bearings, to Adalbert Hammer Feinwerktechnik for the absolutely perfect application of strain gauges, and to GSG Mototechnik as well as MaxXxware Germany for their generous discounts.

The invaluable support of many students was a key factor for the success of the presented research and I hope that all of them may feel my deep gratitude when reading this thesis. However, I also want to highlight the extraordinary engagement of Michael Wallisch, Raphael Pleß, Jean-Eric Schleiffer, Oleg Vasylyev, Nils Magiera, Simon Frisch, Timm Schröder, Daniel Andrés, and Peter Lauche, to whom I am deeply indebted.

Furthermore, I would like to extend my gratefulness to all of my colleagues at *FZD* for the pleasant working environment, the stimulating discussions and their friendship.

---

I am especially thankful to my mentor Dr.-Ing. Patrick Seiniger for introducing me to the fascinating research world of “flying on level zero”, to Dr.-Ing. Benedikt Lattke as further fellow motorcycle researcher, and all those diligently working in the background:

To the members of the mechanical workshop under leadership of Robert Korndörfer, in particular Sven Müller, Michael Augustin, Christine Szuska, Jörg Eberlein, and Thomas Glock, for their passion about the project and all the encouraging “bike-talks” in between.

To Harald Bathke, Nico Cianciaruso, Pia Bossong and the complete IT team, for their straightforward 24/7-support, especially in unconventional and urgent situations.

To Fred Becker, Marco Gerner, and Dr. Rolf Boelcke of the electronics workshop, as well as Dr.-Ing. Nico Steinhardt, for their help concerning electronics.

To Rita Delp, Anke Mehm, Anne Hüther, and Monika Stelzer, as well as chief engineer Dr.-Ing. Norbert Fecher, for their perfect organizational support and ever cheerful spirit.

Undoubtedly, this thesis would be poorer in various aspects, without the vivid discussion in the motorcycle research community and expert interviews. In this context I want to express my thanks vicariously to Dr.-Ing. Achim Kuschefski and Matthias Haasper of the Institute for Motorcycle Safety e.V. (*ifz*) and the participants of their annual scientists’ seminars as well as Hans-Albert Wagner of BMW Motorrad, Gerald Matschl of KTM, again Oliver Fuchs of Honda, and Dr. Markus Lemejda of Bosch. I am moreover grateful to Prof. Dr.-Ing. J. Stefan Bald, head of the Road Research Institute at TU Darmstadt, and Prof. Bernt Spiegel for sharing fascinating insights on road design respectively on the psychology of the “upper half of the motorcycle” that are so intricately interwoven. For valuable detail-information on the historical prototype parts of BSTAM, I thank Stefan Scharting of Schaeffler Technologies, who created lots of them when still a student.

Almost last, but definitely not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my friends and family, for all their encouragement, prayers, and strong backing. In particular, I thank my parents Gerd and Elke for their upbringing, fostering my gifts and paving the way for this excellent education, as well as my beloved wife Miriam for sustaining me with their unconditional support and love, especially during the most sacrificial times on the finish line of this thesis. You are wonderful.

Finally, I praise God whom I cannot thank enough for revealing a glimpse at the beauty of creation concealed in motorcycle dynamics and for making this daring adventure possible for me.

Dear reader, may He bless you richly and always keep you safe on the road.

And now: Enjoy reading!

Kai Schröter

Mühlthal, in December 2014

---

# Contents

<b>List of Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>List of Symbols and Indices .....</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>XIII</b>
<b>1 Introduction and Aims .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation .....	1
1.2 Working Hypothesis and the Brake Steer Torque Avoidance Mechanism .....	6
1.3 Research Objectives .....	7
1.4 Methodology & Structure of this Thesis .....	9
<b>2 The BST Chain of Effects and State of the Art Countermeasures .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Fundamentals of Motorcycle Dynamics.....	11
2.1.1 Coordinate Systems and Basic Chassis Geometry.....	12
2.1.2 Roll Equilibrium, Tire Scrub Radius & Riding Styles.....	14
2.1.3 Influences on Steering Torque Demand.....	17
2.1.4 Tire Road Interaction .....	18
2.1.5 Steering Kinematics and Steering Angle.....	20
2.1.6 Bi-Directional Coupling of Steer & Roll (Stabilization & Maneuvering).....	24
2.1.7 Tire Forces and Ideal Brake Force Distribution during Corner Braking ...	29
2.1.8 Braking Stability .....	33
2.2 The BST Chain of Effects.....	36
2.2.1 The Main Chain of Effects.....	37
2.2.2 Further Primary and Secondary Influences.....	37
2.2.3 The Influence of Riding Style.....	38
2.2.4 The Inverse Effect .....	38
2.2.5 The Role of the Rider as a Controller .....	39
2.3 State of the Art of BST-Countermeasures .....	40
2.3.1 Avoiding BST-Critical Situations.....	41
2.3.2 Training the Rider .....	48
2.3.3 Influencing the Brake Force.....	49
2.3.4 Influencing the Lever Arm(s).....	53
2.3.5 Influencing Wheel Load and Chassis Geometry Changes .....	59
2.3.6 Influencing Secondary Effects on Steering Torque.....	60
2.3.7 Influencing the Steering Torque and Movement.....	61
2.3.8 Influencing the Rolling Moment and Movement.....	64
2.3.9 Using Multi-Track Tilting Vehicles with Two Front Wheels.....	65
2.4 Conclusions .....	69

<b>3</b>	<b>Analytic Considerations on the Kinematic Layout and Effectiveness of BSTAM71</b>	<b>71</b>
3.1	Force Transmission Ratios of a Generic BSTAM and Standard Chassis .....	72
3.2	Steering Torque Demand (STD) of a Standard Chassis .....	76
3.3	Layout and STD of a BSTAM with Laterally Inclined Steering Axis (KPI) .....	80
3.3.1	Remarks on the STD of a BSTAM with Parallel Steering Axis Offset .....	81
3.3.2	Definition & STD of a BSTAM Optimized for Neutral Free Cornering ...	82
3.3.3	The Influence of Pitch on the STD and BSTAM Layout.....	85
3.3.4	STD of the BSTAM Realized in the Prototype Motorcycle .....	90
3.3.5	Discussion of Neglected Influences on STD .....	91
3.3.6	The Inertia Effect Created Through a BSTAM with KPI .....	95
3.4	Layout and STD of a BSTAM with Parallel Steering Axis Offset.....	98
3.4.1	Optimization Potential of a Parallel BSTAM for Neutral Free Cornering	98
3.4.2	Considerations on Effectiveness of Multi-Lever Steering.....	102
3.5	Conclusions on Optimal BSTAM Design .....	104
3.6	Effectiveness Comparison of BSTAM and Standard Chassis.....	106
3.6.1	Model Extensions & Overview of Simulated Experiments.....	107
3.6.2	Maximal Braking on Constant Radius.....	109
3.6.3	Partial Braking on Constant Radius with Different BFD .....	113
3.6.4	Partial Front Braking under Special Conditions .....	116
3.6.5	Conclusions on the Effectiveness of Different BFD.....	118
3.6.6	Comparison of Simulated and Real BFD.....	119
3.7	Hypotheses for Riding Experiments and Concluding Remarks.....	123
3.7.1	Hypotheses on the Expected Performance of Standard Chassis and BSTAM in Riding Tests .....	123
3.7.2	Concluding Remarks.....	124
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementing BSTAM in a Motorcycle.....</b>	<b>125</b>
4.1	General Considerations on Mechanical Setup.....	125
4.1.1	Basic Kinematic Concepts of a BSTAM.....	126
4.1.2	Combining BSTAM with Different Chassis Designs .....	128
4.1.3	Bearing Trajectory and Actuation Concept.....	131
4.1.4	Alternative BSTAM Actuation Concepts.....	134
4.2	Mechanical Setup of the BSTAM Prototype .....	139
4.2.1	Definition of Prototype Motorcycle and Choice of BSTAM Concept.....	139
4.2.2	Excentricity Layout.....	141
4.2.3	Simple Geometric Control Algorithm and Computation of Lever Arms.	144
4.2.4	Chassis Geometry Changes through BSTAM.....	147
4.3	Overview of the BSTAM Prototype .....	149
4.4	Measurement and Control Setup .....	151
4.4.1	Overview of Main Components.....	151
4.4.2	Accuracy of Relevant Measurements .....	152
4.4.3	Data Sampling and Post Processing.....	152
4.4.4	System Performance .....	153

4.4.5	Extended Control Algorithms .....	155
4.4.6	Relevance of Elevated Curve Detection .....	156
4.5	Concluding Remarks .....	156
<b>5</b>	<b>Driving Tests .....</b>	<b>157</b>
5.1	Test Design .....	157
5.1.1	General Requirements .....	157
5.1.2	Test Track Definition .....	157
5.1.3	Test Maneuver and Riding Task .....	159
5.1.4	Test Setups and Maneuver Variations .....	159
5.1.5	Comments on the Conduct of Tests .....	160
5.2	Criteria for Evaluation .....	161
5.2.1	Definition of Characteristic Values .....	161
5.2.2	Exemplary Comparison of Characteristic Values in Corner Braking Experiments with Standard Chassis vs. BSTAM .....	167
5.2.3	Arrangement and Display of Results .....	174
5.3	Global Analysis of All Test Results .....	174
5.3.1	Correlation Analysis of Characteristic Values .....	175
5.3.2	Performance of Centered Steering Axis vs. BSTAM .....	178
5.3.3	Interim Conclusions from Global Analysis .....	182
5.4	Detailed Analysis of Individual Test Results .....	183
5.4.1	Test Setup Nomenclature of Abbreviations .....	183
5.4.2	ABS Braking with Standard Steering under Variation of Brake Application, Riding Style, and Steering Damper .....	184
5.4.3	Partial Front Braking with Standard Steering vs. BSTAM .....	190
5.5	Concluding Remarks .....	204
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion and Outlook .....</b>	<b>206</b>
6.1	Results .....	206
6.2	Transferability of Results .....	210
6.3	Relevance of Results for other Systems and Stakeholders .....	214
6.4	Outlook .....	216
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>221</b>
A.1	Appendix to Chapter 1 .....	221
A.2	Appendix to Chapter 2 .....	222
A.3	Appendix to Chapter 3 .....	223
A.3.1	Equation Set for the Derivation of the Optimized Instantaneous Center of Steering Axis Inclination of OPT BSTAM .....	223
A.3.2	Equation Set for the Computation of Tire Contact Forces with different Brake Force Distributions (BFD) .....	226
A.3.3	Equation Set for the Computation of Measured Brake Force Distributions for the Entry in the BFD Diagram .....	235

A.4 Appendix to Chapter 4 .....	236
A.4.1 Alternative Actuation Concepts .....	236
A.4.2 Technical Data of the Prototype Motorcycle .....	241
A.4.3 Considerations on Steering Torque Measurement .....	242
A.4.4 Considerations on Roll Angle Measurement .....	242
A.4.5 Definition of Filter Parameters .....	243
A.5 Appendix to Chapter 5 .....	248
A.5.1 Results of Global Analysis in CDF-Plot Format.....	248
A.5.2 Correlation Tables for ALL Experiments.....	250
A.5.3 Correlation Tables for Exp. with Centered Steering Axis.....	252
A.5.4 Correlation Tables for Exp. with BSTAM Active.....	254
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>256</b>
<b>Own Publications.....</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Student Research Work .....</b>	<b>265</b>

---

# List of Abbreviations

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Description</b>
ABS	Antilock Brake System
ACT.	Actuator (i.e. BSTAM actuator)
AEB	Autonomous Emergency Braking
ARAS	Advanced Rider Assistance System (cf. ADAS for passenger cars, with D for driver)
BFD (CA-BFD)	(Cornering Adaptive) Brake Force Distribution
BPM	Brake Pitch Moment
BST	Brake Steer Torque
(//)BSTAM	Brake Steer Torque Avoidance Mechanism (with parallel steering axis offset)
OPT BSTAM	BSTAM with optimized instantaneous center of steering axis inclination
BYM	Brake Yaw Moment
CBS	Combined Brake System
C-ABS	Combined Antilock Brake System (Brake-by-Wire)
CoG	Center of Gravity
CoSy	Coordinate System
CTR	A chassis setup with centered steering axis (either standard, or passive BSTAM)
DoF	Degree of Freedom
DS	Displacement Sensitivity
EEF	Excentricity Enlargement Factor
EXP	Experiments
FZD	Institute of Automotive Engineering Darmstadt
GPS	Global Positioning System
HESD	Honda Electronic Steering Damper
IMU	Inertial Measurement Unit
KPI	King-Pin Inclination (angle between (projected) steering axis and symmetry plane)
MBS	Multi Body Simulation
MSC	Motorcycle Stability Control
PBA	Predictive Brake Assist
PMC	Prototype Motorcycle
PTW	Powered Two (and Three) Wheeler
RLP	Rear Wheel Lift-Off Protection
RMS	Root Mean Square
STA	Standard setup / Standard chassis with centered steering axis
STD	Steering Torque Demand
TCS	Traction Control System
TU Darmstadt	Technische Universität Darmstadt
VRU	Vulnerable Road User

Abbreviations that occur only once are explained in context and not contained in this list.

# List of Symbols and Indices

Symbol	Unit	Description
$a_x$	m/s <sup>2</sup>   g	longitudinal acceleration, mainly: deceleration
$a_y$	m/s <sup>2</sup>   g	lateral acceleration
$bd$	m	bearing distance (perpendicular distance between the kinematic center points of the steering bearings measured along the fork legs / conventional steering axis, in $z'_{st}$ -direction)
$c_w$	-	aerodynamic drag coefficient
$c_l$	-	aerodynamic lift coefficient
$c_p$	-	aerodynamic pitch moment coefficient
$c_{roll}$	-	rolling resistance coefficient
$d$	m	displacement, offset, diameter
$e$	m	BSTAM excentricity
$ecr$	%   -	effective compensation ratio
$f$	Hz	frequency
$fl$	m	fork length (perpendicular distance between the kinematic center of the lower steering bearing and front wheel hub, measured along the fork legs)
$fo$	m	fork (yoke) offset (perpendicular distance between standard steering axis and front wheel axle, measured along $x'_{st}$ -axis)
$g$	m/s <sup>2</sup> , N/kg	gravitational acceleration, gravity constant
$g_1, g_2$	various	slope and axis intercept parameters of linear regression of data correlations
$gcr$	%   -	geometric compensation ratio
$h$	m	height
$i$	A	electrical current
$l$	m	length, geometric chassis parameter, lever arm, wheelbase
$l_{x,y,z}$	m	lever arms of front tire longitudinal, lateral, and vertical contact forces towards the steering axis
$l_{yz}$	-	lever ratio (of lateral and normal force levers)
$\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_z$	-	relative lever ratio (ratio of lever ratios of different setups)
$m$	kg	mass
$n$	m	trail
$nt$	m	normal trail
$p$	bar   -	pressure, brake pressure, tire inflation pressure   probability of a correlation
$r$	m	tire rolling radius in center position ( $\lambda = 0$ )
$r_c$	m	tire contour (or: cross-section) radius
$r_r$	m	roll angle dependent tire rolling radius
$s$	%   -	tire (brake) slip
$sr$	m	scrub radius (lateral lever arm from tire contact point towards steering axis)
$t$	s	time
$tcr$	%   -	target compensation ratio
$trigger$	-	trigger signal from the brake light switch
$v$	m/s   km/h	velocity, speed (vehicle or front wheel circumferential speed)

Symbol	Unit	Description
$x, y$	various	abscissa and ordinate parameters for correlation analysis and linear regression
$A$	$m^2$	Area (i.e. the projected frontal area of the vehicle with rider and equipment)
$DS$	$mm/^\circ$	Displacement Sensitivity
$EEF$	-	Excentricity Enlargement Factor
$F$	N	force
$I$	$kgm^2$	mass moment of inertia
$L$	-	length of a straight road   length of whiskers in box-plots (rel. to data spread)
$M$	Nm	moment
$Q$	-	quartile (eg. $Q_1$ and $Q_3$ for the 25 <sup>th</sup> and 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile of data)
$R$	m   -	curve radius   correlation coefficient
$T$	Nm	torque, steering torque, braking torque, driving torque
$\alpha$	$^\circ$	(tire) sideslip angle   curve opening angle
$\beta$	$^\circ$	vehicle sideslip angle
$\chi$	$^\circ$	rider lean angle (relative to motorcycle frame)
$\delta$	$^\circ$	steering angle
$\varepsilon$	$^\circ$	BSTAM excenter actuation angle
$\gamma$	$^\circ$	steering axis inclination angle from vertical (x-z-plane)
$\lambda$	$^\circ$	roll angle
$\mu$	-	(available or utilized) friction potential
$\nu$	$^\circ$	pitch angle
$\sigma$	$^\circ$   -	king-pin inclination angle of steering axis relative to vehicle symmetry plane ( $x^2$ - $z^2$ -plane)   standard deviation of data (separately indicated)
$\rho$	$kg/m^3$	air density
$\tau$	$^\circ$	steering head (or caster) angle
$\omega$	$^\circ/s$   rad/s	angular velocity
$\psi$	$^\circ$	yaw angle
$\Delta$	-	Difference
$a, c, e$	N	Substitute coefficients
$b, d, f$	kg	Substitute coefficients

Some of the utilized symbols are also used as indices and are therefore not necessarily repeated in the list of indices.

Index	Description
0	initial condition, at the beginning of an experiment ( $t = 0$ ), or upright vehicle position ( $\lambda = 0$ )
<i>Ackermann</i>	concerning the Ackermann condition (i.e. the Ackermann steering angle)
<i>(//)BSTAM</i>	related to a <i>(//)</i> BSTAM
<i>BPM</i>	Brake Pitch Moment
<i>BYM</i>	Brake Yaw Moment
<i>STA, sta</i>	(related to the) standard setup with centered steering axis
<i>ac</i>	related to the aerodynamic center
<i>aero</i>	concerning an aerodynamic influence
<i>available</i>	available portion (e.g. of the friction potential $\mu$ )
<i>brk, brake</i>	related to brakes or braking
<i>cg, CoG</i>	(related to the) center of gravity

<b>Index</b>	<b>Description</b>
<i>demand</i>	demand
<i>drag</i>	concerning aerodynamic drag
<i>drive</i>	related to driving forces or torques
<i>dyn</i>	dynamic
<i>eff</i>	effective
<i>end</i>	related to the end of an experiment
<i>friction</i>	concerning friction / friction limits
<i>ft</i>	front
<i>gyro</i>	related to a gyroscope
<i>i</i>	general index parameter
<i>inertia</i>	concerning the “Inertia Effect”
<i>is</i>	concerning the “is” value of a measured variable at a certain point in time
<i>lift</i>	concerning aerodynamic lift
<i>limit</i>	concerning a limiting value
<i>lower</i>	lower threshold value
<i>max</i>	maximal
<i>mean</i>	mean, averaged value
<i>opt</i>	optimal, optimized, related to (the definition of) an optimized (OPT) BSTAM
<i>partial</i>	partial
<i>pitch</i>	concerning the pitch degree of freedom
<i>precession</i>	concerning the precession of a gyroscope
<i>red</i>	reduced
<i>ref</i>	reference
<i>rel</i>	relative
<i>rider</i>	(related to the) rider
<i>rlp</i>	concerning rear wheel lift-off conditions
<i>roll</i>	concerning the roll degree of freedom   concerning the rolling resistance of tires
<i>rr</i>	rear
<i>spin</i>	concerning the spinning of a gyroscope
<i>st</i>	related to steering / the steering system
<i>target</i>	concerning a target value
<i>th</i>	theoretical, physically active (referring to the roll angle)
<i>tir, tire</i>	related to tires (typically the front tire)
<i>tot</i>	total
<i>upper</i>	upper threshold value
<i>used</i>	used or utilized portion (e.g. of the friction potential $\mu$ )
<i>whl, wheel</i>	related to a wheel (typically the front wheel)
<i>x, y, z</i>	in/from x-direction (longitudinal), y-direction (lateral), z-direction (vertical)
<i>yaw</i>	concerning the yaw degree of freedom

---

## Summary

Motorcyclists account for an alarmingly high share among traffic fatalities and severely injured. Especially in unforeseen or hazardous corner braking situations, riders often show a limited capability to balance their brake action and compensation of the Brake Steer Torque (BST) instantaneously. In many cases, the subsequent stand-up tendency of the vehicle can further confuse the rider which might run off track or into oncoming traffic. Since the BST mainly arises as a product of the front brake force with the roll angle dependent tire scrub radius as lateral lever arm, Weidele proposed the so-called BST Avoidance Mechanism (BSTAM), inhibiting BST generation by lateral inclination of the steering axis. The system was however never analyzed or practically tested beyond the demonstration of mechanical feasibility in the early 1990s. Therefore, research objectives lie in the evaluation of a BSTAM's performance and benefit for the rider before the background of the past decades' tremendous improvements in state-of-the-art technology, as well as to find criteria for a favorable system design.

As starting point, influence factors on the BST chain of effects are identified and used as classification scheme for countermeasures, ranging from possibilities of rider training or road design to technical measures on the vehicle. Besides BSTAM, a counter steering actuator, Cornering Adaptive Brake Force Distribution (CA-BFD), semi-active steering dampers, and multi-lever steering are identified as promising.

Focusing on the transmission ratios of front tire contact forces towards the steering axis as the main contributors affected by BSTAM, a simple mathematical model is used to analyze the steering torque demand (STD) of a generic BSTAM against that of the baseline chassis. The balance between normal and lateral force is found to be crucial for a "neutral" steering. Compensation of the tire scrub radius through BSTAM not only eliminates the disturbing influence of the brake force, but also diminishes helpful aligning steering torque components generated by the normal and lateral force, leading to an undesired increase in STD. Kinematic optimization resolves this trade-off for steering axis inclination angles in the order of  $10^\circ$  with an optimal instantaneous center of steering axis rotation located at the intersection of the original steering axis with the vertical connection from tire contact point to wheel hub in upright position. Small steering disturbances arising from the deceleration of wheel spin inertia and inertial forces on the steering system can be accounted for through limitation of front brake pressure gradients and by keeping the instantaneous center of steering axis inclination close to the steering system's center of gravity. An analysis of BSTAM concepts with parallel steering axis adjustment yields acceptable steering balance only for unusually large caster angles and fork offsets (around  $50^\circ$  and 140 mm). However, these setups suffer consid-

erable disturbances through longitudinal accelerations on the steering system (in the order of 10 Nm) and were not further pursued. Also an exemplary analysis of multi-lever steering (i.e. a four-bar linkage) showed no benefits regarding the BST.

Using methods of product design, key aspects of incorporating an optimized BSTAM into a vehicle are investigated and four classes of alternative actuation concepts proposed, that may be favorably incorporated basing on a king-pin or hub-center steering.

For the first time ever, a Honda CBR 600 RR super-sport motorcycle with Combined-ABS and a conventional telescopic fork is equipped with a BSTAM according to Weidele's original design with double excentric adjustment of the upper steering head bearing and tested against the baseline in comparative riding tests.

Correlation analysis of all conducted tests confirms the BST chain of effects, interconnecting disturbances in steering torque, steering angle, roll angle, and also rider lean angle. Moreover, it shows a strong dependency of the disturbance values on the initial brake pressure increase rate and mean deceleration for centered steering axis, while BSTAM eliminates this correlation to a great extend.

In line with predictions from model calculations, riding tests with the baseline chassis confirm a positive influence of "lean in" riding style. For maximal braking, the "stand-up" of the vehicle matches well with the required reductions in roll angle towards lower speeds, provided the maneuver is done intentionally on the test track.

Comparison of baseline and BSTAM in partial front braking maneuvers fully confirms the behavior expected from model calculations. On one hand, handling is compromised due to increases in caster angle and trail (handling index 3.0-3.3 vs.  $4.9 \frac{\text{Nm}}{(\text{m}^2/\text{s}^2)}$ ) and the stationary STD is significantly increased (5.3 vs. 20.9 Nm). On the other, significant reductions are obtained in steering torque deviations upon brake kick-in (21.2 vs. 13.4 Nm), followed by significant improvements in all other disturbance values. Moreover, BSTAM eases directional controllability for braking on narrowing radius turns.

Even though BSTAM proves already effective in the prototype setup and further improvements are expected from the proposed optimizations, especially concerning stationary STD, stability and handling characteristics require further investigations. Moreover, a simulation study reveals, that Cornering Adaptive Brake Force Distribution already reduces the expected disturbance values in partial braking to such low absolute levels, that this measure alone bears the potential to address a great deal of BST relevant situations in real traffic and might further be complimented by advanced semi-active steering damper control. However, before the background of current discussions on the implementation of predictive brake assist or even autonomous emergency braking into powered two wheelers, effective BST countermeasures are a necessary prerequisite. In these regards, a model based counter steering torque actuator as an add-on to the well understood conventional chassis is regarded as to be superior compared to BSTAM.

---

I dedicate this thesis to  
GOD, the creator of heaven and earth,  
JESUS CHRIST, my Lord and Savior, through whom all things are made, and to the  
HOLY SPIRIT, eternal inspiration for every good work.  
SOLI DEO GLORIA.

