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Abstract: A model for a Magneto-Rheological (MR) damper based on Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) is proposed. The ANN model does not require regressors in the input and output vector, i.e. is considered static. Only one sensor is used to achieve a reliable MR damper model which is compared with experimental data provided from two MR dampers with different properties. The RMS of the error is used to measure the model accuracy; from both MR dampers, an average value of 7.1% of total error in the force signal is obtained by taking into account 5 different experiments. The ANN model, which represents the nonlinear behavior of an MR damper, is used in a suspension control system of a Quarter of Vehicle (QoV) in order to evaluate the comfort of passengers maintaining the road holding. A control technique with the MR damper model is compared with a passive suspension system. Simulation results show the effectiveness of a semiactive suspension versus the passive one. The RMS of the comfort signal improves 7.4% with the MR damper while the road holding gain in the frequency response shows that the safety in the vehicle can be increased until 40.4% with the semiactive suspension system. The accurate MR damper model validates a realistic QoV response compliance.

1 INTRODUCTION

A Magneto-Rheological (MR) damper is an hydraulic damper whose oil contains metallic particles that change the rheological properties (i.e. viscosity) of the fluid when a magnetic field is applied; an electric current supplied through the damper coil is used to manipulate the magnetic phenomenon. The variation of the oil viscosity allows to modify the damping ratio in the shock absorber, this property is named semi-activity. The oil viscosity is proportional to the electric current as well as to the MR damper force; however, the join of these mechanisms creates an highly nonlinear behavior in the damping force. The MR damper has been mainly applied in vibration control because it has low power requirement, fast response, simple structure and continuous adjustable damping force over a large span.

The main function of the MR damper in an automotive suspension is to absorb energy in order to get low accelerations of the sprung mass (i.e. automotive chassis) and low deflections in the wheel; thus, an accurate MR damper model is required to design the control system. Even there are important contributions in this field (Guo et al., 2006); there are still several needs. Figure 1 shows the highly nonlinear behavior of an industrial MR damper under various constant electric current inputs, its accurate modeling is a non-trivial task.

![Nonlinear behavior of the MR damper force respect to the control current and relative velocity.](image)

Several mathematical models are available for modeling the nonlinear behavior of MR dampers; generally, they can be grouped as parametric and non-parametric models. Parametric models include the Bingham model (Stanway et al., 1987),
the viscoelastic-plastic model (Gamota and Filisko, 1991), the phenomenological model (Wang and Kamat, 2006), the semi-phenomenological model based on the Bouc-Wen model (Spencer et al., 1996), the improved Bouc-Wen model (Yang et al., 2002), the hyperbolic tangent function model (Kwok et al., 2006), (Guo et al., 2006), the inverse tangent function model (Cesmeci and Engin, 2010) and many others. The Bingham and the viscoelastic-plastic model can not reproduce the nonlinear behavior of an MR damper with high accuracy, while the other models can; however, they have many parameters to identify. On the other hand, some of these physical models use parameters of the internal structure of the shock absorber resulting a particular model case.

In the non-parametric models, the coefficients do not have a physical meaning. Models based on look-up table, fuzzy logic and Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) are the representative non-parametric models for a MR damper. Polynomial models [Choi et al., 2001], (Hong et al., 2002), (Du et al., 2005), (Poussot-Vassal et al., 2008)] require many parameters to express the nonlinear and semiactive behavior of the damping force; while the fuzzy models [Atray and Roschke, 2003], (Ahn et al., 2008)] need a priori knowledge in the frequency and time domain of the MR damper. For ANN models, the knowledge of the dynamic relationships between the variables is not required, only a well training step is needed; in addition, the number of parameters depends on the structure size and commonly the ANN design is based on the minimal dimensions criterion (Freeman and Skapura, 1991), which selects the possible lowest number of hidden layers with the possible lowest number of neurons.

The major effort in the MR damper modeling, by using ANN, is focused on reproduce the inverse dynamics (force-electric current) of the shock absorber (Chang and Zhou, 2002), (Zapateiro et al., 2009), (Metered et al., 2010); however, a recurrent neural network is required for achieving an optimal damping force signal, and normally the input vector is based on two or more sensor measurements: force, displacement and/or velocity. This type of ANN model increases the architecture size and the instrumentation cost in a suspension control system. On the other hand, commonly the modeling of the forward dynamics using ANN requires two ore more time delays of each input by increasing the ANN architecture and its computing time (Savaresi et al., 2005), (Chen et al., 2009), (Boada et al., 2011).

This paper proposes a non-parametric model of an MR damper based on ANN, the model does not require regressors in the input vector and demands only one sensor, i.e. its structure has low complexity for practical implementations of suspension control systems. The MR damper model is validated with experimental data of two MR dampers for analyzing its reliability and it is used in a suspension control system of a Quarter of Vehicle (QoV), this is an example of an application problem where the accurate modeling of the actuation device is one of the most crucial part of the whole control design problem.

The outline of this paper is as follows: in the next section, the ANN design is described. Section 3 shows the experimental system and section 4 presents the modeling results. Section 5 presents the effectiveness of an MR damper versus a passive damper in compliance of a suspension control system. Conclusions are presented in section 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_{MR}$</td>
<td>MR damper force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{dp}$</td>
<td>Damper piston position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{dv}$</td>
<td>Damper piston velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>Electric current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{t}$</td>
<td>Time delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{s}$</td>
<td>Sprung mass in the QoV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{us}$</td>
<td>Unsprung mass in the QoV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{r}$</td>
<td>Road profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{as}$</td>
<td>Vertical position of $m_{s}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{us}$</td>
<td>Vertical position of $m_{us}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{v}$</td>
<td>Vertical velocity of $m_{us}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{av}$</td>
<td>Vertical velocity of $m_{us}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{a}$</td>
<td>Vertical acceleration of $m_{s}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_{as}$</td>
<td>Vertical acceleration of $m_{us}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{s}$</td>
<td>Spring stiffness coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{z}$</td>
<td>Wheel stiffness coefficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2 ANN REVIEW

An ANN is a computational model capable to learn behavior patterns of a process, it can be used to model nonlinear, complex and unknown dynamic systems, (Korbicz et al., 2004). Based on the flow of signals, the ANN architecture can be classified into two major groups: feedforward and recurrent networks. Feedforward networks project the flow of information only in one way, i.e. the output of a neuron feeds to all neurons of the following layer (Hagan et al., 1996); while, the recurrent networks have an output feedback signal.

In MR damper modeling using ANN, typically recurrent neural networks based on Nonlinear-ARX (NARX) structures, i.e. regressors in the input and/or output vector, have been proposed with high accuracy (Chang and Zhou, 2002), (Savaresi et al., 2005), (Zap-
ateiro et al., 2009), (Chen et al., 2009), (Metered et al., 2010), (Boada et al., 2011). The NARX structure is defined as,

\[
F_{MR} = f_NL(z_{def}(t), \dot{z}_{def}(t-1), \ldots, z_{def}(t-k_1), \dot{z}_{def}(t-1), \ldots, \dot{z}_{def}(t-k_2), I(t), I(t-1), \ldots, I(t-k_3), F_{MR}(t-1), \ldots, F_{MR}(t-k_4))
\]

(1)

where \(k_i\) represents a specific number of time delays for each signal, \(z_{def}\) and \(\dot{z}_{def}\) are the displacement and velocity of the damper rod provided from sensor measurements, \(I\) is the actuation signal and \(F_{MR}\) is the damper force (ANN output).

In this paper, a comparison between a feedforward and recurrent neural network is considered for determining the accuracy degree in the damper force by adding the output feedback in the ANN structure. In addition, different arrays in the input vector are used to evaluate the ANN performance with time delays; the arrays with one, two and three regressors in the input vector are compared with the modeling performance of an ANN that does not have delays. Finally, the ANN performance is analyzed when one (velocity) or two (displacement and velocity) signals are used in the input vector.

The ANN training is defined as the adaptation process of the synaptic connections under external stimulations. The backpropagation algorithm is the most used training method since it allows to solve problems with complex net connections; its formulation can be reviewed in detail in (Freeman and Skapura, 1991). The proposed ANN model was trained with backpropagation and crossed validation was used to validate the results.

3 EXPERIMENTAL SYSTEM

Two different MR dampers have been used to perform a total of 5 tests. One damper, called MR\(_1\) damper, is designed by Delphi MagneRide\textsuperscript{TM}; it has continuous actuation and considerable hysteresis at high frequencies with high deflections. The other MR damper, named MR\(_2\) damper, is manufactured by BWI\textsuperscript{TM}; it has only two levels of actuation and its hysteretic behavior is minimal.

An MTS-407\textsuperscript{TM} controller has been used to control the position of the damper piston, Figure 2. An NI-9172\textsuperscript{TM} data acquisition system commands the controller and records the position, velocity and force from the MR damper. A sampling frequency of 1650 Hz was used. The bandwidth of displacement was 0.5-15 Hz, which lies within comfort and road holding automotive applications. The displacement and electric current ranges were: ±25 mm and 0 - 2.5 A, respectively.

Figure 2 also shows the used sensor (VP510-10 of UniMeasure\textsuperscript{TM}), which provides the velocity (\(\dot{z}_{def}\)) and position (\(z_{def}\)) measurements of the damper piston. In this case, a self-generating tachometer generates the velocity measurement; however, it is possible to use another linear velocity transducer.

Figure 2: Experimental system.

A series of training sequences have been proposed in (Lozoya-Santos et al., 2009), the position emulates the suspension deflection and the electric current is the actuation signal. Table 2 shows the design of experiments used to identify the nonlinear behavior of both MR dampers under different sequences of position and actuation.

For displacement sequences, Amplitude-Modulated (AM), Frequency-Modulated (FM) and Stepped Frequency Sinusoidal (SFS) were used to analyze the MR damper dynamics in the transient response under changes in magnitude and frequency of the suspension deflection; Triangular wave with Positive and Negative Variable Slopes (TPNVS) sequence allows to know the dynamic behavior under constant velocity; and Road Profile (RP) represents the suspension deflection move when the vehicle passes under a specific surface. Figure 3 presents some of the different displacement sequences used in the experimental stage in order to identify the nonlinear behavior of both MR dampers.

For electric current sequences, Stepped inCrements (SC) are used to study the effect of the current in the jounce and rebound of the MR damper under different displacements, since the MR\(_2\) damper has not a continuous actuation only two levels of current were designed; Increased Clock Period Signal (ICPS) and Pseudo Random Binary Signal (PRBS) allow to analyze the transient response of the damping force.
when the current changes at different frequencies, the ICPS signal includes random changes in the amplitude and PRBS only switches between two electric current values. Figure 4 shows the behavior of the actuation sequences used in the experiments, for the MR2 damper, the SC sequence only has two states: 0 and 2.5 A.

4 MODELING RESULTS

The ANN model obtained from the different experiments, presented in Table 2, is used to characterize the dynamical behavior of the MR damper and evaluated by the Root Mean Square (RMS) performance index of the error, which is defined as,

\[
RMS = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{F}_{MR}(i) - F_{MR}(i))^2}
\]

where, \( \hat{F}_{MR} \) and \( F_{MR} \) represent the estimated and experimental damping force respectively and \( n \) is the number of total samples in the experiment. The percentage of error represents the RMS of the error normalized by the span of the damping force.

First, the design issues for the ANN model are discussed: the network structure, the required sensors in the input vector, the regressor choice and the selection of the number of parameters of the ANN.

Remark: ANN architecture. A Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) network, which corresponds to a feedforward system, is compared with a recurrent network. The input vector of the MLP network is composed by \( z_{def}, \dot{z}_{def}, I \); while the recurrent network adds the ANN output (damping force). Table 3 presents the modeling error of both structures by using the experiment 2 in the MR1 damper as example. The error percentage represents the average deviation between the modeled damping force and the real measurement based on the RMS value of the error. When the feedback of the MR damper force is considered, the modeling error decreases slightly; however, the ANN architecture and its computing time increase.

Table 3: Performance comparison between the feedforward and recurrent neural networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANN Structure</th>
<th>Error (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLP (feedforward)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: Sensors in the Input Vector. Taking into account an MLP network, two different input vectors have been compared. The former input vector uses the \( z_{def}, \dot{z}_{def} \) and \( I \); while the second one only includes \( \dot{z}_{def} \) and \( I \). Table 4 indicates that the modeling error decreases 46.7 % by considering two sensor measurements in addition to the electric current signal; however, the instrumentation cost can increase and the ANN structure is more complex for the training and testing step.
Table 4: Modeling error (%) in the MLP network using different input vectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor Measurements</th>
<th>Error (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ((\dot{z}))</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ((\dot{z}) and (\ddot{z}))</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remark: Regressor Choice.** Once the ANN architecture and the input vector are defined, different arrays in the input vector of the ANN model have been evaluated, in this case the experiment 2 over the MR\(_1\) damper is used as example. Table 5 shows the modeling error of the ANN when the number of regressors in the 2 input signals varies; in this analysis, the velocity and electric current have the same number of regressors in each test. According to the modeling error, it is not significant to incorporate time delays in the input vector of the ANN.

Table 5: Modeling error (%) in the ANN with different number of regressors in the input vector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressors</th>
<th>Error (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remark: ANN-size Selection.** Finally, the choice of the number of parameters (hidden layers and neurons in these layers) of the non-linear parametric function can be easily made using a cross-validation approach. A 1-hidden-layer structure has been chosen by simulation tests, this structure guarantees the universal-approximation property (Sjöberg, 1995). For determining the number of neurons in the hidden layer, the minimal dimensions criterion is used (Freeman and Skapura, 1991); the best choice is with 10 neurons.

According to the above design issues, the ANN architecture used to model the MR damper dynamics is \(2,10,1\), Figure 5. The ANN input vector includes the signal of the relative velocity and the excitation signal (electric current) without considering regressors, while the damping force corresponds to the ANN output. Modeling results of the proposed ANN model, considering the 5 experiments, is shown in the Table 6. Figure 6 shows the variability of the modeling results. Clearly, the variance of the error is greater in the model of the MR\(_1\) damper since its continuous actuation adds more nonlinearities, which complicate the modeling task; while, the MR\(_2\) damper model shows better modeling performance with lower error standard deviation of the error.

The RMS average, considering all experiments, is 291.4 N for the MR\(_1\) damper and 597.8 N for the MR\(_2\) damper. Since the span of the force is \(\pm 4000\) N approximately for the MR\(_1\) damper and \([-6000 \text{ to } 11000]\) N for the MR\(_2\) damper, the obtained RMS average represents the 7.25% and 7.02% of punctual error in the force signal, respectively. Figure 7 presents a qualitative comparison in the transient response of the force obtained from experimental data and from ANN model; in this case, the MR\(_1\) and MR\(_2\) dampers are subject to the experiment 5. According to Table 6, the MR\(_1\) damper has greater modeling error in the experiment 2 and 5, and viceversa.

In order to test the capability of the ANN for modeling the nonlinear and hysteretic behavior of the MR damper, experimental data are compared with the ANN model in the characteristic diagram of Force-Velocity (FV); this diagram explains the effect of jounce and rebound of the damper and it is a tool for the engineers of automotive design in order to define the suspension capability for improving the comfort and road holding. Figure 8 shows the FV diagram of
both dampers using the experiment 2. Bottom plot in Figure 8 shows that the ANN can model the nonlinear behavior of the MR2 damper with acceptable accuracy, only outliers are not included. Notice in the FV diagram that the MR2 damper has minimal hysteresis and it is composed by two damping leves: 1) high damping force at current greater than 2.5 A and 2) low damping force at 0 A. On the other hand, the MR1 damper has a continuous actuation between 0 and 2.5 A. The ANN correctly models the nonlinear behavior at each current step; however, the hysteresis can not be modeled at low deflection velocities (±0.5 m/s) using only one sensor, up plot in Figure 8. This hysteretic behavior occurs at high frequencies (greater than 10 Hz) with high amplitudes in the suspension deflection, and the velocity sensor does not contain the required information for representing the force dynamics at these frequencies; thus, an acceleration sensor could complement this missing force dynamics.

Although the hysteresis can not be modeled at high frequencies with high displacements, in general, the proposed ANN can be used to represent the MR damper dynamics since the hysteretic behavior appears at not typical deflection amplitudes in an automotive suspension and the frequencies out of the desired span for passengers comfort, i.e. the position pattern is out of the automotive operational zone of the damper. Figure 9 shows the comparison of the FV diagram using experimental data provided from the experiment 2 (left plot) and 4 (right plot). Since the experiment 4 contains data at high frequencies but low amplitudes on the displacement, the hysteresis phenomenon is minimal; while, the experiment 2 has high displacements at high frequencies that cause too much hysteresis.

Another form of getting the ANN model of the MR damper is by using the estimated deflection velocity through a displacement sensor. Figure 10 shows that the measurement of the deflection velocity is prac-
5 MR DAMPER USED IN AUTOMOTIVE SUSPENSIONS

In order to analyze the effectiveness of the MR damper model based on ANN, a semiactive suspension control system of a QoV model is used as tested; the ANN model is included for increasing the comfort of passengers maintaining the road holding.

The QoV model considers a sprung mass \( m_s \) and an unsprung mass \( m_{us} \). A spring with stiffness coefficient \( k_s \) and a MR damper represent the suspension between both masses. The stiffness coefficient \( k_t \) models the wheel tire. The vertical position of the mass \( m_t \) \( m_{us} \) is defined by \( \zeta_r \) \( \zeta_{us} \), while \( \zeta_r \) corresponds to the road profile. It is assumed that the wheel-road contact is ensured.

The system dynamics is given by,

\[
\begin{align*}
    m_s \ddot{\zeta}_s &= -k_s (\zeta_r - \zeta_{us}) - F_{MR} \\
    m_{us} \ddot{\zeta}_{us} &= k_t (\zeta_r - \zeta_{us}) - k_s (\zeta_{us} - \zeta_s) + F_{MR}
\end{align*}
\]

where, \( F_{MR} \) is the MR damping force obtained by the ANN model, which is based on the MR damper dynamics. The QoV model parameters described in 3 and 4 have been identified on a commercial vehicle, Table 7.

The MR force depends on the deflection velocity \( \dot{\zeta}_{def} = \dot{\zeta}_s - \dot{\zeta}_{us} \) and electric current \( I \), this latter signal represents the controller output. Several approaches in control of semiactive suspensions have been proposed (Dong et al., 2010), (Spelta et al., 2010), etc.

The comfort performance of a semiactive suspension, using the Mix 1-sensor (Mix1) control law, is compared with a commercial vehicle suspension which uses a passive damper. Experimental data of the passive damper were modeled by the same ANN technique as the semiactive dampers. Figure 11 shows a conceptual diagram of the semiactive suspension control system; the ANN model, which has been trained off-line, only requires the deflection velocity and the electric current for generating the MR force in a forward way. The block of processing of signals includes filters, estimators and/or observers in order to achieve the control law. Details on the Mix1 control law can be reviewed in (Spelta et al., 2010).

In order to analyze the passengers comfort and road holding in the frequency domain, two road disturbance inputs have been simulated: 1) in the frequency domain, a signal chirp of 2 cm with span of [0.5-20]Hz and 2) in the time domain, a step of 3 cm. Figure 12 shows the QoV performance in the frequency domain; the Power Spectral Density (PSD) is used as performance index, i.e. the maximum gain of a signal is plotted at any specific frequency. The frequency response of the QoV model with the passive damper is considered as benchmark.

According to (Poussot-Vassal et al., 2008), Figure 12 shows that the controller fulfills with the per-

---

### Table 7: QoV model parameters of a commercial vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m_s )</td>
<td>387 (Kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{us} )</td>
<td>295,200 (N/m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_s )</td>
<td>37,300 (N/m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_t )</td>
<td>295,200 (N/m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Figure 10: Comparison between the real and estimated deflection velocity for the experiment 3 in the MR\(_2\) damper.](image)

![Figure 11: General structure of semiactive suspension control system.](image)
Figure 12: Frequency response of the QoV model in closed-loop using a semiactive and passive suspension, the span of frequencies of interest for each objective is bounded by the vertical discontinuous lines.

Performance specification for comfort: at low frequencies [0-2]Hz, the maximum gain of $\ddot{z}_s$ respect to the surface is lower than the passive suspension. In this range of frequencies, a human can feel dizziness and sickness caused by sudden motions. On the other hand, a good road holding is considered when the maximum gain of $\dot{z}_u - z_r$ respect to $z_r$ is limited to 2.5 for low disturbances ($z_u < 3cm$) between 0 to 20 Hz, specially close to the resonance frequency of $m_u$. Bottom plot in Figure 12 indicates that the semiactive suspension control system has good road holding performance in all span of frequencies, the PSD reduces until 2 units in the resonance frequency of the unsprung mass. Thus, the road holding increases 40.4% by using a semiactive suspension system.

For the time domain, the effectiveness of the semiactive suspension versus the passive suspension is clear. Figure 13 displays the transient response of the acceleration of the sprung mass (up plot) and of the wheel deflection (bottom plot). In both transient responses, the semiactive control system can reduce more of 50% in the settling time and decay ratio and approximately a 10% of the maximum deviation.

Table 8. Performance in the transient response of the suspension control system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension Control System</th>
<th>Performance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settling Time (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiactive</td>
<td>Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 CONCLUSIONS

A Magneto-Rheological (MR) damper model based on Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) is proposed. The ANN structure does not require regressors in the input vector and only one sensor (displacement or velocity) is demanded to get a reliable model. In addition, it has been proved that the output feedback in the input vector of the ANN model only improves slightly the modeling performance; however, the computing time in the training and testing step increases because the ANN architecture requires more model parameters when the output feedback is included.

Experimental data provided from two MR dampers (Delphi® named MR_1 damper, and BWI® named MR_2 damper) with different properties have been used to verify the accuracy of the proposed MR damper model based on ANN. The average modeling error in the force signal is lower than 7.25% by con-
Considering 5 different experiments. The force-velocity diagram shows that the $MR_2$ damper can be modeled with high accuracy by the proposed ANN structure since this shock absorber has an on/off actuation and does not have hysteresis; while the $MR_1$ damper presents a more complex dynamics at high frequencies with high displacements and the $MR$ damper model based on the proposed 1-hidden layer structure can not represent this hysteretic behavior with only one sensor. However, this displacement pattern is out of the automotive operational zone of the damper, i.e. it does not occur at normal driving conditions.

By comparing the modeling performance of the proposed $MR$ damper model based on ANN with another $MR$ damper models presented in the literature, it is considerable to assume an optimal modeling performance. In the proposed ANN model, the obtained modeling error of 7.25% based on the RMS is equivalent to 4.7% of Error to Signal-Ratio (ESR), this means that the error in the proposed ANN model is: 1) lower than the ESR average (14.5%) obtained by the Bingham model and reported in (Savarese et al., 2005); 2) lower than the ESR average (8.7%) obtained by a phenomenological model reported in (Ruiz-Cabrera et al., 2010); lower than the ESR average (8.7%) obtained by an ANN model reported in (Savarese et al., 2005) and (Ruiz-Cabrera et al., 2010) respectively. Although these latter ANN structures have regressors, use the output feedback and demand the displacement and velocity sensor.

Due to reliability of the proposed $MR$ damper model and simplicity on the ANN structure, the model can be used to test semiactive suspension control systems. A control technique free of model has been used to control the semiactive suspension of a quarter of vehicle system; the performance of the passive suspension was used as benchmark. Simulation results show that passengers comfort and road holding can be increased at least 7.4% and 40.4% respectively, when an $MR$ semiactive suspension is used.
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