STM JOURNALS

Trends in
Machine Design

ISSN: 2455-3352
Volume 12, Issue 2, 2025
May–August
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/TMD

https://journals.stmjournals.com/tmd

Review TMD

Evolution of Kinematic and Dynamic Design in Robotic Mechanisms: A Systematic Overview

Prashant Roy*

Abstract

The field of robotics has experienced significant advancements in both kinematic and dynamic design, driven by the growing need for precision, adaptability, and autonomy in mechanical systems. Early robotic mechanisms were predominantly rigid and operated based on simple serial architectures, offering limited degrees of freedom and relying heavily on analytical formulations for motion planning and control. Over time, the demand for greater dexterity and operational versatility led to the development of parallel, redundant, and reconfigurable mechanisms. These advancements enabled improvements in workspace utilization, force distribution, and motion accuracy. Kinematic design has evolved from classical Denavit–Hartenberg-based modeling to modern approaches incorporating optimization algorithms, artificial intelligence, and learning-based strategies. Redundant manipulators and flexible joints have allowed robots to perform complex tasks in constrained environments. On the dynamic front, the progression from basic Newton-Euler and Lagrangian formulations to sophisticated real-time control algorithms, including model predictive control, impedance control, and adaptive force regulation, has significantly enhanced performance in terms of responsiveness and robustness. The integration of compliant elements, soft materials, and bio-inspired actuation has introduced new paradigms in safety and human-robot interaction. Furthermore, the adoption of digital twins, simulation platforms, and AI-driven model learning has minimized the dependency on exact physical modeling and enabled faster iterations in design and control. This review systematically explores the historical trajectory, current state, and emerging trends in the kinematic and dynamic design of robotic mechanisms. It highlights the core methodologies, technical challenges, and transformative innovations shaping next-generation robotic systems. The paper also addresses the practical implications of these developments across industries such as manufacturing, healthcare, space exploration, and service robotics. By offering a comprehensive synthesis of past and present advancements, this work aims to support future research and the continued evolution of intelligent robotic systems.

Keywords: DH convention, recursive Newton-Euler algorithms, articulated-body algorithm, soft robotics, robotic mechanisms, kinematics, dynamics, parallel manipulators, trajectory optimization, adaptive control, AI in robotics

INTRODUCTION

The field of robotics has witnessed remarkable transformation since its inception, driven by the need for automation, precision, and adaptability in complex environments. At the heart of every robotic system lies its mechanical structure and motion capabilities, which are primarily governed by the principles of *kinematics* and *dynamics*. Kinematics, the study of motion without considering forces, defines how a robot's parts move in space, while dynamics delves deeper into the forces and torques responsible for these movements. Together, these domains form the foundation upon which robotic mechanisms are conceived, designed, and optimized [1].

***Author for Correspondence**
Prashant Roy
E-mail: royprashant0007@gmail.com

M. Tech. Student, Department of Engineering, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received Date: July 09, 2025
Accepted Date: July 19, 2025
Published Date: July 30, 2025

Citation: Prashant Roy. Evolution of Kinematic and Dynamic Design in Robotic Mechanisms: A Systematic Overview. Trends in Machine Design. 2025; 12(2): 38–43p.

Initially, robotic design focused heavily on rigid-body systems with relatively simple joint configurations, most often applied in controlled industrial environments. Early industrial robots, such as fixed-base manipulators with serial-link arms, operated on predefined motion trajectories with limited flexibility. Their movements were governed by direct geometric solutions and fixed control algorithms, suitable for repetitive and structured tasks. The modeling of these robots relied largely on forward and inverse kinematic analysis, using standardized techniques like the Denavit-Hartenberg (DH) convention for spatial transformations. While these early approaches laid the groundwork for robotic motion planning, they were constrained by limitations in adaptability, workspace optimization, and control under variable load conditions.

As robotics progressed into more advanced domains, such as autonomous navigation, surgical applications, and space exploration, the demand for improved performance pushed the boundaries of traditional kinematic and dynamic design. The need to handle unstructured environments, interact safely with humans, and execute complex tasks in real-time necessitated a shift toward more sophisticated mechanisms. This included the development of parallel manipulators for improved stiffness, redundant robots for enhanced dexterity, and compliant systems capable of safe physical interactions [2, 3].

The integration of dynamics into design and control processes became increasingly important. Realistic modeling had to account for inertial effects, gravitational loads, friction, and external disturbances. Robotic systems evolved from being purely position-controlled to incorporating force and torque feedback, leading to hybrid control architectures such as impedance control, admittance control, and computed torque methods. These advancements enabled robots to perform nuanced tasks such as precision assembly, haptic feedback, and human-robot collaboration.

Moreover, the rise of computational tools and simulation platforms significantly accelerated the development of robotic designs. The adoption of artificial intelligence, especially machine learning and optimization algorithms, further enhanced the adaptability and learning capacity of robotic systems. These tools now allow for real-time parameter tuning, trajectory generation, and environment-aware motion planning, extending beyond the scope of traditional analytical methods.

HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ROBOTIC KINEMATICS

The early development of robotic kinematics laid the groundwork for all modern manipulator designs. Early robotic systems were characterized by rigid linkages, basic joint structures, and simple control systems. As technology matured, engineers and researchers introduced standardized representations and motion planning tools to solve spatial movement and positioning problems [4].

Denavit-Hartenberg (DH) Convention

The DH convention, developed in the 1950s, provided a systematic way to assign coordinate frames to robot links and joints. This method allowed engineers to describe complex robotic structures using a minimal set of parameters, standardizing kinematic modeling across platforms and simplifying the derivation of transformation matrices for forward and inverse kinematics.

Geometric and Algebraic Methods

Initial solutions for robotic kinematics primarily used geometric reasoning and algebraic manipulation. These methods were sufficient for low-degree-of-freedom (DOF) robots, offering closed-form solutions to inverse kinematics. However, as robots evolved in complexity, these approaches became computationally intensive or insufficient, motivating the development of more sophisticated numerical and iterative solution techniques.

Configuration Space (C-Space)

The concept of configuration space, or C-space, was introduced to analyze robot motion in high-dimensional spaces. It allows each robot pose to be represented as a point in an abstract space, enabling visualization of feasible paths, obstacle avoidance, and motion planning. C-space modeling marked a shift toward algorithm-driven pathfinding strategies in robotics [5].

ADVANCES IN DYNAMIC MODELING

Dynamic modeling is essential for understanding how robotic mechanisms respond to forces and torques during operation. As robotic applications became more complex, the modeling of dynamics evolved from simple rigid-body analysis to more sophisticated, real-time, and adaptive techniques that enable accurate motion prediction and responsive control.

Key Developments in Dynamic Modeling

Coriolis and Centripetal Forces

These inertial forces significantly impact the accuracy of dynamic models in fast-moving robotic systems. Coriolis forces arise due to rotational motion, while centripetal forces maintain circular trajectories. Modern dynamic models integrate these elements to improve trajectory tracking and control stability, especially in high-speed or multi-degree-of-freedom robotic mechanisms.

Joint Friction and Backlash

Real-world robotic joints often experience friction and backlash, which lead to inaccuracies in motion and control. Modeling these effects involves using empirical data and nonlinear functions to simulate resistance and joint play. Including these parameters enhances the realism of simulations and improves the performance of feedback control algorithms [6].

Real-Time Torque Control

Advanced robots require the ability to adjust torque in real time for smooth and responsive operation. Real-time torque control uses dynamic equations to compute required joint torques for desired motion, adapting instantly to disturbances or load changes. It plays a critical role in precision tasks like assembly, surgery, and haptics.

Recursive Newton-Euler Algorithms (RNEA)

RNEA allows fast and efficient computation of forces and torques in serial manipulators. The algorithm uses a recursive formulation that propagates velocities and accelerations from base to end-effector and then computes forces back to the base. It is especially useful in real-time applications where computational efficiency is critical.

Articulated-Body Algorithm (ABA)

ABA is widely applied in multibody dynamics to calculate accelerations and forces in articulated robots. Unlike RNEA, which is more suitable for serial chains, ABA handles tree structures and floating-base systems efficiently. Its advantage lies in its linear complexity, making it ideal for large and complex robotic systems [7].

EVOLUTION IN DESIGN PARADIGMS

Serial vs. Parallel Mechanisms

The evolution from serial to parallel mechanisms was driven by the need for higher stiffness, better accuracy, and greater payload capacity. While serial manipulators offer simplicity and larger workspace, they often suffer from cumulative positioning errors and lower structural rigidity. Parallel mechanisms overcome these by using closed-loop kinematic chains (Table 1).

Compliant and Flexible Mechanisms

Traditional rigid mechanisms are now being complemented by compliant and flexible designs that allow safe human-robot interaction, adaptability to uncertain environments, and passive energy absorption. These mechanisms rely on material deformation rather than joints for movement, enabling bio-inspired behaviors and fine control in delicate tasks such as soft gripping or micro-manipulation [8–10].

Table 1. Comparison table: serial vs. parallel mechanisms.

Feature	Serial Mechanisms	Parallel Mechanisms
Workspace	Larger	Limited
Accuracy	Moderate (cumulative error)	High (error compensation possible)
Stiffness	Lower	High
Payload Capacity	Limited	High
Control Complexity	Lower	Higher
Common Examples	Articulated arms, SCARA	Stewart platform, Delta robot

Types of Flexible Mechanisms

- *Flexure Joints:* Provide precise movement through elastic deformation.
- *Soft Robotics:* Use soft actuators (pneumatic, hydraulic, or smart materials) for adaptive motion.
- *Variable Stiffness Actuators (VSAs):* Enable tunable compliance for safety and versatility in tasks.

KINEMATIC REDUNDANCY AND OPTIMIZATION

To increase the dexterity and flexibility of robotic systems, designers often incorporate kinematic redundancy, where the number of degrees of freedom (DOF) exceeds the minimum required to perform a given task. This redundancy allows robots to avoid obstacles, maintain joint limits, and optimize task-specific criteria during motion. Advanced optimization strategies are essential to resolve the infinite possible configurations.

Jacobian-based Optimization

Jacobian matrices provide a mathematical relationship between joint velocities and end-effector velocities. In redundant manipulators, optimization criteria, such as manipulability, joint limit avoidance, or energy efficiency, can be integrated into the inverse kinematics solution using the Jacobian pseudoinverse and weighted least squares. These methods enhance robot adaptability in real-time operations and complex environments, including surgical and service robotics.

Real-time Inverse Kinematics with Constraints

In practical applications, robots often operate under physical and task-based constraints like joint limits, collision avoidance, and end-effector orientation. Real-time solvers use iterative numerical methods to compute inverse kinematic solutions that respect these constraints. Techniques such as Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP) and constraint-based optimization frameworks are widely employed for high-speed, safe, and efficient robot motion planning.

Singularity Avoidance Techniques

Kinematic singularities occur when the robot loses certain directional control, often leading to unstable or undefined behavior. Redundant robots can actively avoid singular configurations by optimizing their posture using metrics like the manipulability index. Methods like null space projection allow the robot to move through configurations while avoiding singularities, ensuring smoother and more predictable trajectories.

Evolutionary and AI-driven Approaches

With the rise of computational power and artificial intelligence, modern redundancy resolution increasingly involves machine learning and evolutionary computation. Algorithms such as genetic algorithms, neural networks, and reinforcement learning allow robots to learn optimal kinematic configurations through experience. These methods enable adaptation to dynamic environments and improve performance in tasks like path-following and human-robot collaboration.

DYNAMIC CONTROL STRATEGIES

Modern robotic systems demand precise control over motion and force, especially in dynamic and unpredictable environments. Dynamic control strategies integrate real-time feedback, dynamic modeling, and predictive algorithms to improve performance, stability, and adaptability. Below are key strategies shaping the dynamic control landscape in contemporary robotic mechanisms:

- *Computed Torque Control (CTC):* CTC is a model-based approach that compensates for robot dynamics using feedforward torques computed from the system's inverse dynamics. It combines this with a feedback loop for error correction. This method enables fast and accurate trajectory tracking by effectively linearizing the system behavior under nominal operating conditions.
- *Impedance and Admittance Control:* These control techniques define desired mechanical impedance or admittance between the robot and environment, facilitating compliant interaction. Impedance control modulates force based on motion deviation, while admittance control adjusts motion based on external forces. Both are vital for safe human-robot interaction and manipulation of delicate or variable loads.
- *Force/Motion Hybrid Control:* Hybrid control allows robots to regulate force along constrained directions while simultaneously controlling motion in others. This dual-mode approach is particularly useful for tasks like surface polishing, assembly, or machining, where contact forces and movement must be independently regulated to maintain both stability and task accuracy.
- *Model Predictive Control (MPC):* MPC uses a dynamic model to predict future system states and optimize control actions over a moving time horizon. It accounts for system constraints and allows proactive adjustments, offering robust performance in uncertain or changing environments. MPC is especially useful in multi-joint, high-speed, or unstable robotic systems.
- *Adaptive and Learning-Based Controllers:* Adaptive controllers adjust their parameters in real-time to handle modeling errors or changes in system dynamics. When combined with machine learning techniques, such as reinforcement learning or neural networks, they enable robots to self-tune and learn optimal behaviors from experience, enhancing resilience and autonomy in dynamic tasks.

SIMULATION AND DIGITAL TWINS

Simulation tools have significantly transformed the robotic design and validation process by enabling virtual testing before physical deployment. These platforms allow designers to model kinematics, simulate dynamic behavior, and analyze control strategies efficiently. The emergence of *digital twins*, real-time virtual replicas of physical robots, has further enhanced predictive maintenance, performance monitoring, and fault diagnosis. They are now widely used across industries to optimize operational decisions, reduce downtime, and improve lifecycle management (Table 2).

INTEGRATION WITH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into robotic system design has significantly enhanced adaptability, autonomy, and decision-making capabilities. Modern AI approaches reduce the reliance on exact mathematical modeling and allow robots to operate efficiently in uncertain or dynamic environments. Key applications include:

- *Model-Free Dynamics Learning:* AI enables robots to understand motion behavior without predefined equations.

Table 2. Common simulation and twin platforms.

Platform	Key Features
Gazebo	Physics-based simulation, ROS integration
V-REP/CoppeliaSim	Multi-robot simulation, scripting support
MATLAB/Simulink	Kinematic modeling, control system design
TwinCAT 3	Real-time digital twin implementation
Siemens NX	CAD + digital twin and performance analytics

- *Autonomous Trajectory Generation:* Path planning is optimized using neural networks and reinforcement learning.
- *Real-Time Kinematic Adaptation:* Systems dynamically adjust to new tasks or environments based on sensory input.

CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite rapid advancements, robotic mechanism design still faces several challenges. Achieving an optimal balance between flexibility, precision, and robustness remains difficult. Real-time modeling of complex, nonlinear dynamics, especially in unstructured environments, demands more efficient algorithms and adaptive control strategies. Ensuring safe and reliable human-robot collaboration is another critical concern. Additionally, sustainable and modular designs for long-term deployment are gaining importance. Future efforts will likely focus on integrating smart materials, decentralized intelligence, and bio-inspired architectures to enhance autonomy and resilience.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of kinematic and dynamic design in robotic mechanisms showcases the continuous advancement of robotics from rigid, predefined systems to intelligent, adaptive machines. This progression has been driven by the integration of new modeling techniques, control strategies, and computational tools. The transition from purely analytical models to hybrid AI-driven frameworks reflects the growing complexity and capability of robotic systems. Continued interdisciplinary research will be essential to meet the challenges of real-time performance, safety, and flexibility in next-generation robotic applications.

REFERENCES

1. Pfeifer R, Lungarella M, Iida F. Self-organization, embodiment, and biologically inspired robotics. Science. 2007; 318(5853): 1088–93.
2. Dollar AM, Herr H. Lower extremity exoskeletons and active orthoses: challenges and state-of-the-art. IEEE Trans Robot. 2008; 24(1): 144–58.
3. Bicchi A, Tonietti G. Fast and “soft-arm” tactics. IEEE Robot Autom Mag. 2004; 11(2): 22–33.
4. Tsai LW. Robot Analysis: The Mechanics of Serial and Parallel Manipulators. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1999.
5. Siciliano B, Khatib O, editors. Springer Handbook of Robotics. 2nd Edn. Cham: Springer; 2016.
6. Featherstone R. Rigid Body Dynamics Algorithms. New York: Springer; 2008.
7. Yoshikawa T. Manipulability of robotic mechanisms. Int J Rob Res. 1985; 4(2): 3–9.
8. Hirzinger G, Brunner B, Dietrich J, Heindl J. Sensor-based space robotics–ROTEX and its telerobotic features. IEEE Trans Robot Autom. 1993; 9(5): 649–63.
9. Hutter M, Gehring C, Lauber A, Bloesch M, Hoepflinger MA, Siegwart R. Starleth: A compliant quadrupedal robot for fast, efficient, and versatile locomotion. In: Proc Int Conf Climbing and Walking Robots. 2012; 483–90.
10. Corke P. Robotics, Vision and Control: Fundamental Algorithms in MATLAB. 2nd Edn. Cham: Springer; 2017.