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Abstract—In this paper, a physics-based model is proposed for a biomimetic robotic fish propelled by an ionic polymer–metal composite (IPMC) actuator. Inspired by the biological fin structure, a passive plastic fin is further attached to the IPMC beam. The model incorporates both IPMC actuation dynamics and the hydrodynamics, and predicts the steady-state cruising speed of the robot under a given periodic actuation voltage. The interactions between the plastic fin and the IPMC actuator are also captured in the model. Experimental results have shown that the proposed model is able to predict the motion of robotic fish for different tail dimensions. Since most of the model parameters are expressed in terms of fundamental physical properties and geometric dimensions, the model is expected to be instrumental in optimal design of the robotic fish.

Index Terms—Biologically inspired robots, hydrodynamic modeling, ionic polymer–metal composites, robotic fish.

I. INTRODUCTION

Animal-like robots, so-called biomimetic robots, are inspired by biological animals for various applications. Fish are one of the most fascinating and natural examples of swimmers as a result of millions of years of evolution, endowed with a variety of morphological and structural features for moving through water with speed, agility, and efficiency [1], [2]. Intrigued by the remarkable feats in biological swimming and driven by the desire to mimic such capabilities, extensive theoretical [3], [4], experimental [5], [6], and computational [7] research has been conducted to understand hydrodynamic propulsion and maneuvering.

Recent years have also witnessed significant effort in the development of aquatic robots or robotic fish [8]–[15]. Motivated by fish fins, a number of researchers have studied the use of oscillating foils as propulsion devices for underwater vehicles or robots [13], [16]–[18]. While the existing work has been predominantly focused on rigid, oscillating plates or foils driven by motors [13], [16], [17], robotic fish using emerging soft actuation materials are gaining increasing interest. Electroactive polymers (EAPs), also known as artificial muscles, are attractive for aquatic robots because they are flexible and produce significant bending deformations under low voltages (several volts) [19], [20]. Two particularly promising classes of EAP materials are ionic polymer–metal composites (IPMCs) [19], [21] and conjugated polymers [20], [22]–[24]. IPMC-based robotic fish have been reported by several groups [9], [11], [12], [25]–[27]. An IPMC sample typically consists of a thin ion-exchange membrane (e.g., Nafion), chemically plated on both surfaces with a noble metal as electrode [28]. When a voltage is applied across an IPMC, transport of hydrated cations and water molecules within the membrane, and the associated electrostatic interactions lead to bending motions, and hence the actuation effect.

A faithful model is desirable for both optimal design [29] and control [30] of an underwater robot. For instance, Boyer et al. presented a dynamic model for 3-D eel-like robot [31]. Morgansen et al. investigated geometric methods for modeling and control of free-swimming and rigid fin-actuated underwater vehicles [13]. There have been limited studies related to modeling of flexible fins. A finite-element method was adopted by Yim et al. to model the motion of an IPMC actuator underwater [32], where an empirical RC circuit was used to predict the bending moment of IPMC under actuation. The added-mass effect due to acceleration of surrounding water was ignored in modeling hydrodynamic interactions, and the authors presented only simulation results. Modeling of IPMC actuators in underwater operations was also studied by Brunetto et al. [33]. However, there actuation dynamics of IPMC was represented by a frequency-dependent coupling term, which was essentially the empirical frequency response and did not capture the fundamental physics of IPMC. Furthermore, the experimental results in [33] were limited to a clamped IPMC beam in water, and no attempt was made to validate the model on a free-swimming robot. Recently, Porfiri and coworkers investigated the hydrodynamics of an IPMC beam using numerical computation [34] and digital particle image velocimetry (DPIV) measurements [35]. Although their work was very interesting, it was limited to a clamped IPMC beam only and the actuation dynamics of IPMC was not considered.

In this paper, we present, to our best knowledge, the first model for IPMC-propelled robotic fish that captures the intrinsic actuation physics of IPMC, and the complex hydrodynamic interactions between IPMC and fluid, and is validated in experiments on a free-swimming robotic fish prototype. Inspired by biological fish fins, where passive, collagenous membranes are driven by muscle-controlled fin rays [1], we have attached a passive, plastic fin to the tip of IPMC to enhance propulsion. In this paper, we call such a fin structure as hybrid tail. The proposed model incorporates the interactions of the passive fin with both the IPMC actuator and the fluid, allowing us to simultaneously capture the passive fin’s role in boosting propulsion and its loading effect on the IPMC beam. The model is used...
to predict the cruising speed of robotic fish, given a periodic actuation voltage to the IPMC fin. A more detailed account of the approach follows.

Based on the elongated-body propulsion theory of Lighthill [36], [37], the steady-state velocity of a swimming fish is related to the bending displacement and the slope of the tail end. The key of the modeling work is then to derive the motion of the hybrid tail under IPMC actuation and hydrodynamic interactions. Modeling of the hybrid tail starts with a fourth-order partial differential equation (PDE) that can capture the beam dynamics of IPMC in fluid. It incorporates the hydrodynamic force acting on the IPMC beam and the driving force introduced by actuation of IPMC. A mode-summation method is employed to obtain the solution to the PDE. The distributed bending moment generated by an actuation input is obtained using a physical, yet compact, model that captures the internal ion dynamics of IPMC [38]. In order to evaluate the actuation-induced generalized forces for the mode equations, we decompose the distributed moment into a distributed force along the length and a concentrated bending moment at the beam end, which would generate the same bending moment along the length. The model is then extended to capture the interactions between the IPMC and the passive fin. The hydrodynamic force acting on the passive fin is replaced by a concentrated moment and the force acting at the tip of IPMC actuator, which can be incorporated into the beam dynamics to obtain an analytical expression for the motion of hybrid tail.

Experiments have been performed to identify model parameters and validate the model. It is found that the model can predict well the cruising speed of the robot at different operating frequencies, for different tail dimensions. Since most of the parameters in the proposed model are expressed in terms of fundamental physical properties and geometric dimensions, the model will be instrumental for optimal design of the IPMC-propelled robotic fish to achieve good speed and efficiency.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. A prototype of robotic fish is described in Section II. The proposed model is presented in Section III. Experimental results on model validation are presented in Section IV. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section V.

II. DESCRIPTION OF IPMC-PROPELLED ROBOTIC FISH

Fig. 1(a) shows the schematic of the robotic fish, and Fig. 1(b) shows a prototype, which is an upgraded version of the one reported in [12]. The fish is designed to be fully autonomous and serve as a mobile, aquatic sensing platform. It consists of a rigid body and an IPMC caudal fin. Two gold-coated copper electrodes are used for IPMC to reduce corrosion of the electrodes in water. Corrosion of the electrodes results in high resistance of the contact, which would reduce the actuation performance of the IPMC tail and consume more electrical power. The IPMC actuator is further covered by a passive plastic fin to enhance propulsion. The rigid shell of the fish was custom-made to reduce the wetted surface, while having enough interior room to house rechargeable batteries and various electronic components for control, sensing, wireless communication, and navigation.

All of these components are contained in a water-proof packaging with necessary wires and pins exposed for charging batteries and driving IPMC actuator. Without the tail, the fish is about 20 cm in length and 5.7 cm in diameter. Total volume is about 180 cm$^3$. The fish body is in a water drop shape, which is expected to lead to good hydrodynamic efficiency. The Reynolds number of the swimming robotic fish is given by $U D_0/\nu$, where $U$ is the speed of the robot, $D_0$ is the body diameter, and $\nu = 10^{-6}$ m$^2$/s is the kinematic viscosity of water. With a speed $U$ of about 0.02 m/s (see Section IV-C), the Reynolds number of the robot is of the order of 1000. The total weight of the robotic fish is about 290 g. The shape and configuration of the robot put it into the category of carangiform fish.

III. MODEL

In this section, we first review Lighthill’s theory on elongated-body propulsion (see Section III-A). IPMC beam dynamics in fluid is discussed next, considering general force and moment inputs (see Section III-B). This is followed by detailed consideration of actuation-induced bending moment in the model, as well as the load contribution to the IPMC beam from the passive fin (see Section III-C). Finally, the model for computing the speed of IPMC-propelled robotic fish is obtained by merging Lighthill’s theory and the hybrid tail dynamics (see Section III-D).
A. Lighthill’s Theory of Elongated-Body Propulsion

A body is considered elongated if its cross-sectional area changes slowly along its length. The robotic fish described in Section II is thus elongated and Lighthill’s theory [37] applies.

Suppose that the tail is bending periodically with the bending displacement at $z$ denoted by $w(z,t)$. See Fig. 1(a) for notation. At the steady state, the fish will achieve a periodic, forward motion with some mean speed $U$. In the discussion here, the word “mean” refers to the average over one period. The mean thrust $\mathcal{T}$ produced by the tail can be calculated as

$$\mathcal{T} = \left[ \frac{m}{2} \left( \frac{\partial w(z,t)}{\partial t} \right)^2 - U^2 \left( \frac{\partial w(z,t)}{\partial z} \right)^2 \right]_{z=L_1} \tag{1}$$

where $z = L_1$ denotes the end of tail, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the mean value, and $m$ is the virtual mass density at $z = L_1$, expressed as

$$m = \frac{1}{4} \pi S c^2 \rho_w \beta \tag{2}$$

where $S_c$ is the width of the tail at the end $z = L_1$, $\rho_w$ is the fluid density, and $\beta$ is a nondimensional parameter close to 1.

Equation (1) indicates that the mean thrust depends only on the lateral velocity $(\partial w/\partial t)$ and the slope $(\partial w/\partial z)$ at the tail end. A cruising fish, under inviscid flow conditions, will experience a drag force $F_D$ as

$$F_D = \frac{C_D \rho_w U^2 S}{2} \tag{3}$$

where $S$ is the wetted surface area and $C_D$ is the drag coefficient. At the steady state, the mean thrust $\mathcal{T}$ is balanced by the drag $F_D$, from which one can solve the cruising speed $U$ as

$$U = \left[ \frac{m (\partial w(z,t)/\partial t)^2}{C_D \rho_w S + m (\partial w(z,t)/\partial z)^2} \right]_{z=L_1}. \tag{4}$$

Since the speed of the fish is related to the lateral velocity and the slope of the trailing edge, one needs to fully understand the actuation dynamics of the tail.

B. IPMC Beam Dynamics in Fluid

In order to obtain the full actuation model of IPMC, we start with a fourth-order PDE for the dynamic deflection function $w(z,t)$ [39] as

$$Y I \frac{\partial^4 w(z,t)}{\partial z^4} + C \frac{\partial w(z,t)}{\partial t} + \rho_m A \frac{\partial^2 w(z,t)}{\partial t^2} = f(z,t) \tag{5}$$

where $Y$, $I$, $C$, $\rho_m$, and $A$ denote the effective Young’s modulus, the area moment of inertia, the internal damping ratio, the density, and the cross-sectional area of the IPMC beam, respectively, and $f(z,t)$ is the distributed force density acting on the beam.

Converting (5) into the Laplace domain, we obtain

$$Y I \frac{\partial^4 w(z,s)}{\partial z^4} + C s w(z,s) + \rho_m A s^2 w(z,s) = F(z,s). \tag{6}$$

The force on the beam consists of two components, the hydrodynamic force $F_{\text{hydro}}$ from water and the driving force $F_{\text{drive}}$ due to the actuation of IPMC

$$F(z,s) = F_{\text{hydro}}(z,s) + F_{\text{drive}}(z,s). \tag{7}$$

The hydrodynamic force acting on the IPMC beam can be expressed as [40]

$$F_{\text{hydro}}(z,s) = -\rho_w \frac{\pi}{4} W^2 s^2 \Gamma_1(\omega) w(z,s), \quad 0 \leq z \leq L \tag{8}$$

where $W$ is the width of the IPMC beam, $\Gamma_1(\omega)$ is the hydrodynamic function for the IPMC beam subject to an oscillation with radial frequency $\omega$, and $\rho_w$ is the density of fluid. The hydrodynamic function for a rectangular beam can be represented as [40]

$$\Gamma_1(\omega) = \Omega(R_e) \left[ 1 + \frac{4iK_1(-i\sqrt{R_e})}{\sqrt{iR_e} K_0(-i\sqrt{R_e})} \right] \tag{9}$$

where the Reynolds number $R_e$ of a vibrated beam in water is given by

$$R_e = \frac{\rho_w W^2 \omega}{4\eta}$$

$K_0$ and $K_1$ are modified Bessel functions of the third type, $\Omega(R_e)$ is the correction function associated with the rectangular beam cross section [40], and $\eta$ is the viscosity of fluid.

With (7) and (8), the beam dynamics equation (6) can be written as

$$Y I \frac{\partial^4 w(z,s)}{\partial z^4} + C s w(z,s) + (\mu_m + m_4 \Gamma_1) s^2 w(z,s) = F_{\text{drive}}(z,s) \tag{10}$$

where $m_4 = \rho_w (\pi/4) W^2$ is the added mass and $\mu_m = \rho_m A$ is the mass of IPMC per unit length. Under harmonic oscillation with frequency $\omega$, we can denote

$$\mu_v = \mu_m + m_4 \Re(\Gamma_1) \tag{11}$$

$$C_v = C - m_4 \omega \Im(\Gamma_1) \tag{12}$$

where $\mu_v$ is the equivalent mass of IPMC per unit length in water and $C_v$ is the equivalent damping coefficient of IPMC in water. $\Re(\cdot)$ and $\Im(\cdot)$ are the functions that get the real part and the imaginary part from a complex value, respectively. Equation (12) means that the damping of IPMC vibration in water includes both the internal damping in IPMC and the frequency-dependent external damping caused by fluid. With (11) and (12), (10) can be written as [33]

$$Y I \frac{\partial^4 w(z,s)}{\partial z^4} + C_v s w(z,s) + \mu_v s^2 w(z,s) = F_{\text{drive}}(z,s). \tag{13}$$

According to the mode analysis method, we can express the solution to (13) as the sum of different modes [41] as

$$w(z,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi_i(z) q_i(s) \tag{14}$$

where $\varphi_i(z)$ is the beam shape for the $i$th mode and $q_i(s)$ is the corresponding generalized coordinate. The mode shape $\varphi_i(z)$

\[ ... \]
takes the form
\[ \varphi_i(z) = \cosh(\lambda_i z) - \cos(\lambda_i z) - \beta_i (\sinh(\lambda_i z) - \sin(\lambda_i z)) \]
(15)
where \( \lambda_i \) can be obtained by solving
\[ 1 + \cos(\lambda_i L) \cosh(\lambda_i L) = 0 \]
and
\[ \beta_i = \frac{\sinh(\lambda_i L) - \sin(\lambda_i L)}{\cosh(\lambda_i L) + \cos(\lambda_i L)}. \]
The generalized coordinate \( q_i(s) \) can be represented as
\[ q_i(s) = f_i(s)Q_i(s) \]
(16)
where \( f_i(s) \) is the generalized force
\[ Q_i(s) = \frac{1}{s^2 + 2\xi_i\omega_i s + \omega_i^2} \]
(17)
and the natural frequency \( \omega_i \) and the damping ratio \( \xi_i \) for the \( i \)th mode are
\[ \omega_i = \frac{C_i^2}{L^2} \sqrt{\frac{Y}{I}} / \mu_v(\omega_i) \]
(18)
\[ \xi_i = \frac{C_v(\omega_i)}{2\mu_v(\omega_i)\omega_i} \]
(19)
and \( C_i = \lambda_i L \). Noting that \( \Gamma_1(\omega) \) is almost a constant value in the frequency region around \( \omega_i \), one can consider \( \mu_v(\omega_i) \) as a constant in (18). Therefore, \( \omega_i \) can be obtained approximately. Then, with \( \omega_i, \xi_i \) can be obtained from (19). The generalized force \( f_i(s) \) is obtained from \( F_{\text{drive}} \) as
\[ f_i(s) = \frac{1}{M_i} \int_0^L F_{\text{drive}}(z, s) \varphi_i(z) \, dz \]
where \( M_i \) is the generalized mass
\[ M_i(s) = \int_0^L \mu_v \varphi_i^2(z) \, dz = \mu_v L. \]
(20)

The next step is to derive the generalized force \( f_i(s) \) from the moment generated by IPMC actuation and from the hydrodynamic force acting on the passive fin but transmitted to the IPMC beam.

C. Actuation Model of the Tail

In our earlier work [38], we fully investigated the electrical dynamics of IPMC to obtain the moment generated within IPMC, but there, the beam dynamics in water was not considered. In the following, we will incorporate both electrical dynamics and hydrodynamic interactions into a full-actuation model for IPMC hybrid tail in water.

The ion movement inside an IPMC, under the influence of an applied electric field, leads to a distribution of net charge density along the thickness direction of IPMC. A physics-based model for IPMC proposed by Nemat-Nasser and Li [42] relates the actuation-induced (axial) stress proportionally to the charge density, through electromechanical coupling. Variation of the actuation-induced stress along the thickness direction, thus, results in a bending moment at each point along the length direction. Our work on physics-based, control-oriented modeling of IPMC actuators [38] further incorporates the effect of distributed surface resistance. The latter leads to nonuniform potential difference along the length direction, which, in turn, leads to actuation-induced bending moment that varies along the length direction, referred to as distributed bending moment in this paper. See [38] for further details.

With distributed surface resistance, we can relate the actuation-induced bending moment \( M_{\text{IPMC}}(z, s) \) at point \( z \) to the actuation voltage \( V(s) \) by an infinite-dimensional transfer function [38] as
\[ M_{\text{IPMC}}(z, s) = \frac{\alpha_0 W k_e (\gamma(s) - \tanh(\gamma(s)))}{(s\gamma(s) + K \tanh(\gamma(s)))} \times \cosh(\sqrt{B(s)}z) - \sinh(\sqrt{B(s)}z) \tanh(\sqrt{B(s)L}) V(s) \]
(21)
with
\[ \theta(s) = \frac{W k_e s\gamma(s)(s + K)}{h(s\gamma(s) + K)} \]
\[ B(s) = \sqrt{r_1 \left( \frac{\theta(s)}{1 + r_2 \theta(s)} \right) + \frac{2}{R_p}} \]
\[ \gamma(s) = \sqrt{s + K \frac{d}{d}} \]
\[ K = \frac{F^2 d C^-}{\kappa_e R T (1 - C^- \Delta V)} \]
where \( \alpha_0 \) is an electromechanical coupling constant, \( d \) is the ionic diffusivity, \( R \) is the gas constant, \( F \) is Faraday’s constant, \( T \) is the absolute temperature, \( C^- \) is the anion concentration, \( \Delta V \) is the volumetric change, \( x \) is the coordinate defined in the thickness direction, \( \kappa_e \) is the effective dielectric constant of the polymer, \( r_1 \) is the electrode resistance per unit length in the length direction, \( r_2 \) is the electrode resistance per unit length in the thickness direction, and \( R_p \) is the through-polymer resistance per unit length. \( W \), \( L \), and \( h \) are the width, length, and half thickness of the IPMC beam, respectively.

We replace the moment \( M_{\text{IPMC}}(z, s) \) induced by actuation by three components: a distributed force density \( F_d(z, s) \) acting along the length, a concentrated force \( F_c(L, s) \), and a moment \( M(L, s) \) acting at the IPMC tip \( z = L \), where
\[ F_c(L, s) = \frac{\partial M_{\text{IPMC}}(z, s)}{\partial z} \bigg|_{z=L} \]
\[ F_d(z, s) = \frac{\partial^2 M_{\text{IPMC}}(z, s)}{\partial z^2} \]
\[ M(L, s) = M_{\text{IPMC}}(L, s). \]
(22)
(23)
The rationale of this replacement is that these components can generate the same bending moment as \( M_{\text{IPMC}}(z, s) \). See Appendix A for the details of this justification. With (21), it can
be verified that $F_c(L, s) = 0$. Then, the generalized force can be obtained as [41]

$$ f_{i1}(s) = \frac{1}{M_i} \left( \int_0^L F_d(z, s) \varphi_i(z) \, dz + M(L, s) \varphi'_i(L) \right), \quad \text{(24)} $$

Fig. 2 shows that the original moment is replaced by a distributed force density and a concentrated moment. With the aforementioned replacement, we can derive the models for the IPMC tail-only case and the hybrid tail case.

1) With IPMC Tail Only: With (22) and (23), the generalized force (24) can be written as

$$ f_{i1}(s) = H_{f_i}(s) V(s) \quad \text{(25)} $$

where

$$ H_{f_i}(s) = \frac{1}{2M_i} \left( (a - b) \left( a_L + b_L - cL - dL \right) \right) $$

$$ + \frac{a_0 \omega_k}{M_i \omega^2} \left( \gamma(s) \right) \left( \text{s} + \text{tanh}\left( \gamma(s) \right) \right) \frac{\varphi'(L)}{K \text{sn}\left( \gamma(s) \right)} \left( 1 + r_2 \theta(s) \right) \text{cosh}(cL) \quad \text{(26)} $$

and

$$ a = \frac{a_0 \omega_k}{M_i} \left( \gamma(s) \right) \left( \text{s} + \text{tanh}\left( \gamma(s) \right) \right) \frac{B(s)}{1 + r_2 \theta(s)} $$

$$ b = a \tan(h(\sqrt{B(s)})) \quad c = \sqrt{B(s)} \quad \text{(27)} $$

$$ a_L = \frac{\sinh((c + \lambda_i)) L}{c + \lambda_i} \quad b_L = \frac{\sinh((c - \lambda_i)) L}{c - \lambda_i} \quad \text{(28)} $$

$$ c_L = \frac{\sinh((c + j\lambda_i)) L}{c + j\lambda_i} \quad d_L = \frac{\sinh((c - j\lambda_i)) L}{c - j\lambda_i} \quad \text{(29)} $$

See Appendix B for the derivation of $H_{f_i}(s)$.

From (14), one can then get the transfer function $H_1(L, s)$ relating $w(L, s)$ to $V(s)$ as

$$ H_1(L, s) = \frac{w(L, s)}{V(s)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi_i(L) H_{f_i}(s) Q_i(s). \quad \text{(31)} $$

We can also derive the transfer function $H_{1d}(L, s)$ relating the slope of the beam $\partial w(L, s)/\partial z$ to the input voltage $V(s)$ as

$$ H_{1d}(L, s) = \frac{\partial w(L, s)/\partial z}{V(s)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi'_i(L) H_{f_i}(s) Q_i(s). \quad \text{(32)} $$

2) Hybrid Tail: From (1) and (2), the tail width $S_c$ at the end has a significant impact on the speed $U$. One could increase $S_c$ by simply using a wider IPMC beam. Due to the IPMC actuation mechanism, however, a too wide beam (i.e., plate) will produce curling instead of bending motion, and is thus not desirable. Therefore, it has been chosen to increase the edge width by attaching a passive plastic piece, as illustrated in Fig. 3.

![Fig. 3. Illustration of an IPMC beam with a passive fin. The lower schematic shows the definitions of dimensions.](image)

While such a hybrid tail is expected to increase the thrust, one has to also consider that the extra hydrodynamic force on the passive fin adds to the load of IPMC, and may reduce the bending amplitude. Therefore, it is necessary to model these interactions carefully.

The hydrodynamic force acting on the passive fin can be written as [40]

$$ f_{\text{tail}}(z, s) = -\frac{\pi}{4} \rho_w s^2 b(z)^2 \Gamma_2(\omega) w(z, s), \quad L_0 \leq z \leq L_1 \quad \text{(33)} $$

where $\Gamma_2(\omega)$ is the hydrodynamic function of the passive fin. Note that the hydrodynamic force acting on the active IPMC beam has been incorporated in (10), and therefore, only the hydrodynamic force on the passive fin needs to be considered here. Since the passive fin used is very light, its inertial mass is negligible compared to the propelled virtual fluid mass, and is thus ignored in the analysis here. Considering that the passive fin is rigid compared to IPMC, its width $b(z)$ and deflection $w(z, s)$ can be expressed as

$$ b(z) = \frac{b_1 - b_0}{L_1 - L_0} (z - L_0) + b_0 \quad \text{(34)} $$

$$ w(z, s) = w(L_0, s) + \frac{\partial w(L_0, s)/\partial z}{\partial z} (z - L_0) \quad \text{(35)} $$

where $b_0$, $b_1$, $L$, $L_0$, and $L_1$ are as defined in Fig. 3. Then, one can calculate the moment introduced by the passive fin: for $L_0 \leq z \leq L_1$, 

If we define

\[ M_{\text{filn}}(z, s) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_{\text{tail}}(\tau, s) (\tau - z) \, d\tau \]

\[ = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_{\text{tail}}(\tau, s) (\tau - L_0) \, d\tau \]

\[ + (L_0 - z) \int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_{\text{tail}}(\tau, s) \, d\tau. \]  

(36)

then (36) can be written as

\[ M_{\text{filn}}(z, s) = M_{\text{tail}}(s) + F_{\text{tail}}(s) (L_0 - z). \]  

(38)

Fig. 4 shows the forces and moments acting on the hybrid tail. One can obtain the generalized force as

\[ f_{2i}(s) = \frac{1}{M_i} \left( \int_{t_0}^{t_1} F_d(z, s) \varphi_i(z) \, dz + \varphi_i(L_0) F_{\text{tail}}(s) \right) \]

\[ + \left( M_{\text{tail}}(s) + M(L_0, s) \right) \varphi_i(L_0) \]  

(39)

where \( M_{\text{tail}} \) and \( F_{\text{tail}} \) are defined in (37), \( F_d(z, s) \) and \( M(L_0, s) \) are defined in (22) and (23).

Then, the transfer function relating \( \omega(L_0, s) \) to \( V(s) \) and that relating \( \omega'(L_0, s) \) to \( V(s) \) can be found as

\[ H_2(L_0, s) = \frac{(1 + F_s) A_s}{(1 + C_s)(1 + F_s) - B_s J_s} \]  

(40)

\[ H_{2d}(L_0, s) = \frac{(1 + C_s) E_s - A_s J_s}{(1 + C_s)(1 + F_s) - B_s J_s} \]  

(41)

where

\[ A_s = H_1(L_0, s) \quad E_s = H_{1d}(L_0, s) \]

\[ D = L_1 - L_0, \quad k = \frac{b_1 - b_0}{D}, \quad M_s = \frac{\pi}{4} \sqrt{2(\omega)} \rho_w \]

\[ B_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_i(L_0) Q_i(s)}{M_i} M_s \varphi_i(L_0) k_a + \varphi_i(L_0) k_b \]  

(42)

\[ C_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_i^2(L_0)}{M_i} M_s \varphi_i(L_0) k_a + \varphi_i(L_0) k_b \]  

(44)

\[ F_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_i(L_0) Q_i(s)}{M_i} M_s \varphi_i(L_0) k_a + \varphi_i(L_0) k_b \]  

(45)

\[ J_s = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_i^2(L_0)}{M_i} M_s \varphi_i(L_0) k_a + \varphi_i(L_0) k_b \]  

(46)

and

\[ k_a = \frac{k^2 D^5}{5} + \frac{2k_b D^3}{4} + \frac{b_k^2 D^3}{3} \]

\[ k_b = \frac{k^2 D^4}{4} + \frac{2k_b D^3}{3} + \frac{b_k^2 D}{2} \]

\[ k_c = \frac{k^2 D^3}{3} + k_b D^2 + b_k D. \]  

(47)

See Appendix C for the detailed derivation. From (35), (40), and (41), one can obtain the transfer functions relating the bending displacement and the slope at \( z = L_1 \) to the voltage input \( V(s) \) as follows:

\[ H_3(L_1, s) \triangleq \frac{w(L_1, s)}{V(s)} = H_2(L_0, s) + H_{2d}(L_0, s) D \]

\[ H_{3d}(L_1, s) \triangleq \frac{\omega'(L_0, s)}{V(s)} = H_{2d}(L_0, s). \]  

(48)

D. Speed Model of Robotic Fish

Given a voltage input \( V(t) = A_m \sin(\omega t) \) to the IPMC actuator, the bending displacement and the slope of the tail at the tip \( z = L_1 \) can be written as

\[ w(L_1, t) = A_m |H(j\omega)| \sin(\omega t + \angle H(j\omega)) \]  

(49)

\[ \frac{\partial w(z, t)}{\partial z} \bigg|_{z=L_1} = A_m |H_d(j\omega)| \sin(\omega t + \angle H_d(j\omega)) \]  

(50)

where \( \angle (\cdot) \) denotes the phase angle, and \( H(s) \) and \( H_d(s) \) represent \( H_3(L_1, s) \) and \( H_{3d}(L_1, s) \), respectively, obtained at the end of Section III-C. From (4), one can then obtain the steady-state speed \( U \) of the robotic fish under the actuation voltage \( V(t) = A_m \sin(\omega t) \) as

\[ U = \sqrt{\frac{m A_m^2 \omega^2 |H(j\omega)|^2}{2C_D \rho_w S + m A_m^2 |H_d(j\omega)|^2}}. \]  

(51)

One can easily extend (51) to periodic signals of other forms. For instance, the prototype in Fig. 1(b) uses square-wave voltage signals for ease of implementation. To derive the speed \( U \), we can write out the Fourier series of a square wave. Then the velocity of the fish actuated under a square-wave voltage with amplitude \( A_m \) can be obtained as

\[ U = \sqrt{\frac{m \rho_w \omega^2}{8 \pi^2}} \left[ \sum_{n=1,3,5, \ldots}^\infty \frac{|H(jn\omega)|^2}{C_D \rho_w S + m A_m^2 |H_d(jn\omega)|^2} \right]^{1/2}. \]  

(52)

Derivation of (52) is omitted here due to the space limitation.
IV. EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION AND PARAMETERS IDENTIFICATION

In this section, three different types of experiments have been carried out for model identification and validation: 1) drag coefficient identification (see Section IV-A); 2) identification and validation of the actuation model for IPMC underwater with and without the passive fin (see Section IV-B); and finally, 3) validation of the model for fish motion with different tail dimensions (see Section IV-C).

A. Drag Coefficient Identification

The most important parameter related to the fish body is the drag coefficient $C_D$, which depends on the Reynolds number, the fitness ratio of the body, and the properties of the fish surface and fluid. In order to identify $C_D$, the fish was pulled with different velocities, and metric spring scales were used to measure the drag force $F_D$. With the measured drag force, velocity, and surface area of the fish, the drag coefficient $C_D$ was calculated from (3). Fig. 5 illustrates the experimental setup for drag force measurement.

Through drag force measurement, one can get the plot of the drag force versus velocity. Based on (3), one can fit the experimental data with simulation data through the least-squares method to identify the drag coefficient. Fig. 6 shows the drag force versus the velocity of the fish. Table I shows the parameters related to the drag force.

B. Fish Tail Model Verification

To investigate the parameters related to the IPMC beam dynamics, the natural vibrations of IPMC in water and air were measured without actuation voltage applied to the IPMC. They were also used to verify $Q_1(s)$ for the first mode vibration. To investigate the hydrodynamic effect of passive fin on the IPMC beam, the frequency responses of the tail subject to voltage input were measured for both with and without the plastic fin. They were also used to verify the actuation models of IPMC. Fig. 7 shows the schematic of experimental setup. In the natural vibration testing, the tail was fixed in water and a mechanical impulse was applied at the tip to make the beam vibrate. The first-mode vibration was measured by a laser sensor (OADM 2016441/S14F, Baumer Electric). In the frequency response testing, the fish tail was fixed in the water by a frame arm, and a sequence of sinusoid voltages with amplitude 3.3 V and frequency ranging from 0.05 to 10 Hz were applied to the IPMC. The lateral displacement of the IPMC beam was captured by a laser sensor, and the actuation voltage was measured by a dSPACE station (DS1104, dSPACE).

1) Beam Dynamics Identification: Since the actuation bandwidth of IPMC actuators is relatively low (up to a few hertz), it suffices to consider the first mode of the beam motion. The parameters related to the beam dynamics can be identified through passive vibration tests of IPMC in water. The first-mode vibration related to the step response of the second-order system $Q_1(s)$ [see (17)] is

$$y(t) = y(0) e^{-\zeta \omega_1 t} \cos \left( \omega_1 t \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2} \right).$$

In the experiment, we tapped the tip of the cantilevered IPMC beam (submerged in water) and recorded the tip trajectory with the laser sensor as the beam underwent passive, damped oscillations. Fig. 8 shows both the simulation data and the experimental data on the tip displacement of the vibrating IPMC beam, where the beam dimensions were $L = 23 \text{ mm}$ and $W = 15 \text{ mm}$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$S$</th>
<th>$\rho_w$</th>
<th>$C_D$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$218 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2$</td>
<td>$1000 \text{ kg/m}^3$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Fig. 8, the natural frequency and damping ratio in water were identified to be \( \omega_1 = 54 \text{ rad/s} \), \( \xi_1 = 0.14 \). The hydrodynamic function of IPMC beam \( \Gamma_1(\omega) \) can be simulated based on (9). The correction function \( \Omega(\omega) \) for rectangular shape beam reported in [40] is used in the simulation. Around the natural frequency, one can pick \( \text{Re}(\Gamma_1) = 1.07 \) and \( \text{Im}(\Gamma_1) = 0.04 \).

Based on (11), one can get \( \mu_v \). Based on (18) and (19), one can obtain \( Y \) and \( C_v \). Table II shows all the parameters related to the beam dynamics.

2) Fish Tail Model Identification: In the fish tail model, some parameters can be directly measured, such as dimensions, temperature, resistance, and density of IPMC. Some parameters are physical constants, such as \( R \), \( F \), and \( \rho_w \). Since \( |C^+ - \Delta V| \ll 1 \) [42], we take \( 1 - C^+ \Delta V = 1 \). Some parameters, such as \( k_e \), \( \alpha_0 \), and \( r_2 \) need to be identified through fitting the frequency responses with model simulation, which was discussed in [38]. \( \Gamma_2 \) can be identified through fitting the frequency response of hybrid tail with simulation data. Table III shows the parameters related to the electrical dynamics of IPMC. The dimensions of IPMC-only tail are shown in Table II. The dimensions of hybrid tail tail1 are shown in Table IV.

The actuation model of IPMC with and without passive fin is verified. We applied sinusoidal voltage signals with amplitude 3.3 V and different frequencies to IPMC. Both the voltage input and the bending displacement output at the tail tip were measured to obtain the empirical frequency responses. In the case of an IPMC beam only, the displacement measurement was made at the beam tip; in the case of a hybrid tail, the displacement was measured at the tip of passive fin. In the simulation of the actuation models, only the first mode was taken into account, because the frequencies used were below or close to the first-mode resonant frequency. Fig. 9(a) compares the Bode plot of \( H_1(L, s) \) without passive fin, and (b) model \( H_2(L_1, s) \) with passive fin, in comparison with their experimental measurements.
frequency is estimated to be about 8.6 Hz, which is consistent with the IPMC beam’s natural frequency in water, as identified from the free-vibration experiment shown in Fig. 8. Fig. 9(b) compares the Bode plot of $H_3(L_1, s)$ (see (48) in Section III) and the measured frequency response from voltage input to the tail tip displacement for the hybrid tail. As can be seen in the figure, the cutoff frequency of the hybrid tail is much lower than that of an IPMC alone. This can be explained by the additional mass effect at the IPMC tip, introduced by the fluid pushed by the passive fin.

C. Speed Model Verification

To validate the speed model of the robotic fish, the velocities of the fish propelled by the IPMC under square-wave voltage inputs with amplitude 3.3 V and different frequencies were measured. In this experiment, the robotic fish swam freely in a tank marked with start and finish lines, and a timer recorded the time it took for the fish to travel the designated range after it reached the steady state. Fig. 10 shows a snapshot of the fish swimming in the tank.

The capability of the model in predicting cruising speed was verified for different operating frequencies, for different tail dimensions. The speed model for a square-wave input [see (52)] was applied to the robotic fish, as described in Section II. In the simulation of (52), we took the first three terms in each infinite series, which provided a good approximation to the sum

![Fig. 10. Snapshot of robotic fish in swimming test.](image)

![Fig. 11. Identified $\Gamma_2$ for tail 1 and tail 2.](image)

![Fig. 12. Verification of the motion model for the fish with different tails. (a) With tail 1. (b) With tail 2. (c) With tail 3. (d) With tail 4.](image)
of infinite series. Four different hybrid tails were investigated, shown in Table IV. The identified hydrodynamic functions \( \Gamma_2 \) are shown for tail1 and tail2 in Fig. 11. It can be seen that, while the hydrodynamic functions are qualitatively close to each other, they are shape-dependent. The predicted speeds match the experimental data well, as shown in Fig 12. Intuitively, within the actuation bandwidth of IPMC, the achieved speed increases with the actuation frequency. As the frequency gets relatively high, the bending amplitude of IPMC decreases. Thus, for each tail, there is an optimal frequency under which the fish reaches the highest speed. Both the optimal frequency and the corresponding highest speed depend on the dimensions of both IPMC and passive fin, which can be predicted by the speed model.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, the modeling of steady-state cruising motion was presented for an IPMC-propelled robotic fish. The model incorporates both IPMC actuation dynamics and hydrodynamic interactions, and it further considers the effect of a passive fin on the robot performance. The model was verified in experiments for robotic fish with different tail dimensions. The model will be useful for design and control of the robot to meet the tradeoff between locomotion speed and energy consumption.

Although a focus of the modeling work here is to understand how the steady-state speed of the robot depends on the fin design and actuation input, the approach to modeling IPMC fins in underwater operation holds promise for understanding general motions and maneuvers of the robotic fish. We will extend the presented model to investigate steady turning motion under periodic but asymmetric (left versus right) actuation of the IPMC, as well as unsteady motions such as the acceleration and deceleration of the robot. Path planning and control of the robotic fish will also be examined. In addition, we are exploring the use of IPMC as flow sensors for robotic fish control.

We note that other ionic-type EAPs, in particular, conjugated polymers have also been explored as propelling mechanisms for robotic fish [22]–[24]. The focus of the current paper is on incorporating both IPMC actuation dynamics and hydrodynamics into modeling. The comparison of IPMC-enabled robotic fish with those of conjugated polymer-enabled ones is outside of the scope of this paper, although a clear distinction is that a conjugated polymer fin needs either to be encapsulated or to work in electrolyte for long-term operation [24]. However, the presented approach to coupling actuation and hydrodynamic effects can be potentially extended to conjugated polymer-enabled robotic fish by using corresponding actuation models, e.g., [43].

APPENDIX A

DERIVATION OF \( M(L, s), F_i(L, s), \) AND \( F_{di}(z, s) \) IN SECTION III-C

Based on the principle of replacement in Section III-C, one gets, for \( 0 \leq z \leq L \)

\[
M_{IPMC}(z, s) = \int_{z}^{L} F_{di}(\tau)(\tau - z) d\tau + F_c(L, s)(L - z)
+ M(L, s).
\]

At \( z = L \), one gets

\[
M(L, s) = M_{IPMC}(L, s)
\]

which is (23). Then, one takes the derivative with respect to \( z \) on both sides of (22) as

\[
\frac{\partial M_{IPMC}(z, s)}{\partial z} = \int_{z}^{L} \frac{\partial (F_{di}(\tau)(\tau - z))}{\partial z} d\tau - F_c(L, s)
= - \int_{z}^{L} F_{di}(\tau) d\tau - F_c(L, s).
\]

(53)

Letting \( z = L \) in (53), one obtains

\[
F_c(L, s) = - \frac{\partial M_{IPMC}(z, s)}{\partial z} \Bigg|_{z=L}.
\]

Finally, (22) is obtained by taking the derivative with respect to \( z \) on both sides of (53).

APPENDIX B

DERIVATION OF \( H_{fi}(s) \)

With (22), (21), and definitions of \( a, b, \) and \( c \) in (27) and (28), (24) can be written as

\[
f_{di}(s) = \frac{V(s)}{M_i} \int_{0}^{L} (a \cosh(cz) - b \sinh(cz)) \varphi_i(z) dz
+ \frac{M(L, s) \varphi'_i(L)}{M_i}.
\]

(54)

Denote

\[
f_{di} = \int_{0}^{L} (a \cosh(cz) - b \sinh(cz)) \varphi_i(z) dz.
\]

(55)

Then, (54) can be written as

\[
f_i(s) = \frac{V(s)}{M_i} f_{di} + \frac{M(L, s) \varphi'_i(L)}{M_i}.
\]

(56)

With definition of \( \varphi_i(z) \) in (15), (55) can be written as

\[
f_{di} = \int_{0}^{L} \begin{pmatrix}
a(a \cosh(cz) \cosh(\lambda_i z) - \cosh(cz) \cos(\lambda_i z))
- \beta z a \cosh(cz) \sinh(\lambda_i z) - \cosh(cz) \sin(\lambda_i z))
- b \cosh(cz) \sinh(\lambda_i z) - \cosh(cz) \cos(\lambda_i z))
+ \beta b \cosh(cz) \sin(\lambda_i z) - \cosh(cz) \sin(\lambda_i z))
\end{pmatrix} dz.
\]

(57)

After integrating (57), we obtain

\[
f_{di} = (a - b)(a_L + b_L - c_L - d_L)
- \beta z (a - b)(a_L - b_L + j c_L - j d_L)
\]

(58)
where \( a_L, b_L, c_L, \) and \( d_L \) are defined in (29) and (30). With (23) and (58), (56) can be written as

\[
f_{11}(s) = \frac{V(s)}{2M_i} \left[ (a - b) (a_L + b_L - c_L - d_L) \right.
\]

\[
- \beta (a - b) (a_L - b_L + j c_L - j d_L) \left. \right] + \frac{\alpha_0 W K b_L (\gamma(s) - \tanh(\gamma(s))) \varphi_L' (L)V(s)}{(s \gamma(s) + K \tanh(\gamma(s))) (1 + r_2 \theta (s)) \cosh(c_L)}. \tag{59}
\]

Then, one can obtain the transfer functions (26) from (59).

**APPENDIX C**

**DERIVATION OF ACTUATION MODEL FOR HYBRID TAIL**

With (24), (39) can be written as

\[
f_{2i}(s) = f_{1i}(s) + \frac{F_{\text{tail}}(s) \varphi_l (L)}{M_i} + \frac{M_{\text{tail}}(s) \varphi_l' (L)}{M_i} \tag{60}
\]

With (25) and (37), (60) can be written as

\[
f_{2i} = H_{f1} (s) V(s) - \frac{M_i}{M_i} \left[ \varphi_l (L) k_a + \varphi_l (L) k_b \right] w' (L_0, s)
\]

\[
- \frac{M_i}{M_i} \left[ \varphi_l' (L) k_a + \varphi_l' (L) k_b \right] w (L_0, s) \tag{61}
\]

The general coordinate \( q_{2i}(s) \) is

\[
q_{2i}(s) = Q_i(\cdot) f_{2i}(s) \tag{62}
\]

Then, with (61) and (62), (14) can be written as

\[
w(z,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi_l (L_0) Q_i(s) H_{f1} (s) V(s)
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} M_i \varphi_l (L_0) Q_i(s) \left[ \varphi_l' (L_0) k_a + \varphi_l' (L_0) k_b \right] w' (L_0, s)
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} M_i \varphi_l' (L_0) k_a + \varphi_l' (L_0) k_b \right] w (L_0, s) \tag{63}
\]

From (31), (63) can be written as

\[
w(z,s) = H_{1i}(s) V(s) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} M_i \varphi_l (L_0) Q_i(s)
\]

\[
\times \left[ \varphi_l' (L_0) k_a + \varphi_l' (L_0) k_b \right] w' (L_0, s)
\]

\[
+ \left[ \varphi_l' (L_0) k_a + \varphi_l' (L_0) k_b \right] w (L_0, s) \tag{64}
\]

and with (32), the slope can be written as

\[
w'(z,s) = H_{1d}(s) V(s) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} M_i \varphi_l' (L_0) Q_i(s)
\]

\[
\times \left[ \varphi_l' (L_0) k_a + \varphi_l' (L_0) k_b \right] w' (L_0, s)
\]

\[
+ \left[ \varphi_l' (L_0) k_a + \varphi_l' (L_0) k_b \right] w (L_0, s) \tag{65}
\]

With the definition of \( A_s, E_s, B_s, C_s, F_s, \) and \( J_s \) in (42)-(46), one can write (64) and (65) as

\[
w(L_0, s) = A_s V(s) - B_s w(L_0, s) - C_s w'(L_0, s) \tag{66}
\]

\[
w'(L_0, s) = E_s V(s) - F_s w'(L_0, s) - J_s w(L_0, s) \tag{67}
\]

Solving (66) and (67) for \( w(L_0, s) \) and \( w'(L_0, s) \) gives

\[
w(L_0, s) = \frac{(1 + F_s) A_s - B_s E_s}{(1 + C_s) (1 + F_s) - B_s J_s} V(s) \tag{68}
\]

\[
w'(L_0, s) = \frac{(1 + C_s) E_s - A_s J_s}{(1 + C_s) (1 + F_s) - B_s J_s} V(s) \tag{69}
\]

Then, one can obtain the transfer functions (40) and (41).
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