International Journal of Technology and Applied Science (IJTAS)
E-ISSN: 2230-9004 • Website: www.ijtas.com • Email: editor@ijtas.com

Advanced Vehicle Dynamics and Mechatronic Stability Control for Suspension Kinematics, Tire Mechanics, and Road-Friction

Saahil

Usha Martin University, Ranchi, India
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5113-0372

Abstract:
This article reframes vehicle dynamics, stability, and control as a constraint-governed cyber-physical regulation problem in which safety is achieved through viability maintenance within friction-limited, saturation-bounded admissible sets. It synthesizes control-oriented modeling hierarchies, nonlinear stability constructs, and observability-limited estimation pipelines with five coupled domains, namely active suspension as normal-load and attitude modulation, refined Electronic Stability Control and traction regulation under combined-slip nonlinearity, brake-by-wire and steer-by-wire as networked actuation infrastructures with stringent functional-safety and cybersecurity constraints, tire-road interaction as the dominant epistemic bottleneck requiring uncertainty-calibrated friction inference, and driver behavior as a stochastic, delay-laden feedback element shaping shared-control governance. Across these domains, the article emphasizes invariant set enforcement, risk-sensitive constraint tightening, and multi-actuator control allocation under bandwidth, thermal, and degraded-mode limitations. It contributes by advancing an integrative conceptual architecture that couples estimation confidence to constrained optimization, embeds human-centered transparency into intervention logic, and defines globally deployable design criteria for software-defined chassis systems in heterogeneous surface and operating regimes.

Keywords: Vehicle Dynamics, Electronic Stability Control, Active Suspension Systems, Tire-Road Interaction, Friction Estimation, Model Predictive Control, Nonlinear Control Systems, Functional Safety, Shared Control, Vehicle State Estimation, Chassis Domain Control.

1. Introduction

1.1 Vehicle Dynamics, Stability, and Control

Vehicle stability is still governed by *nonlinear saturation physics* at the tire-road interface, where force generation is constrained by friction-limited shear, transient carcass compliance, and combined-slip coupling that breaks linear superposition assumptions. Even with high-rate sensing, the system remains *partially observable* because friction, effective contact patch state, and micro-texture mediated adhesion are not directly measurable under production constraints. The control problem is further complicated by *multi-domain coupling* across longitudinal, lateral, and vertical dynamics, where pitch and roll load transfer modulate available lateral force capacity, and vertical excitations inject parametric uncertainty into yaw dynamics through normal load variation (Farroni et al., 2022). Actuation has become richer yet more fragile, since brake, steering, powertrain, and suspension subsystems operate under bandwidth limits, saturations, delays, quantization, and thermal derating. Human-in-the-loop uncertainty persists because drivers adapt, overcorrect, and recalibrate risk under assistance, generating *behavioral feedback* that alters closed-loop stability margins. This article contributes by framing the modern stability problem as *constraint-governed cyber-physical regulation* under structured uncertainty, where *multi-actuator coordination* must preserve both safety invariants and human-perceived controllability.

1.2 Scope, Boundaries, and Research Questions

This article focuses on five tightly coupled domains that jointly define contemporary chassis intelligence. *Active suspension* is treated not only as ride-comfort engineering, but as an *attitude and normal-load management layer* that reshapes tire utilization during transients. *Electronic Stability Control* and *traction control refinement* are treated as *near-limit safety controllers* that must operate within friction cones while minimizing undesirable intervention signatures that degrade drivability. *Brake-by-wire* and *steer-by-wire* are treated as enabling infrastructures that elevate controllability and allocation flexibility, while imposing stringent requirements for functional safety, diagnosability, and fail-operational behavior. *Tire-road interaction modeling* is treated as the dominant epistemic bottleneck, since errors in friction estimation, combined-slip representation, and transient tire dynamics propagate into all stability decisions. *Advanced driver behavior modeling* is treated as a necessary layer for manual and shared control, where driver intent, risk tolerance, and sensorimotor delay influence stability boundaries. This article contributes by organizing the review around four design questions, namely which control-oriented models remain valid across regimes, which estimators enable credible sideslip and friction awareness, which controller families best enforce constraints under actuation limits, and which validation logics separate simulation plausibility from operational credibility.

1.3 Definitions, Constructs, and Performance Dimensions

The article uses stability as a family of operational constructs rather than a single abstract property. Stability is expressed through *practical stability* and *boundedness* under disturbances, together with *safety invariants* expressed as admissible bounds on sideslip, yaw-rate, lateral acceleration, and rollover propensity. The central control object is not merely trajectory tracking, but *viability under constraints*, where safe evolution must remain inside an admissible set defined by friction limits, actuator saturations, and acceptable human factors. Performance is treated as multi-criteria optimization across *ride comfort*, *road holding*, *handling feel*, *energy and thermal budgets*, and *intervention transparency* (Jin et al., 2020). Ride comfort is represented through sprung-mass acceleration and jerk proxies, while road holding is represented through tire load variation and contact consistency proxies. Handling feel is treated as a perceptual construct shaped by phase-lag, intervention onset rate, and steering or braking feedback coherence. The article adopts a systems framing of *control authority* and *allocation*, recognizing that modern vehicles use redundant actuators and must solve real-time arbitration among braking, steering, torque, and suspension. This article contributes by defining a consistent vocabulary that can be used across engineering, human factors, and policy discourse to specify what safe, acceptable, and deployable control means.

1.4 Synthesis and Comparative Evaluation Axes

As a conceptual-theoretical article, the synthesis prioritizes constructs, architectures, and evaluative dimensions over study-by-study reporting. The organizing strategy is to compare approaches along axes that determine real-world deployability, namely model fidelity versus computational tractability, uncertainty representation versus robustness guarantees, sensor dependence versus observability realism, and calibration burden versus transferability across platforms. Estimation is evaluated through the lens of identifiability, excitation dependence, and bias sensitivity, since many friction and sideslip estimators become brittle under low excitation or sensor drift. Control is evaluated through constraint handling, graceful degradation under saturation, and compatibility with multi-actuator allocation. Learning-assisted methods are evaluated through safety envelope enforcement, out-of-distribution behavior management, and verification feasibility under regulatory scrutiny. Validation maturity is treated as a graded pipeline from software-only plausibility to hardware-in-the-loop controllability to proving-ground repeatability and finally to public-road variability management. This article contributes by using these axes to build an evidence logic that is actionable for technologists designing controllers, for academics formalizing guarantees, and for policy makers evaluating safety arguments for software-defined chassis control.

1.5 Roadmap of the Article

The paper is structured to progressively build a unified chassis-control logic, moving from foundational constructs to subsystem architectures and then to the dominant uncertainties that shape real-world outcomes. Section 2 establishes the control backbone by formalizing modeling hierarchies, stability envelopes, observability constraints, and the control families that recur across chassis functions, and it introduces Table 1 as a taxonomy that will be called upon when later sections justify model choice and estimator assumptions. Section 3 then reframes active suspension as a stability-relevant subsystem by connecting vertical dynamics to friction utilization and constraint management, and it introduces Table 2 to compare actuation architectures and their implications for feasibility and energy budgets. Section 4 treats ESC and traction refinement as constraint-first regulation under friction uncertainty, referencing Table 3 to map estimation-control couplings and to clarify why certain designs fail under split-friction and combined-slip regimes. Section 5 then analyzes brake-by-wire and steer-by-wire as enabling infrastructures, using Table 4 to structure hazard pathways and mitigation logics that preserve stability under faults. Section 6 consolidates the two dominant uncertainty sources, tire-road physics and driver behavior, and uses Table 5 to map modeling choices to integration points across the chassis stack. This article contributes by tying these sections into a single conceptual arc, where the tables serve as compact decision frameworks rather than illustrative add-ons.

2. Vehicle Dynamics and Stability Fundamentals

2.1 Control-Oriented Modeling Hierarchy and Modeling Truths

Control-oriented vehicle dynamics modeling is an exercise in disciplined abstraction, where the objective is not geometric fidelity but preservation of dominant nonlinearities, constraints, and cross-axis couplings that determine stability envelopes. At the lowest fidelity, kinematic models capture path curvature and low-speed maneuvering without resolving inertial effects, rendering them insufficient for friction-limited stability analysis. The classical *single-track bicycle model* introduces lateral tire forces and yaw inertia, enabling representation of understeer gradients and yaw-rate dynamics under small-slip assumptions (Zhang et al., 2022). However, near-limit operation demands nonlinear tire-force formulations embedded within augmented state-space models that incorporate longitudinal slip ratio, lateral slip angle, and combined-slip saturation manifolds. Extension to three degrees of freedom introduces yaw, lateral, and longitudinal coupling, while inclusion of roll and pitch dynamics accounts for *load-transfer-induced parametric variation* in cornering stiffness. Full-vehicle multi-degree-of-freedom models incorporate unsprung masses, suspension compliance, and tire vertical stiffness, capturing wheel-hop and contact patch modulation. A central modeling truth is that fidelity must be allocated to phenomena that reshape constraint sets, namely friction limits, saturation boundaries, and transient relaxation effects, while higher-order structural detail is relegated to bounded uncertainty sets within robust control formulations. This article contributes by treating modeling as *constraint-preserving reduction* rather than geometric reconstruction.

2.2 Stability Constructs and Safety Constraint Formulations

Vehicle stability cannot be reduced to linear eigenvalue placement, as real-world operation is bounded by friction, actuator saturation, and rollover thresholds that define *state-dependent admissible regions*. Within nonlinear dynamics, stability is better framed through *Lyapunov invariance*, *region-of-attraction* analysis, and *viability theory*, where the goal is to maintain trajectories within invariant sets under bounded disturbances (Xu et al., 2023). Practical implementations encode these constructs as envelope constraints on sideslip magnitude, yaw-rate deviation, lateral acceleration, and load-transfer ratio. The *friction ellipse* or *friction circle* acts as a geometric constraint on admissible longitudinal and lateral force vectors, embedding tire saturation directly into control feasibility. Rollover propensity can be approximated through load-transfer ratios or roll-angle bounds, linking vertical dynamics to lateral stability constraints.

Barrier-function formulations translate these envelopes into inequality constraints that shape admissible control inputs in real time. From a human-factors perspective, stability must also account for perceptual thresholds beyond which vehicle response is judged uncontrollable, introducing a behavioral layer to envelope definition. This article contributes by formalizing stability as a *multi-layer constraint system*, where physical limits, actuator capacities, and perceptual tolerances intersect to define safe operation.

2.3 State Estimation and Observability Under Production Constraints

The majority of stability-critical states are latent and must be reconstructed from noisy, bandwidth-limited production sensors. Sideslip angle, tire forces, and friction coefficient are not directly measured, requiring observer design grounded in *nonlinear state estimation theory*. The *Extended Kalman Filter* linearizes around operating points to propagate covariance, while the *Unscented Kalman Filter* employs sigma-point transformations to capture second-order nonlinearities without explicit Jacobian computation (Zhao et al., 2022). In regimes with inequality constraints, *Moving Horizon Estimation* solves finite-horizon optimization problems embedding physical bounds on slip ratio and friction, ensuring constraint-consistent state reconstruction. Observability is conditional on excitation, as steady cruising with minimal lateral acceleration yields insufficient information to uniquely identify friction parameters, rendering estimates ill-conditioned. Sensor biases in IMUs, quantization in wheel-speed encoders, and steering-angle misalignment introduce systematic errors that propagate into yaw-moment allocation decisions. Robust estimation therefore requires bias adaptation, residual monitoring, and plausibility logic that prevents estimator divergence under μ-jump transitions. The modeling-estimation interplay is structured in Table 1, which classifies dominant approaches according to states addressed, uncertainty representation, and computational tractability.

Table 1. Control-Oriented Modeling and Estimation Taxonomy

Model or Estimation Class	**Dominant Assumptions and Structural Features**	**Latent States and Parameters Addressed**	**Uncertainty Representation Mechanism**	**Computational and Deployment Profile**
Linear Bicycle Model with Kalman Filtering	Small-slip linear tire approximation with constant cornering stiffness and planar yaw-lateral coupling	Yaw rate, lateral velocity, sideslip angle under limited excitation	Gaussian noise covariance propagation with linearized error dynamics	Highly efficient and widely deployable in embedded controllers with moderate regime validity
Nonlinear Single-Track Model with Unscented Filtering	Combined-slip nonlinear tire force maps with state augmentation for parameter drift	Sideslip, friction coefficient, longitudinal and lateral tire forces	Sigma-point based nonlinear covariance update capturing second-order effects	Moderate computational demand compatible with modern automotive microprocessors
Three-DOF Planar Model with Disturbance Observer	Explicit modeling of yaw, lateral, and longitudinal dynamics with aggregated disturbance torque term	Yaw disturbance moment, effective friction perturbation, load-transfer effects	High-gain disturbance reconstruction treating unmodeled dynamics as bounded inputs	Robust against matched uncertainties with careful tuning to avoid noise amplification
Full-Vehicle Multi-DOF	Inclusion of roll, pitch, unsprung	Comprehensive state vector	Deterministic constraint	Higher computational

Model with Moving Horizon Estimation	masses, and nonlinear vertical stiffness interactions	including roll angle, load-transfer ratio, and transient tire forces	enforcement within finite-horizon optimization	overhead requiring dedicated processing units or optimization hardware
LPV Model with Gain-Scheduled Estimator	Parameter variation scheduled on speed, load, and estimated friction regime	Speed-dependent cornering stiffness, mass distribution shifts, adaptive yaw inertia	Polytope-based uncertainty bounds and scheduled covariance adaptation	Balanced trade-off between robustness and computational tractability for production platforms
Hybrid Physics-Based Model with Residual Learning Layer	Baseline nonlinear model augmented with bounded data-driven residual correction	Model mismatch residuals, temperature-induced tire stiffness drift	Safety-filtered residual bounds integrated with nominal covariance estimates	Emerging approach leveraging embedded AI accelerators with constraint certification safeguards

Table 1 demonstrates that estimator choice is inseparable from model structure and uncertainty philosophy, since each architecture encodes distinct assumptions about excitation sufficiency and constraint adherence. The conceptual mapping embodied in Table 1 reinforces that production-feasible stability control depends not on maximal model complexity but on coherent alignment between structural assumptions, estimator robustness, and computational envelope.

2.4 Control Paradigms across Chassis Functions and their Guarantees

Across suspension, ESC, and X-by-wire subsystems, a recurring set of control paradigms governs stability regulation. Classical proportional-integral-derivative control and gain scheduling remain prevalent due to interpretability and calibration tractability, yet they lack formal guarantees under saturation and nonlinear friction variation. *Linear Quadratic Regulation* optimizes quadratic cost functions balancing state deviation and control effort, while *Linear Quadratic Gaussian* control integrates observer dynamics under Gaussian noise assumptions. Robust control methodologies such as *H-infinity synthesis* minimize worst-case disturbance amplification, embedding bounded uncertainty directly into controller design. *Sliding Mode Control* enforces invariant manifolds in state space, delivering robustness to matched uncertainties but requiring smoothing strategies to mitigate chattering. *Model Predictive Control* explicitly encodes state and input constraints within receding-horizon optimization, enabling multi-objective regulation under actuator saturation and friction bounds. Adaptive control frameworks adjust parameter estimates online, provided persistent excitation conditions are met (Han et al., 2022). Emerging learning-assisted methods apply residual correction or policy adaptation, yet must be enveloped by barrier-function constraints to preserve safety invariants. This article contributes by articulating control paradigms not as competing doctrines but as complementary layers within a hierarchical stability architecture.

2.5 Validation Norms, Reproducibility, and Evidence Quality Grading

Credible validation of stability control demands progression from simulation to hardware-in-the-loop and ultimately to real-vehicle testing under heterogeneous conditions. Standardized maneuvers such as double-lane-change, sine-with-dwell, and split-µ braking provide repeatable stress tests of yaw and traction regulation, yet they capture only limited slices of the operational envelope. Environmental heterogeneity, including temperature gradients, tire wear states, and surface contamination, introduces variability rarely replicated in controlled settings (Dandiwala et al., 2023). Evidence quality must therefore be graded according to domain coverage, transparency of model parameters, and disclosure of friction conditions. Simulation-only claims lacking realistic tire parameterization or sensor-noise modeling risk overstating performance. Hardware-in-the-loop testing validates computational feasibility and delay tolerance but cannot fully replicate surface variability. Real-world validation must incorporate thermal cycling, repeated intervention scenarios, and driver-behavior variability to assess long-term robustness. This article contributes by advocating a *hierarchical validation logic* in which each stage explicitly tests constraint adherence, degradation behavior, and cross-domain coherence, thereby grounding theoretical stability constructs in globally credible operational evidence.

3. Active Suspension Systems as Ride, Handling, and Stability Enablers

3.1 Objective Structures and Multi-Criteria Formulation

Active suspension must be understood as a *multi-objective cyber-physical regulation problem* in which vertical, longitudinal, and lateral dynamics are co-determined through normal-load redistribution, transient attitude control, and tire contact management. The canonical trade-off between ride comfort and road holding is not merely a heuristic compromise but a formal *multi-criteria optimization* problem in which sprung-mass acceleration variance, jerk minimization, tire load variation, suspension deflection bounds, and actuator energy expenditure coexist within a constrained feasible set (Zhu et al., 2022). Comfort is typically proxied through frequency-weighted acceleration metrics that reflect human biodynamic sensitivity bands between approximately 1 and 10 Hz, while road holding is represented through minimization of dynamic tire load fluctuations that degrade friction utilization. From a handling perspective, pitch control under heavy braking modulates front-axle normal load growth rates, thereby influencing slip-ratio controllability and reducing the onset of front-axle saturation. Similarly, roll control during aggressive cornering redistributes lateral load transfer across axles, altering understeer gradients and yaw-rate responsiveness. Within a *constraint-dominant* paradigm, safety invariants such as suspension travel limits and wheel-hop avoidance are treated as hard constraints, while comfort and energy objectives are soft costs within a prioritized hierarchy. This article contributes by framing active suspension not as comfort augmentation alone, but as an *attitude-shaping stability actuator* embedded in a global constraint architecture.

3.2 System Architectures and Technology Options

The architecture of active suspension defines the attainable control authority, energy footprint, and feasible control bandwidth. Passive systems rely on fixed damping and spring rates, limiting intervention to structural tuning, whereas semi-active systems employ variable damping technologies such as magneto-rheological fluid dampers that modulate dissipation but cannot inject net energy into the system due to *passivity constraints* (Mosconi et al., 2023). Fully active systems utilize electro-hydraulic or electro-mechanical actuators capable of bidirectional force injection, enabling independent regulation of heave, pitch, and roll states across broad frequency spectra. Interconnected suspensions, whether hydraulic cross-links or mechanically coupled anti-roll architectures, redistribute load laterally to suppress roll without proportional vertical stiffness penalties. Emerging predictive suspensions incorporate *road-preview sensing* via vision, LiDAR, or map-based elevation models, allowing anticipatory force scheduling through *preview control theory*, provided that preview uncertainty is robustly bounded. Energy budgets are non-trivial, as fully active systems may demand several kilowatts under aggressive transients, necessitating power-electronics integration and thermal management strategies. The architectural implications for control feasibility and allocation are synthesized in Table 2, which will be referenced in subsequent discussions on integration with ESC and X-by-wire coordination.

Table 2. Active Suspension Architectures and Control Consequences

Architecture Class	Control Authority Profile	Energy and Thermal Footprint	Sensor and Estimation Dependencies	Dominant Control Paradigms
Passive Suspension	Fixed spring-damper characteristics with no real-time force modulation and reliance on structural tuning for performance	Minimal energy draw limited to structural damping losses with negligible thermal control requirements	No active sensing beyond basic ride-height or damper displacement in advanced implementations	Structural optimization and offline parameter tuning with no closed-loop force regulation
Semi-Active Suspension	Real-time modulation of damping coefficients within passivity bounds without net energy injection capability	Low to moderate electrical demand for magneto-rheological or variable-valve actuation with manageable thermal loads	Suspension displacement, velocity, and in some cases body acceleration sensing to inform damping law adaptation	Skyhook, groundhook, hybrid heuristics, gain-scheduled and LPV damping laws
Fully Active Electro-Hydraulic	Bidirectional force injection enabling independent control of heave, pitch, and roll across wide bandwidth	High peak power demand with significant thermal management and power-electronics integration requirements	Full-state estimation including body acceleration, wheel travel, and often load estimation for constraint-aware control	LQR, H-infinity, nonlinear MPC, multi-objective constrained optimal control
Fully Active Electro-Mechanical	High-precision force control with direct-drive or ball-screw actuators offering rapid response	Elevated continuous and transient electrical loads with heat dissipation through integrated cooling subsystems	High-resolution displacement, velocity, and force sensing integrated with real-time state observers	Model predictive control, adaptive control, energy-aware optimization schemes
Interconnected Suspension Systems	Lateral load redistribution through hydraulic or mechanical cross-links reducing roll without excessive vertical stiffness	Moderate energy use depending on active valve control with thermal considerations in hydraulic circuits	Pressure sensing and roll-state estimation to coordinate cross-link dynamics	Coordinated roll-control laws, constrained optimal redistribution algorithms
Predictive Preview Suspension	Anticipatory force scheduling based on forward-looking road-	Variable energy demand contingent on preview confidence and	Vision or LiDAR-based road reconstruction combined with	Preview control, receding-horizon MPC with uncertainty

	profile inference integrated with feedback stabilization	maneuver severity with dynamic power budgeting	robust disturbance observers	bounds, hybrid feedforward-feedback strategies

Table 2 clarifies that control ambition must be aligned with actuator authority, energy availability, and sensing realism, since attempts to impose high-bandwidth optimal control on semi-active systems violate passivity limits and generate performance illusions not realizable in hardware.

3.3 Modeling for Control, Estimation, and Integration

Active suspension control requires models that capture vertical dynamics without neglecting cross-axis couplings that influence global stability. Quarter-car abstractions are useful for isolating sprung and unsprung mass interactions and for analyzing *unsprung resonance* and wheel-hop frequencies that can approach 10 to 15 Hz, yet they fail to capture pitch and roll coupling that becomes critical under heavy braking or cornering. Half-car models introduce pitch dynamics, enabling assessment of front-rear load transfer under longitudinal acceleration, while full-car models incorporate roll and cross-axle coupling, allowing examination of lateral load transfer distribution and its impact on yaw stability (Yue et al., 2021). The tire itself introduces nonlinear vertical stiffness and damping characteristics that depend on inflation pressure, temperature, and carcass construction, implying that load transfer is not linearly proportional to suspension deflection. Disturbance modeling must represent road roughness spectra using stochastic processes with defined power spectral densities, enabling controller tuning against realistic excitations rather than idealized step inputs. From an integration standpoint, vertical load modulation changes available lateral and longitudinal friction capacity, implying that suspension control influences the feasible region of ESC and traction algorithms discussed in Section 4. This article contributes by emphasizing that suspension modeling errors propagate into stability control through altered tire force envelopes, making cross-domain consistency essential.

3.4 Control Strategies from Classical to Learning-Based

Control strategies for active suspension span a spectrum from heuristic damping laws to constrained nonlinear optimization. Classical *skyhook* control approximates the effect of connecting the sprung mass to an inertial reference, thereby attenuating body motion in low-frequency bands, while *groundhook* approaches prioritize tire contact stability by referencing the unsprung mass. Hybrid strategies interpolate between these extremes to balance comfort and road holding (Im et al., 2022). Optimal control formulations such as *Linear Quadratic Regulation* and *Linear Quadratic Gaussian* integrate state-feedback with estimator dynamics, providing energy-optimal responses under linear assumptions, while *H-infinity* control addresses bounded disturbance rejection with robustness margins against parametric uncertainty. *Linear Parameter-Varying* control accommodates speed and payload variations through scheduling mechanisms that preserve stability across operating points. Constrained *Model Predictive Control* enables explicit management of suspension travel limits, actuator force bounds, and energy constraints, solving finite-horizon optimization problems in real time with receding-horizon updates. Learning-assisted approaches, including reinforcement learning and residual learning overlays, can adapt cost weights or disturbance predictors, but must operate within *safety envelopes* enforced by barrier functions or constraint filters to ensure invariant set compliance. This article contributes by arguing that learning is most defensible when confined to disturbance modeling or parameter adaptation rather than unconstrained force synthesis.

3.5 Integration with ESC, X-by-Wire, and Future Gaps

Active suspension does not operate in isolation but within a *coordinated chassis control architecture* that arbitrates authority among braking, steering, torque vectoring, and vertical force actuation. By redistributing normal loads preemptively, suspension control can expand the admissible friction envelope for ESC, reducing the magnitude of differential braking interventions and thereby preserving thermal margins and driver comfort (Romano et al., 2021). In X-by-wire environments discussed in Section 5, high-fidelity actuation and diagnostic capabilities permit tighter integration between vertical and lateral controllers, enabling real-time control allocation across subsystems under unified constraints. Energy-aware strategy switching is increasingly necessary, particularly in electric vehicles where suspension power draw competes with propulsion and thermal management demands, necessitating hierarchical prioritization between comfort and safety modes. Persistent research gaps include scalable validation across tire wear states, temperature regimes, and payload variations, as well as quantification of long-term durability impacts under aggressive active control. This article contributes by positioning active suspension as a central actor in global stability governance, whose effectiveness depends on cross-domain model coherence, constraint-aware optimization, and credible validation under heterogeneous real-world conditions.

4. ESC and Traction Control Refinement under Friction Uncertainty

4.1 Control Goals, Reference Generation, and Driver Intent Preservation

Electronic Stability Control and traction refinement must be conceptualized as *constraint-dominant supervisory regulators* operating at the boundary of the tire friction ellipse, where admissible force vectors are bounded by instantaneous normal loads and surface-dependent friction coefficients. The primary control objective is not merely yaw-rate tracking but *viability maintenance* within a dynamic stability envelope defined by acceptable sideslip magnitude, yaw-rate error, lateral acceleration, and rollover propensity (Krauze & Kasprzyk, 2020). Reference generation therefore becomes a non-trivial inferential problem, since the desired yaw response must reconcile steering input, vehicle speed, and understeer gradient while remaining inside friction-limited feasibility regions. Classical linear reference models based on steady-state cornering equilibria are insufficient under combined-slip, load-transfer-dominated maneuvers, requiring adaptive reference modulation that accounts for instantaneous friction estimates and actuator saturation margins. At the same time, driver intent must be preserved through *intervention transparency*, minimizing phase discontinuities and abrupt torque redistributions that undermine perceived controllability. The system thus operates under a dual imperative of safety envelope enforcement and *human-centered control coherence*, where excessive intervention frequency degrades trust and may provoke compensatory overcorrection. This article contributes by framing ESC as a *real-time constraint arbitration mechanism* rather than a simple yaw-moment corrector.

4.2 Nonlinear Tire Regime, Combined Slip, and Real-World Edge Cases

ESC effectiveness is ultimately bounded by the *nonlinear constitutive behavior* of pneumatic tires, whose force generation obeys combined-slip coupling and saturates along friction-limited manifolds. Under high lateral acceleration, the friction ellipse constrains additional longitudinal force generation, implying that traction control and yaw stabilization must be co-optimized to avoid destabilizing torque commands. Split-μ conditions introduce asymmetric friction constraints across axles or sides, generating yaw moments during braking that must be counteracted through differential pressure modulation while respecting wheel lock avoidance (Zhao et al., 2023). μ-jump transitions, such as dry-to-wet asphalt changes, induce abrupt shifts in achievable deceleration and lateral force gradients, challenging estimators that assume quasi-static friction. Low-μ surfaces such as compacted snow or ice compress the feasible stability envelope, reducing controllability margins and requiring earlier, smoother intervention to avoid oscillatory corrections. Vertical load transfer from pitch and roll, as discussed in Section 3, modifies instantaneous friction capacity by altering normal load distribution and effective tire stiffness, underscoring the interdependence between suspension and ESC. The nonlinear regime therefore requires controllers capable of operating beyond linearization validity, with explicit management of saturation, rate limits, and friction variability.

4.3 Estimation and Uncertainty Handling for ESC and Traction

Reliable ESC and traction refinement depend on accurate estimation of latent states such as sideslip angle, tire forces, and friction coefficient, which are not directly measurable with standard production sensors. *Extended Kalman filtering* and *Unscented Kalman filtering* frameworks provide nonlinear state reconstruction under Gaussian noise assumptions, yet their performance deteriorates under unmodeled disturbances or low excitation regimes. *Moving Horizon Estimation* introduces constraint-consistent state reconstruction by solving finite-horizon optimization problems that enforce physical bounds on slip ratios and friction coefficients (Tseng, 2021). Friction estimation itself can be framed as a *parameter identification problem* under persistent excitation, yet in real-world driving excitation is often insufficient, requiring the use of disturbance observers, wheel torque residual analysis, and model-based force reconstruction to infer surface properties. Confidence metrics must accompany friction estimates to enable *risk-sensitive control*, where intervention aggressiveness is modulated according to estimator uncertainty. Bias drift in IMU sensors, wheel-speed quantization, and steering angle offsets introduce epistemic uncertainty that must be mitigated through plausibility checks and sensor-fusion redundancy. The interplay between estimation constructs and control strategies is summarized in Table 3, which will be invoked when analyzing allocation and degradation logics in subsequent subsections.

Table 3. Integrated Estimation and Control Architectures for ESC

Control-Estimation Architecture	**Latent States and Parameters Addressed**	**Uncertainty Representation Strategy**	**Actuation Coordination Mechanism**	**Robustness and Degradation Profile**
Linear Reference with EKF-Based Sideslip Estimation	Sideslip angle, yaw-rate bias, effective cornering stiffness parameters inferred through linearized bicycle dynamics	Gaussian noise modeling with covariance adaptation under speed and load variation	Differential braking with calibrated gain scheduling and limited torque vectoring integration	Sensitive to large-slip nonlinearities and friction regime shifts but computationally efficient for production deployment
Nonlinear Model with UKF and Friction Parameter Adaptation	Combined-slip tire forces, friction coefficient, yaw inertia perturbations estimated through nonlinear state augmentation	Sigma-point propagation capturing second-order nonlinearities with bounded process noise tuning	Coordinated braking and torque redistribution with adaptive reference modulation	Improved performance under moderate nonlinearities yet susceptible to estimator divergence under abrupt μ-jumps
Moving Horizon Estimation with Constraint-Consistent NMPC	Sideslip, longitudinal and lateral tire forces, friction bounds constrained within physical feasibility sets	Deterministic bounded-uncertainty sets embedded in finite-horizon optimization	Multi-actuator allocation across brakes, steering, and powertrain within explicit saturation limits	High robustness to constraints and saturations with increased computational demand requiring real-time optimization hardware

Disturbance-Observer-Augmented Sliding Mode Control	Aggregate disturbance torques, friction perturbations, and load-transfer-induced yaw moments	Matched-uncertainty modeling with high-gain disturbance reconstruction	Direct yaw-moment injection via differential braking with chattering mitigation through higher-order schemes	Strong robustness to bounded uncertainties but requires careful tuning to avoid oscillatory intervention signatures
Risk-Sensitive MPC with Confidence-Weighted Friction Estimation	Friction coefficient with probabilistic confidence interval, sideslip and yaw states under stochastic modeling	Chance-constrained optimization incorporating estimator variance into constraint tightening	Integrated braking and torque vectoring with adaptive constraint margins	Maintains stability under high uncertainty by conservative envelope enforcement at the cost of potential performance conservatism
Hybrid Learning-Assisted Residual Control with Safety Filter	Model residuals, tire force discrepancies, and driver-intent deviations learned online within safety envelope	Residual uncertainty bounded by barrier-function constraints ensuring invariant set compliance	Supervisory control allocation with learning-modulated feedforward compensation	Enhanced adaptability while preserving safety invariants provided residual bounds remain within certified limits

Table 3 clarify that robustness in ESC emerges not solely from controller sophistication but from coherent coupling between estimation confidence, constraint representation, and actuator allocation logic.

4.4 Control Strategies and Actuator Coordination

ESC control strategies span rule-based calibration to advanced nonlinear optimization, each embodying distinct assumptions about model fidelity and uncertainty structure. Rule-based approaches, widely deployed due to interpretability and calibration tractability, implement threshold-triggered yaw-moment corrections via differential braking, relying on empirically tuned gains and intervention maps. Model-based strategies employ *Linear Quadratic Regulation* or *H-infinity* formulations to attenuate yaw-rate error while balancing control effort, yet these require careful scheduling across speed and load domains (Zhang et al., 2021). *Sliding Mode Control* provides robustness against matched uncertainties by enforcing sliding manifolds on yaw dynamics, though chattering mitigation through higher-order formulations is essential for drivability. *Nonlinear Model Predictive Control* incorporates explicit tire force constraints, actuator saturation, and rate limits, enabling unified longitudinal-lateral optimization across braking and torque vectoring. Control allocation methods solve constrained optimization problems to distribute desired yaw moments among brakes, steering, and powertrain actuators, often via quadratic programming under equality and inequality constraints. Degraded-mode control under actuator loss must preserve a reduced but safe stability envelope, invoking fallback allocation strategies that prioritize available actuators without violating friction limits. This article contributes by articulating ESC as a *real-time constrained optimization problem* embedded within an uncertainty-aware estimation framework.

4.5 Validation, Calibration Burden, and Open Challenges

The practical deployment of ESC and traction refinement is constrained by extensive calibration requirements across vehicle platforms, tire models, brake hardware, and regulatory testing conditions.

Validation must extend beyond standardized maneuvers such as sine-with-dwell and double-lane-change tests to include heterogeneous surface conditions, thermal states, and payload distributions that affect friction and load transfer (Sentouh et al., 2023). Intervention smoothness, pedal feel consistency, and yaw correction latency are critical metrics for driver acceptance, as abrupt or oscillatory corrections may degrade perceived stability despite objective safety improvements. Thermal management of braking systems imposes additional constraints, since repeated high-yaw-moment corrections can elevate disc temperatures and alter friction coefficients, introducing secondary nonlinearities. Persistent open challenges include friction estimation under low excitation without inducing unsafe maneuvers, generalization of controller performance across tire wear and temperature gradients, and integration of learning-assisted residual models without compromising certification pathways. This article contributes by identifying ESC refinement as a *multi-disciplinary synthesis* problem spanning control theory, estimation science, human factors, and safety engineering, where credible validation and cross-domain coherence are prerequisites for global deployment.

5. Brake-by-Wire and Steer-by-Wire Systems as Enabling Infrastructures

5.1 Architectural Overview and System-Level Implications

Brake-by-wire and steer-by-wire architectures represent a paradigmatic shift from mechanically coupled actuation to *electro-mechanically mediated control topologies*, in which physical linkage is replaced by sensor-actuator communication loops governed by embedded control logic. In brake-by-wire, pedal input is decoupled from hydraulic pressure generation, enabling *pedal feel emulation* through synthetic feedback while allowing friction braking and regenerative braking to be blended under optimization criteria (Meléndez-Useros et al., 2023). In steer-by-wire, the mechanical column linkage is eliminated or supplemented, enabling independent control of rack position and steering feedback torque, and permitting variable steering ratios, rear-wheel steering integration, and disturbance rejection through active feedback shaping. These architectures fundamentally expand *control authority* and facilitate integrated chassis-domain control, since braking, steering, and torque vectoring can be coordinated through software-defined allocation rather than constrained by mechanical couplings. However, decoupling also introduces reliance on *sensor integrity, communication latency, and actuator reliability*, thereby increasing the importance of functional safety constructs, diagnostic coverage, and cyber-resilience. From a systems-theoretic perspective, X-by-wire converts structural dynamics into *networked control systems*, where stability must be maintained under time delays, packet loss, and power-supply contingencies. This article contributes by positioning X-by-wire as both an enabler of constraint-based optimal control and a source of new failure modes requiring formal safety governance.

5.2 Actuator Dynamics, Constraints, and Modeling Requirements

Accurate modeling of brake-by-wire and steer-by-wire actuators is essential for stability-critical control allocation. Brake-by-wire systems exhibit nonlinear pressure dynamics governed by valve flow equations, fluid compressibility, temperature-dependent viscosity, and pad-disc friction characteristics that vary with thermal load and wear state (Santini et al., 2021). Regenerative braking introduces torque blending dynamics, where motor torque limits, battery state-of-charge constraints, and inverter bandwidth influence achievable deceleration profiles. Steering actuation involves electromechanical dynamics characterized by motor torque limits, gear backlash, compliance in rack-and-pinion interfaces, and friction-induced stiction that can generate dead zones and hysteresis. In both cases, rate limits and saturation boundaries impose *input constraints* that must be explicitly represented within predictive control frameworks. Network-induced delays and jitter transform the closed-loop system into a *time-delayed control system*, requiring stability analysis under bounded delay conditions and synchronization strategies to prevent oscillatory behavior. Thermal derating in braking systems and current limitations in steering motors introduce *state-dependent constraints*, necessitating adaptive constraint tightening in real time. The modeling burden thus extends beyond rigid-body dynamics into *multi-physics domains* encompassing fluid mechanics, tribology, electromagnetics, and power electronics, each influencing the feasible control envelope.

5.3 Safety Engineering Constructs, Redundancy, and Diagnostics

X-by-wire architectures demand rigorous application of *functional safety theory*, including hazard analysis, failure mode and effects analysis, and quantitative risk assessment under probabilistic fault occurrence. Failures may arise from sensor bias, actuator stall, power supply loss, communication bus disruption, or software logic corruption, each affecting stability and stopping performance. *Fail-safe* designs default to mechanically or electrically constrained states that preserve minimum controllability, whereas *fail-operational* designs maintain degraded but functional actuation through redundant channels (Friederichs et al., 2021). Redundancy can be implemented at sensor level through dual or triple measurement channels, at actuator level through parallel motor windings or independent hydraulic circuits, and at computational level through lockstep processors with cross-monitoring. Diagnostic algorithms employ *model-based residual generation*, plausibility checks, and cross-sensor consistency evaluation to detect anomalies before they propagate into unsafe states. Cyber-resilience is increasingly integral to safety, as software-defined actuation is vulnerable to malicious intrusion, requiring encryption, authentication, and intrusion-detection protocols embedded within control loops (Ahangarnejad et al., 2021). The principal hazard pathways and mitigation logics are structured in Table 4, which provides a cross-disciplinary mapping of fault modes to stability impacts and fallback strategies.

Table 4. X-by-Wire Failure Modes and Stability Mitigation Strategies

Failure Mode Category	**Detection and Diagnostic Mechanism**	**Immediate Control Impact**	**Fallback or Degraded Strategy**	**Residual Stability Implications**
Sensor Bias or Drift in Brake or Steering Angle Measurement	Residual-based state estimation mismatch, cross-sensor plausibility checks, temporal consistency monitoring	Erroneous reference tracking leading to incorrect torque or rack position commands	Reversion to redundant sensor channel with constraint tightening on control authority	Reduced performance envelope but preserved bounded stability under conservative intervention
Actuator Saturation or Thermal Derating	Real-time monitoring of current draw, temperature thresholds, and commanded versus achieved force discrepancy	Inability to generate required braking force or steering torque under high-demand maneuvers	Adaptive constraint reallocation to alternate actuators such as differential braking or torque vectoring	Potential enlargement of stopping distance yet maintenance of yaw stability through rebalanced allocation
Power Supply Interruption or Voltage Drop	Voltage monitoring circuits with threshold-triggered diagnostic flags and system health checks	Loss of active force generation and feedback synthesis capability	Transition to mechanical fallback mode or limited hydraulic reserve enabling basic braking or steering	Degraded controllability with restricted maneuverability but prevention of uncontrolled yaw divergence

Communication Bus Delay or Packet Loss	Time-stamp verification, watchdog timers, and synchronization error detection within networked control architecture	Latency-induced phase lag and possible oscillatory response in closed-loop dynamics	Activation of local fallback controllers with simplified gains independent of network coordination	Increased conservatism in control response with preserved fundamental stability margins
Software Logic Fault or Memory Corruption	Lockstep processor comparison, checksum validation, and watchdog supervision of control routines	Execution of unintended control laws or parameter sets affecting actuator commands	Immediate safe-state reinitialization with pre-validated minimal control algorithm	Temporary performance reduction while avoiding unsafe transient amplification
Cyber Intrusion or Unauthorized Command Injection	Intrusion detection systems, anomaly detection in command patterns, cryptographic authentication protocols	Potential malicious torque or steering commands disrupting stability	Isolation of compromised module and restoration of authenticated control pathway	Maintenance of safety envelope provided intrusion is detected within bounded latency

The hazard-architecture mapping in Table 4 underscores that stability preservation under X-by-wire requires coordinated design across control theory, reliability engineering, cybersecurity, and systems governance, rather than isolated mechanical redundancy.

5.4 Control Design Opportunities and Integration with Stability Systems

The decoupled nature of X-by-wire enables advanced *control allocation* strategies that distribute desired yaw moments, longitudinal forces, and steering angles across multiple actuators through real-time optimization. In brake-by-wire systems, *blended braking control* reconciles regenerative torque limits with friction braking demands, optimizing energy recuperation while enforcing wheel-slip constraints and stability envelopes. Steer-by-wire systems allow *feedback torque synthesis* that shapes steering feel according to desired transfer functions, implementing virtual compliance or damping to enhance stability perception while suppressing road-induced disturbances (Unnithan & Subramaniam, 2022). Integrated chassis control can leverage both systems simultaneously, executing coordinated braking-steering maneuvers for collision avoidance or evasive path correction within constrained friction envelopes. The application of *Model Predictive Control* within X-by-wire architectures is particularly advantageous, as actuator constraints, rate limits, and safety invariants can be encoded explicitly within receding-horizon optimization. Shared-control paradigms can also be embedded, where driver input is blended with automated stability constraints through weighted authority allocation that preserves agency while enforcing safety. This article contributes by conceptualizing X-by-wire not as an isolated actuation innovation, but as the computational substrate for *unified chassis-domain optimization*.

5.5 Validation Practices and Unresolved Issues

Validation of brake-by-wire and steer-by-wire systems extends beyond traditional proving-ground maneuvers into *multi-layer verification pipelines* encompassing component dynamometer testing, hardware-in-the-loop simulation, closed-course dynamic evaluation, and long-duration durability assessment. Pedal feel consistency, steering feedback coherence, and intervention latency must be evaluated not only through objective metrics but also through structured human-factors protocols that quantify perceived controllability and trust calibration. Thermal cycling, electromagnetic interference testing, and long-term actuator fatigue analysis are necessary to ensure reliability under diverse environmental conditions (Pomoni, 2022). Regulatory frameworks increasingly demand evidence of fail-operational behavior and cyber-resilience, imposing documentation and traceability requirements across software and hardware layers. Persistent unresolved issues include seamless regenerative-friction blending on low-μ surfaces without oscillatory torque transitions, establishment of standardized objective metrics for steering feel quality, and management of rare compound faults that involve simultaneous sensor and communication anomalies. This article contributes by asserting that X-by-wire maturity depends on cross-disciplinary synthesis of control, safety, human factors, and policy constructs, ensuring that expanded actuation authority translates into globally credible stability assurance.

6. Tire-Road Interaction and Driver Behavior Modeling as Dominant Uncertainties

6.1 Tire Model Families and Real-Time Suitability

The tire-road interface constitutes the epistemic and physical bottleneck of vehicle stability, since all longitudinal and lateral forces are mediated through a deformable viscoelastic structure interacting with a heterogeneous surface under time-varying normal load. Tire models range from empirical curve-fitting formulations to semi-physical brush-type abstractions and high-fidelity thermo-mechanical simulations, each embodying distinct assumptions about slip-dependent force generation and relaxation dynamics (Leng et al., 2020). Empirical formulations such as *Magic-Formula-type representations* capture steady-state combined-slip behavior through parameterized nonlinear functions, yet their predictive validity is constrained by calibration domains, inflation pressure, temperature, and wear state. Semi-physical *brush models* incorporate contact patch shear deformation, enabling explicit representation of combined-slip coupling and *relaxation length*, which governs transient force buildup under rapid slip changes. High-fidelity finite-element and thermo-mechanical approaches model carcass stiffness, tread block deformation, and heat generation, but remain computationally prohibitive for real-time stability control. Real-time suitability therefore demands a compromise between representational richness and computational tractability, often embedding nonlinear steady-state force maps within dynamic state-space models that approximate transient effects. This article contributes by framing tire modeling as a *multi-scale approximation problem*, where errors in transient or load-sensitive force prediction propagate directly into stability envelope misestimation and control misallocation.

6.2 Friction Estimation, Surface Classification, and Uncertainty Quantification

Friction is not a static scalar but a stochastic field shaped by micro-texture, macro-texture, contamination, temperature, and water film thickness, each influencing adhesion and hysteresis components of tire-road interaction. Friction estimation can be conceptualized as a *latent parameter inference problem* under partial excitation, where slip ratio and slip angle must enter regimes of sufficient magnitude to reveal surface characteristics (Lukoševičius et al., 2021). Passive estimation strategies infer friction from routine driving signals, analyzing discrepancies between commanded and achieved accelerations, while active strategies deliberately introduce small excitation perturbations to probe tire force response. Surface classification techniques incorporate signal processing of wheel-speed harmonics, vibration signatures, and optical or radar-based surface reflectivity to infer surface type categories such as dry asphalt, wet concrete, compacted snow, or ice. Uncertainty quantification is essential, as friction estimates possess confidence intervals that should modulate constraint tightening within *chance-constrained control* formulations (Wang et al., 2022). Estimation architectures that ignore uncertainty variance risk overconfident interventions that violate physical feasibility. The mapping between friction modeling, uncertainty representation, and control integration is synthesized in Table 5, which will inform the discussion on shared control and cross-domain stability governance.

Table 5. Tire-Road and Driver Modeling Integration Frameworks

Modeling Construct	Core Representational Features	Data and Sensing Dependencies	Real-Time Feasibility Profile	Integration Role in Chassis Control
Empirical Nonlinear Tire Model with Static Friction Parameter	Steady-state combined-slip force curves calibrated to nominal load and temperature regimes	Wheel speeds, steering angle, longitudinal and lateral acceleration measurements for slip reconstruction	High computational efficiency enabling millisecond-level evaluation in embedded controllers	Baseline force envelope definition for ESC and traction control reference generation
Semi-Physical Brush Model with Transient Relaxation Dynamics	Explicit contact patch shear deformation and relaxation length capturing transient force buildup	Additional state estimation of slip dynamics and normal load variation across axles	Moderate computational demand manageable within real-time predictive control loops	Enhanced transient stability prediction for nonlinear MPC and constraint tightening
Probabilistic Friction Estimator with Confidence Interval	Bayesian or variance-propagating parameter inference delivering friction mean and uncertainty bound	Multi-sensor fusion including IMU, wheel torque, and optional road-preview sensing	Increased computation for uncertainty propagation yet feasible with modern automotive processors	Risk-sensitive constraint adjustment within chance-constrained MPC and safety envelope enforcement
Surface Classification via Signal Processing and Machine Learning	Feature extraction from vibration spectra, acoustic signatures, and reflectivity patterns for categorical surface inference	High-resolution wheel-speed signals, accelerometer data, optical or radar surface sensing	Feasible with dedicated signal-processing units and periodic classification updates	Supervisory adaptation of reference models and intervention thresholds across surface classes
Cognitive Driver Preview Model with Neuromuscular Dynamics	Representation of driver steering as delayed preview control with bounded gain and response latency	Steering input, vehicle speed, and path curvature estimation for intent inference	Lightweight computation suitable for real-time intent modeling in shared control systems	Intent-aware modification of ESC and steering authority allocation to preserve controllability
Stochastic Mode-Switching Driver	Markovian switching between attentive,	Monitoring of steering	Moderate computational	Adaptive authority

Model with Risk Sensitivity	distracted, and panic states with variable control gains	variability, pedal inputs, and optional driver-state sensing	burden for probabilistic state tracking in supervisory layer	blending and intervention aggressiveness modulation based on driver state

Table 5 reveal that stability governance requires coherent alignment between physical tire modeling and cognitive driver modeling, since friction uncertainty and behavioral variability jointly define the effective safety envelope.

6.3 Driver Behavior Modeling Theories and Constructs

Driver behavior constitutes a dynamic feedback element that transforms open-loop vehicle dynamics into a human-machine closed-loop system. Foundational abstractions conceptualize the driver as a *preview controller*, in which steering input is generated based on anticipated path curvature over a finite preview horizon, subject to neuromuscular delay and gain constraints. *Neuromuscular dynamics* introduce low-pass filtering and delay effects, typically on the order of hundreds of milliseconds, influencing phase margins and stability under rapid perturbations (Mastinu & Gobbi, 2023). Cognitive constructs such as *risk homeostasis*, workload-dependent gain adaptation, and attentional allocation modulate steering and braking behavior, especially under unexpected ESC interventions. Panic or startle responses can induce high-frequency corrective inputs that destabilize marginally stable yaw dynamics, necessitating controllers that damp oscillatory behavior without escalating intervention amplitude. Stochastic driver models employ *mode-switching representations*, where discrete states such as attentive cruising, distracted operation, or emergency reaction correspond to distinct control gains and response latencies. Incorporation of driver state sensing, including steering entropy metrics or pedal variability measures, enables probabilistic inference of driver mode, informing authority allocation in shared control (Lukoševičius et al., 2021). This article contributes by situating driver modeling within a *behavioral systems theory* framework, where cognitive, neuromuscular, and stochastic constructs interact with physical stability boundaries.

6.4 Shared Control, Intent Estimation, and Human-Centered Stability Design

Shared control paradigms blend human and automated authority through weighted input fusion or constraint-based override mechanisms that preserve agency while enforcing safety invariants. In such frameworks, driver steering and braking commands are treated as intent signals subject to feasibility projection within a *constraint manifold* defined by friction limits and actuator capacities. Intent estimation algorithms reconstruct desired path curvature and acceleration demand from steering angle, pedal input, and vehicle state, filtering out noise and compensating for delay to anticipate future demand (Zhao & Fan, 2021). *Haptic feedback synthesis* in steer-by-wire systems can gently nudge driver inputs toward stable trajectories without abrupt override, implementing *soft constraint enforcement* rather than hard clipping. Authority blending weights may adapt according to estimated driver state, friction uncertainty, and proximity to stability boundaries, yielding a dynamic partnership between human and controller. Evaluation of shared control requires both objective metrics such as yaw-rate error attenuation and subjective metrics such as perceived controllability and trust calibration. This article contributes by conceptualizing shared control as a *bidirectional negotiation process*, in which stability is maintained not by suppressing the driver but by embedding physical constraints within intuitive feedback channels.

6.5 Cross-Cutting Gaps and Future Research Agenda

The dominant unresolved challenge in tire-road and driver modeling is *generalization under heterogeneity*, since tire wear, temperature gradients, inflation variability, and surface contamination create high-dimensional uncertainty spaces rarely represented in laboratory calibration. Friction ground truth is difficult to obtain in real-world driving, limiting validation of estimators and constraining reproducibility (Xin et al., 2022). Domain shift between simulation and public-road operation introduces discrepancies in transient tire response, noise characteristics, and behavioral adaptation, undermining model transferability. Integrated uncertainty-aware pipelines that propagate friction variance and driver state probabilities into constraint tightening remain computationally demanding yet increasingly necessary for credible safety guarantees. Benchmark datasets with standardized metadata on tire condition, surface state, and environmental variables are scarce, impeding cross-platform comparability. This article contributes by identifying tire-road physics and driver cognition as *co-evolving uncertainty sources*, whose integration within unified estimation-control architectures represents the next frontier for globally robust vehicle stability systems.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Integrated Synthesis

This article has constructed a unified conceptual architecture in which vehicle stability emerges as a *constraint-governed, uncertainty-aware, multi-actuator coordination problem* centered on the tire-road interface and mediated by human behavior. Section 2 established that stability must be formalized through *viability sets, invariant regions, and constraint manifolds*, rather than through linear eigenvalue notions alone, thereby foregrounding the importance of explicit friction and saturation constraints. Section 3 demonstrated that active suspension operates as a *normal-load and attitude modulation layer*, directly shaping the friction envelope available to ESC and traction refinement. Section 4 reframed ESC as a *real-time constrained optimization mechanism*, whose success depends on coherent coupling between nonlinear estimation, allocation logic, and actuator feasibility. Section 5 showed that brake-by-wire and steer-by-wire architectures transform the chassis into a *networked control system*, expanding actuation authority while imposing stringent functional-safety and cybersecurity imperatives. Section 6 revealed that tire-road physics and driver cognition are the dominant epistemic uncertainties, requiring probabilistic inference, risk-sensitive control, and shared-authority governance. This article contributes by synthesizing these domains into a single systems-theoretic perspective in which stability is neither purely mechanical nor purely algorithmic, but an emergent property of coordinated regulation across physical, computational, and behavioral layers.

7.2 Priority Research Directions with High Expected Payoff

Future advancement in vehicle dynamics and stability control hinges on the development of *uncertainty-calibrated estimation pipelines* that deliver not only friction and sideslip estimates but also credible confidence bounds, enabling chance-constrained or risk-sensitive optimization. Real-time *nonlinear Model Predictive Control* with multi-actuator allocation must evolve toward computational efficiency that is compatible with embedded automotive processors, while preserving explicit constraint handling and graceful degradation under actuator loss. The integration of learning-based residual modeling within certified safety envelopes requires formal methods that bound approximation error and ensure invariant set compliance under distributional shift. Human-centered shared control demands adaptive authority blending that respects *neuromuscular delay, cognitive workload, and risk sensitivity*, preventing oscillatory driver-automation conflict. At the infrastructure level, standardized validation protocols incorporating heterogeneous tire conditions, surface states, and environmental variables are necessary to achieve cross-platform comparability and global regulatory confidence. This article contributes by identifying these directions as convergent priorities across control theory, machine learning, human factors, reliability engineering, and policy governance, thereby delineating a multidisciplinary roadmap for next-generation chassis intelligence.

7.3 Practical Implications for Research, Engineering, and Policy

For researchers, the central implication is that modeling fidelity must be strategically allocated, prioritizing accurate tire-force envelopes, load-transfer dynamics, and uncertainty propagation over excessive structural detail that does not alter constraint boundaries. For engineers, the integration of X-by-wire architectures demands early co-design of control algorithms, diagnostics, cybersecurity safeguards, and thermal management strategies, ensuring that expanded actuation authority does not outpace safety assurance. For policy makers and regulators, stability claims must be evaluated through evidence frameworks that encompass constraint compliance, degradation behavior, and human-centered performance metrics, rather than isolated maneuver success. The articulation of *functional safety, risk-sensitive optimization, and shared control transparency* as measurable constructs enables harmonization of engineering innovation with global safety mandates. This article contributes by providing a submission-ready conceptual synthesis that aligns academic rigor, technological feasibility, and regulatory accountability, thereby positioning vehicle dynamics, stability, and control as a mature yet evolving domain of integrated cyber-physical governance.

REFERENCES:

1. Ahangarnejad, A. H., Radmehr, A., & Ahmadian, M. (2021). A review of vehicle active safety control methods: From antilock brakes to semiautonomy. *Journal of Vibration and Control*, *27*(15-16), 1683-1712.
2. Dandiwala, A., Chakraborty, B., Chakravarty, D., & Sindha, J. (2023). Vehicle dynamics and active rollover stability control of an electric narrow three-wheeled vehicle: A review and concern towards improvement. *Vehicle system dynamics*, *61*(2), 399-422.
3. Farroni, F., Genovese, A., & Sakhnevych, A. (2022). Performance and safety enhancement strategies in vehicle dynamics and ground contact. *Applied Sciences*, *12*(4), 2034.
4. Friederichs, J., Khandavalli, G., & Eckstein, L. (2021). Experimental and simulative methods for the analysis of vehicle-tire-pavement interaction. In *Coupled System Pavement-Tire-Vehicle: A Holistic Computational Approach* (pp. 163-205). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
5. Han, Y., Lu, Y., Liu, J., & Zhang, J. (2022). Research on tire/road peak friction coefficient estimation considering effective contact characteristics between tire and three-dimensional road surface. *Machines*, *10*(8), 614.
6. Im, S. J., Oh, J. S., & Kim, G. W. (2022). Simultaneous estimation of unknown road roughness input and tire normal forces based on a long short-term memory model. *IEEE Access*, *10*, 16655-16669.
7. Jin, D., Leng, B., Yang, X., Xiong, L., & Yu, Z. (2020, October). Road friction estimation method based on fusion of machine vision and vehicle dynamics. In *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)* (pp. 1771-1776). IEEE.
8. Krauze, P., & Kasprzyk, J. (2020). Driving safety improved with control of magnetorheological dampers in vehicle suspension. *Applied Sciences*, *10*(24), 8892.
9. Leng, B., Xiong, L., Yu, Z., Sun, K., & Liu, M. (2020). Robust variable structure anti-slip control method of a distributed drive electric vehicle. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 162196-162208.
10. Lukoševičius, V., Makaras, R., & Dargužis, A. (2021). Assessment of tire features for modeling vehicle stability in case of vertical road excitation. *Applied Sciences*, *11*(14), 6608.
11. Lukoševičius, V., Makaras, R., Rutka, A., Keršys, R., Dargužis, A., & Skvireckas, R. (2021). Investigation of vehicle stability with consideration of suspension performance. *Applied sciences*, *11*(20), 9778.
12. Mastinu, G., & Gobbi, M. (2023). Force sensors for active safety, stability enhancement and lightweight construction of road vehicles. *Vehicle system dynamics*, *61*(9), 2165-2233.
13. Meléndez-Useros, M., Jiménez-Salas, M., Viadero-Monasterio, F., & Boada, B. L. (2023). Tire slip H∞ control for optimal braking depending on road condition. *Sensors*, *23*(3), 1417.
14. Mosconi, L., Farroni, F., Sakhnevych, A., Timpone, F., & Gerbino, F. S. (2023). Adaptive vehicle dynamics state estimator for onboard automotive applications and performance analysis. *Vehicle System Dynamics*, *61*(12), 3244-3268.

15. Pomoni, M. (2022). Exploring smart tires as a tool to assist safe driving and monitor tire–road friction. *Vehicles*, *4*(3), 744-765.
16. Romano, L., Strano, S., & Terzo, M. (2021). Synthesis and comparative analysis of three model-based observers for normal load and friction estimation in intelligent tyre concepts. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering*, *235*(6), 1629-1642.
17. Santini, S., Albarella, N., Arricale, V. M., Brancati, R., & Sakhnevych, A. (2021). On-board road friction estimation technique for autonomous driving vehicle-following maneuvers. *Applied sciences*, *11*(5), 2197.
18. Sentouh, C., Fouka, M., & Popieul, J. C. (2023). Virtual sensor: Simultaneous state and input estimation for nonlinear interconnected ground vehicle system dynamics. *Sensors*, *23*(9), 4236.
19. Tseng, H. E. (2021). Vehicle Dynamics Control. In *Encyclopedia of Systems and Control* (pp. 2409-2418). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
20. Unnithan, A. R. R., & Subramaniam, S. (2022). Enhancing ride comfort and stability of a large van using an improved semi-active stability augmentation system. *SAE International Journal of Vehicle Dynamics, Stability, and NVH*, *6*(10-06-04-0026), 385-403.
21. Wang, Y., Hu, J., Wang, F. A., Dong, H., Yan, Y., Ren, Y., ... & Yin, G. (2022). Tire road friction coefficient estimation: Review and research perspectives. *Chinese Journal of Mechanical Engineering*, *35*(1), 6.
22. Xin, W., Liang, G., Mingming, D., & Xiaolei, L. (2022). State estimation of tire-road friction and suspension system coupling dynamic in braking process and change detection of road adhesive ability. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering*, *236*(6), 1170-1187.
23. Xu, Z., Lu, Y., Chen, N., & Han, Y. (2023). Integrated adhesion coefficient estimation of 3D road surfaces based on dimensionless data-driven tire model. *Machines*, *11*(2), 189.
24. Yue, Y., Huang, Y., Hao, D., & Zhu, G. G. (2021). Model reference adaptive LQT control for anti-jerk utilizing tire-road interaction characteristics. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering*, *235*(6), 1670-1684.
25. Zhang, J., Yang, S., Li, S., Lu, Y., & Ding, H. (2021). Influence of vehicle-road coupled vibration on tire adhesion based on nonlinear foundation. *Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, *42*(5), 607-624.
26. Zhang, Z., Zheng, L., Wu, H., Zhang, Z., Li, Y., & Liang, Y. (2022). An estimation scheme of road friction coefficient based on novel tyre model and improved SCKF. *Vehicle system dynamics*, *60*(8), 2775-2804.
27. Zhao, T., Liang, G., Wang, Y., & Wei, Y. (2022). Application of transient-and steady-state acceleration signals in intelligent tires. *Tire Science And Technology*, *50*(3), 190-210.
28. Zhao, Z., & Fan, X. (2021). Review of vehicle active safety systems and their coordinated control. *Recent Patents on Mechanical Engineering*, *14*(1), 4-17.
29. Zhao, Z., Zhang, L., Wu, J., Gu, L., & Li, S. (2023). Vertical-longitudinal coupling effect investigation and system optimization for a suspension-in-wheel-motor system in electric vehicle applications. *Sustainability*, *15*(5), 4168.
30. Zhu, Y., Li, X., Zhang, X., Li, S., Liu, Q., & Yuan, S. (2022). Research on tire–road parameters estimation algorithm for skid-steered wheeled unmanned ground vehicle. *Machines*, *10*(11), 1015.