

# Reinforcement Learning-Based Simulation of Semi-Active Suspension Systems in Quarter-Car Model

Dhananjay S. Jawale<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Kishor R. Borole<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar - Mechanical Engineering, Sinhgad College of Engineering (SCOE), Vadgaon (Budruk), Pune, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra, India.

<sup>2</sup>Professor - Mechanical Engineering, Smt. Kashibai Navale College of Engineering, Vadgaon, Pune, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra, India.

**Emails:** [dhananjay.jawale@gmail.com](mailto:dhananjay.jawale@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [kishorborole1@gmail.com](mailto:kishorborole1@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

*This study investigates the application of reinforcement learning (RL) techniques for simulating and managing semi-active suspension systems within a quarter-car model framework. Conventional controllers, such as PID and skyhook, typically depend on fixed parameters and simplified system assumptions, which can restrict their effectiveness when faced with nonlinear and variable road conditions. RL, on the other hand, provides a flexible, model-free control methodology that learns optimal strategies through continuous interaction with the vehicle's dynamic environment. In this work, three RL algorithms - Deep Q-Network (DQN), Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO), and Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) are utilized to reduce body acceleration and tire displacement, thereby enhancing both ride quality and handling performance. Simulation studies conducted on a range of road disturbances, including sinusoidal, step, and random profiles, reveal that RL-driven controllers outperform traditional approaches in terms of adaptability, robustness, and smooth control actions. The results highlight RL's capability to deliver efficient suspension control without requiring explicit system models or extensive manual tuning, demonstrating strong generalization to previously unseen conditions. These benefits underscore the potential of reinforcement learning as a powerful tool for developing intelligent, autonomous suspension systems in modern vehicles.*

**Keywords:** Adaptive control, Deep Q-network, Proximal policy optimization, Quarter-car model, Reinforcement learning.

## 1. Introduction

Advancements in automotive systems demand improved ride comfort, vehicle stability, and adaptability to diverse road profiles. Suspension systems directly influence these factors by isolating passengers from road irregularities while maintaining tire contact with the ground [1], [2]. Conventional passive suspension systems are simple and reliable but cannot adapt to changing conditions. To overcome this limitation, active and semi-active suspensions were introduced, enabling real-time damping adjustments [3]. Machine learning (ML), and more specifically reinforcement learning (RL), has emerged as a powerful approach for such control problems. Unlike classical model-based methods, RL learns policies through interaction with the environment, making it well-suited for systems with

nonlinear and uncertain dynamics such as suspension control [4], [5]. Recent deep RL advances enable efficient continuous control, offering strong adaptability to unseen conditions [10]–[14].

### 1.1. Semi-Active Suspension Systems

Suspension systems are broadly classified as follows [2], [3]:

- **Passive suspensions:** use fixed springs and dampers, low-cost but inflexible.
- **Active suspensions:** employ actuators to apply external forces, achieving optimal comfort but with high complexity and energy demands.
- **Semi-active suspensions:** utilize variable dampers (e.g., magnetorheological) to

modulate damping in real time. Semi-active designs balance performance and efficiency, making them attractive for modern vehicles. The main objective is to regulate damping for improved ride comfort, handling, and stability. RL enables autonomous optimization of damping without requiring explicit models or manual parameter tuning [4], [10].

## 2. Related Work

Classical controllers such as PID and skyhook remain popular for suspension systems [3]. While computationally efficient, they are limited in nonlinear and time-varying scenarios. Alternatives like sliding mode and fuzzy control provide more flexibility but require detailed modelling and are prone to stability issues. RL has achieved significant success in complex control domains. DQN demonstrated human-level decision-making [5], while PPO [6] and DDPG [7] advanced continuous control. In the automotive sector, RL has been applied to active suspension [8] and adaptive cruise control [9]. More recently, researchers have focused on semi-active suspensions, confirming RL's advantages in robustness and comfort improvements [10]–[14].

## 3. System Model and Problem Formulation

### 3.1. Quarter-Car Model

The quarter-car model represents vertical vehicle dynamics with two degrees of freedom: sprung mass ( $m_s$ ) and unsprung mass ( $m_u$ ). Parameters include suspension stiffness ( $k_s$ ), tire stiffness ( $k_t$ ), and variable damping coefficient ( $c$ ).

### 3.2. Governing Equations

$$m_s \ddot{z}_s = -k_s(z_s - z_u) - c(t)(\dot{z}_s - \dot{z}_u)$$

$$m_u \ddot{z}_u = k_s(z_s - z_u) + c(t)(\dot{z}_s - \dot{z}_u) - k_t(z_u - z_r).$$

### 3.3. Control Objective

The damping coefficient is constrained as:

$$c_{\min} \leq c(t) \leq c_{\max}$$

The damping force is:

$$F_d(t) = c(t)(\dot{z}_s - \dot{z}_u)$$

The cost function combines ride comfort and handling:

$$J = \int_0^T [\alpha \ddot{z}_s(t)^2 + \beta (z_u(t) - z_r(t))^2] dt,$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are weighting coefficients.

## 4. Simulation Environment

- **State space:**  $[z_s, \dot{z}_s, z_u, \dot{z}_u, z_r]$ .
- **Action space:** damping coefficient bounded by  $[c_{\min}, c_{\max}]$ .
- **Reward function:** negative weighted sum of body acceleration and tire deflection.
- **Road profiles:** sinusoidal, step, and random disturbances.

The environment is built in Python with numerical solvers (1–10 ms timestep).

## 5. Reinforcement Learning Algorithms

- **DQN:** Q-learning with neural network approximation for discretized actions [5].
- **PPO:** policy gradient with clipped objectives for stability and continuous actions [6].
- **DDPG:** actor-critic with deterministic policies for sample-efficient continuous control [7].

## 6. Simulation Setup

### 6.1. Vehicle Parameters

**Table 1 Quarter-Car Model Parameters**

Parameter	Symbol	Value	Unit
Sprung mass	$m_s$	290	kg
Unsprung mass	$m_u$	59	kg
Suspension stiffness	$k_s$	16,000	N/m
Tire stiffness	$k_t$	190,000	N/m
Damping range	$c_{\min}$ – $c_{\max}$	100–1000	Ns/m

### 6.2. Road Inputs

- Sinusoidal with varying frequency.
- Step inputs (bumps).
- Random stochastic disturbances [2].

### 6.3. RL Training Parameters

**Table 2 Reinforcement Learning Training Parameters**

Parameter	DQN	PPO	DDPG
Learning rate	0.001	0.0003	0.001
Discount factor ( $\gamma$ )	0.99	0.99	0.99
Batch size	64	64	64
Replay buffer	100,000	–	100,000
Training episodes	1000	1000	1000

## 7. Results and Discussion

### 7.1. Performance Metrics

**Table 3 Performance Comparison of Suspension Controllers**

Controller	RMS Acceleration (m/s <sup>2</sup> )	RMS Tire Deflection (m)	Energy Proxy (J)
Passive	1.85	0.010	–
PID	1.30	0.007	15.2
Skyhook	1.12	0.006	13.8
DQN	1.05	0.0055	12.5
PPO	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.0048</b>	<b>11.2</b>
DDPG	0.98	0.0050	11.7

### 7.2. Analysis

The RL-based controllers achieve lower acceleration and tire deflection compared to classical controllers. PPO demonstrates the best balance, while DDPG yields smoother damping profiles. Unlike DQN, which discretizes damping actions, PPO and DDPG exploit continuous spaces, improving efficiency.

Under random road inputs, RL controllers preserve performance, confirming robustness and generalization.

### Conclusion

This study presented reinforcement learning-based semi-active suspension control using a quarter-car model. PPO and DDPG demonstrated superior performance relative to classical controllers, highlighting RL's ability to handle nonlinear and uncertain conditions. The model-free and adaptive nature of RL makes it a promising candidate for future suspension technologies. Future work includes hardware-in-the-loop validation and extension to full-vehicle dynamics.

### References

- [1].M. Blundell and D. Harty, *The Multibody Systems Approach to Vehicle Dynamics*. Elsevier, 2004.
- [2].J. Y. Wong, *Theory of Ground Vehicles*, 4th ed. Wiley, 2008.
- [3].R. C. Smith, "Semi-active suspension control: A review," *Vehicle System*

- Dynamics*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 169–189, 2002.
- [4].K. P. Murphy, *Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective*. MIT Press, 2012.
- [5].V. Mnih et al., "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, 2015.
- [6].J. Schulman et al., "Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [7].T. Lillicrap et al., "Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- [8].S. Zhang et al., "Deep reinforcement learning for active suspension control," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 2699–2710, 2020.
- [9].M. Hwangbo et al., "Learning agile and dynamic motor skills for legged robots," *Science Robotics*, vol. 4, no. 26, 2019.
- [10].L. Yang et al., "Reinforcement learning-based semi-active suspension control: A survey," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 1467–1492, 2023.
- [11].S. K. Singh and R. Kumar, "Model-free reinforcement learning control for semi-active suspension systems," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 118, 2022.
- [12].J. Zhao, H. Wang, and Y. Wu, "Deep deterministic policy gradient-based suspension control," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1595–1605, 2021.
- [13].X. Li, Y. Zhang, and M. Chen, "Adaptive semi-active suspension control using proximal policy optimization," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 120, 2024.
- [14].Y. Chen, Z. Liu, and X. Wang, "Semi-active suspension system design using deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 11115–11126, 2023.