

Joint torques prediction of a robotic arm using neural networks

Giulia d'Addato^{1,5}, Ruggero Carli², Eurico Pedrosa³, Artur Pereira³, Luigi Palopoli⁴, Daniele Fontanelli⁵

Abstract—Accurate dynamic models are crucial for many robotic applications. Traditional approaches to deriving these models are based on the application of Lagrangian or Newtonian mechanics. Although these methods provide a good insight into the physical behaviour of the system, they rely on the exact knowledge of parameters such as inertia, friction and joint flexibility. In addition, the system is often affected by uncertain and nonlinear effects, such as saturation and dead zones, which can be difficult to model. A popular alternative is the application of Machine Learning (ML) techniques - e.g., Neural Networks (NNs) - in the context of a “black-box” methodology. This paper reports on our experience with this approach for a real-life 6 degrees of freedom (DoF) manipulator. Specifically, we considered several NN architectures: single NN, multiple NNs, and cascade NN. We compared the performance of the system by using different policies for selecting the NN hyperparameters. Our experiments reveal that the best accuracy and performance are obtained by a cascade NN, in which we encode our prior physical knowledge about the dependencies between joints, complemented by an appropriate optimisation of the hyperparameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the major problems in the robotics field is the identification of dynamic models. The problem is becoming increasingly important in a class of emerging applications where the control of contact forces and torques between the robot and the environment is a crucial safety concern [1], [2]. For instance, in the context of human-robot cooperation, safety is essential and requires the implementation of appropriate algorithms to control and limit the forces exerted on the operator when s/he comes into contact with the robot [3], [4]. An accurate knowledge of the torques of each joint is key to the design of this type of controller and is the main motivation behind the present work.

The most immediate way of reconstructing the information about the joint torques is by direct measurement. This solution requires a set of sensors placed at each joint. However, this approach is expensive, firstly because the hardware is expensive in its own right, and secondly because the system requires frequent maintenance operations to recalibrate the sensors.

A possible alternative is to model the dynamics of the system, which relates the torques to the joint state variables (see Equation (1)). This approach is affected by two main issues: (1) the physical parameters are difficult to identify due to the nonlinearity of the system; (2) there are several sources of uncertain dynamic effects (e.g., dead zones and saturation), which are unknown or difficult to model.

In these cases, ML techniques come to the rescue. Specifically, modelling the system by using a black-box approach allows us to use an NN to learn the complex relationship within the data, also generalising across a wide range of scenarios and adapting to changes in the system configuration. In particular, NNs hold the promise to capture the workings of factors such as friction, inertia and nonlinear behaviour. This promising avenue requires a proper understanding of the most suitable NN architecture for the problem at hand and of its hyperparameters.

In this paper, we investigate the aforementioned problem in a specific application scenario: the prediction of the joint torques of a 6 DoF industrial robotic arm. Our key contribution lies in the design and implementation of three distinct NN architectures. The core problem is how to exploit the dependencies between the joints, and each of the three solutions addresses this in a different way. The first architecture neglects these dependencies altogether and attempts to learn them from the data. The second one takes the dependencies into account by employing three separate NNs for each joint group. The third one adopts a hybrid approach that maintains joint groupings while also incorporating inter-group dependencies.

The selection of the optimal model is influenced by a cost function that evaluates the prediction error and depends on the choice of NN hyperparameters. In this work, we considered the prediction error as a performance metric and our experimental results show that the hybrid architecture is the most accurate one when accompanied by an adequate optimisation of the hyperparameters.

II. RELATED WORKS

The development of human-robot collaboration is leading to high safety requirements. Since the need for interaction and proximity to the user requires the robotic arm to be aware of its surroundings, motion control and force computation must be as accurate as possible, especially when the robot is moving at high speed. The problem of force/torque prediction in modern robotic assistants has been approached from various perspectives. In general, the difficulty of the prediction is due to the nonlinear dynamics, the uncertainties in the parameter values and the disturbances not considered

¹ Project co-funded by the European Union – Next Generation Eu - under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Mission 4 Component 1 Investment 4.1 - Decree No. 118 (2/03/2023) of Italian Ministry of University and Research - Concession Decree No. 2333 (22/12/2023) of the Italian Ministry of University and Research, Project code D93C23000470005, within the Italian National Program PhD Programme in Autonomous Systems (DAuSy).

² Department of Information Engineering, Università di Padova, Italy.

³ IEETA, DETI, LASI, University of Aveiro, Portugal.

⁴ Department of Information Engineering and Computer Science, Università di Trento, Italy.

⁵ Department of Industrial Engineering, Università di Trento, Italy.

in the analytical model of the robot dynamics. In order to overcome these issues, several approaches have been proposed in the literature, including observer-based, least-squares and learning-based methods [5].

In most modern applications, external force sensors are mounted on the robot to estimate forces. However, these are expensive tools and not all robots are equipped with them. Therefore, cheaper sensor-less estimation methods are often used. A commonly used technique for predicting external torques consists of force observers or generalised momentum observers, which isolate the external torques on the joint torques, without needing external force sensors [6]. The prediction of the forces acting on the manipulator is based on the measured position and orientation data and on the knowledge of the control forces and moments, remodelling the dynamics of the observer error from time to time.

This method can be extended and combined with learning-based approaches, as ML is a growing field of research that is also showing promising results in torque prediction. The advantage of this type of methods is not only that they do not require the knowledge of an accurate analytical model (as they treat the function approximation task as a black-box), but also that they are computationally cheaper. There are several standard ML techniques such as Linear Regression, Gaussian Mixture Regression, Gaussian Process Regression, Support Vector Regression, Feedforward or Recurrent NNs: all these models learn a forward or inverse mapping from the joint states to the joint torques [7], [8]. An interesting class of black-box solutions is based on Gaussian process regression (GPR), where each joint is usually considered individually and the unknown function, i.e. its torque, is modelled a priori as a single Gaussian process (GP) [9], [10].

A promising novel approach that uses ML or Deep Learning (DL) counteracts the loss of physical plausibility of black-box representations by embedding physical constraints in the network design. For instance, a recently implemented solution to this issue is the so-called Deep Lagrangian Network (DeLaN) [11], which integrates Lagrangian mechanics into DL frameworks, thus combining the solid theoretical control and physics foundations with the flexibility of DL. By imposing Lagrangian mechanics and energy conservation principles on deep networks, a DeLaN can learn physical attributes such as the mass matrix, centripetal, Coriolis, gravitational, and frictional forces, and system energy. A similar but more general technique for learning arbitrary Lagrangians is the so-called Lagrangian neural network (LNN) [12]. These approaches ensure that the learned parameters align more closely with real-world physics, enhancing the reliability and interpretability of the model's outputs.

Unlike the latter approaches, which can be critical in several applications such as control and simulation, our approach is based on feedforward neural models that approximate the relationship between the joint states and the joint torques. This guarantees a robust and reliable solution, particularly suitable in contexts where the experimentation is limited or the robustness of the approach is prioritised. Furthermore, while techniques such as DeLaN and LNN are




Fig. 1. Example of feedforward neural network architecture

relatively new and less tested, the approach we adopt is well documented in the literature, confirming its reliability and robustness.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND METHODS

Finding a dynamic model that accurately estimates the joint torques τ of a robotic arm is a crucial and complex task. Robot dynamics consists of the relationship between the forces acting on a robot and its resulting motion. This relation can be written as an inverse dynamic equation, where the torques being applied to the joints are defined as a function of the joints state, namely their position, velocity and acceleration ($\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}}, \ddot{\mathbf{q}}$). A classical way to draw up this inverse dynamics equation is the Euler–Lagrange formulation, which leads to the following standard equation:

$$\tau = B(\mathbf{q})\ddot{\mathbf{q}} + C(\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}}) + g(\mathbf{q}) + h(\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}}, \ddot{\mathbf{q}}), \quad (1)$$

where $B(\mathbf{q})\ddot{\mathbf{q}}$ represents the inertial terms, $C(\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}})\dot{\mathbf{q}}$ the centripetal and Coriolis terms, $g(\mathbf{q})$ the gravity terms, $h(\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}}, \ddot{\mathbf{q}})$ any torques related to other additional joint dynamic effects, such as friction, and τ the effect of any force exerted by the external environment on the robot.

The analytical estimation of the dynamic model often requires simplifications in order to reduce the computational complexity. Indeed, inertia and friction parameters can be difficult to obtain analytically in an accurate way. For this reason, ML approaches can be helpful and effective to identify the dynamics. In this work, no analytical dynamics derivation is presented, but the procedure would require to calculate quantities such as Lagrangian, potential and kinetic energy and to solve the standard dynamics (1), which can be more compactly expressed as:

$$\tau = f(\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}}, \ddot{\mathbf{q}}). \quad (2)$$

The function $f(\cdot)$ is the nonlinear relationship to be found by training an NN (as in Figure 1) on the given dataset. This data is generated by moving the actual robot in space and collecting data for positions, velocities, accelerations and torques from each joint. While $\mathbf{q}, \dot{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{q}}$ are used for the NN training inputs, τ represents the outputs, consistent with the dynamics (2). Since the data are collected from the actual mechanism, also frictional terms are automatically accounted

for by the NN, thus solving one of the most relevant issues of traditional nonlinear identification approaches. By comparing the NN torque estimation against the actual values, the trained network accuracy can be evaluated based on the prediction reliability. For this purpose, one of the most common performance metrics, also used in this work, is the Mean Squared Error (MSE), which is defined as:

$$MSE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tau_i - \hat{f}(\mathbf{q}_i, \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i, \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_i) \right)^2, \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ is the learned model generating the prediction $\hat{\tau}_i$ [13].

A. Data acquisition and pre-processing

The first step toward the construction of our NNs is to acquire and pre-process the dataset. The data collection process is carried out following the grid search principles for each of the six joints, so as to optimise both the data size and the acquisition time. This optimisation step allows us to manage large amount of data. Redundant data are removed, by grouping joints into independent subgroups based on orthogonal motions. In the specific case of the arm used for this work, the arm's joints are categorised into three groups: (a) joint 1; (b) joints 2 and 3; (c) joints 4, 5 and 6. This grouping aligns with the structure of the NN models proposed in the next section. Data collection involves setting initial, final, and step angles for each joint, moving one joint at a time within each subgroup. To accelerate the acquisition and to avoid excessive motions, the joints are not reset to their initial position, but they are moved sequentially. The first joint does not affect any of the other ones, as it is fixed at the base and its configuration is generally not changed during the data acquisition phase, except when the speed is changed. Finally, shuffling the configurations ensures that a large number of poses is used in the learning phase.

The dataset includes joint position, velocity, acceleration, and torque for each of the 6 joints at every instant of acquisition. Before entering the training phase, we refined the dataset by applying a standardisation procedure. Standardisation amounts to normalise the variable ranges, by transforming the values X of a dataset so that the mean of the training samples is 0 ($\mu = 0$) and the standard deviation is equal to one ($\sigma = 1$):

$$X_{new} = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma}. \quad (4)$$

This refinement is known to enhance dataset manageability and algorithmic efficiency [14]. In this work, data normalisation is performed using the `StandardScaler()` function from the `sklearn` library in Python.

B. Neural Networks models

NNs are able to capture both the nonlinear dependencies and the real-world effects (e.g., friction, dead bands, etc.) that are not easy to incorporate in the analytical dynamics (Equation (1)). In this work, the measurements in the dataset are acquired from a 6 DoF robotic arm, so the network




Fig. 2. Cascade NN architecture

could potentially have 18 inputs, i.e. position, velocity and acceleration for each joint, and 6 predicted outputs. In fact, we can exploit our prior knowledge of the dependencies between data and their significance in the overall model, in order to both reduce the effort of the neural implementation, and to improve the accuracy. The implementation of three distinct neural models is indeed aimed at understanding the impact of joint dependencies on torque prediction. These architectures include a network that completely ignores joint dependencies, another that fully accounts for dependencies by separating them into three distinct networks, and a hybrid model that preserves joint groupings while keeping them connected. Through this approach, we seek to understand the extent to which joint dependencies contribute to improve torque prediction accuracy. The three NN implementations tested include:

- 1) Single fully connected neural network: it receives 17 input parameters, i.e. all the available joint variables except the position of the first joint. The latter is removed from the input data as it is independent of the outputs and therefore does not provide significant information for the network learning process. Its structure is similar to that in Figure 1;
- 2) Multiple neural networks corresponding to the independent groups of joints: the input variables corresponding to each of the three independent groups do not affect the output of the others. This model reduces the computational cost as fewer weights need to be calculated and updated;
- 3) Cascade neural network: it starts learning with one input node and then adds new inputs as new hidden neurons evolve (see Figure 2). This model considers the same groups of joints of the second one, but starts by giving as input only the state of the first joint, then the output obtained from the latter and the second group of joint states, and so on. In practice, the output of each network becomes the input of the next one, creating a series of connected networks.



Fig. 3. Comau Racer-5-0.80 robot [18]

Regardless of the architecture chosen, all the networks implemented are multilayer perceptron NNs, connecting multiple layers in a directed graph and using backpropagation as a supervised learning technique [15].

C. Hyperparameters optimisation

Despite rapid advances in ML and DL, practical aspects such as hyperparameter tuning remain challenging [16]. Hyperparameters, which define the architecture of the neural model, must be specified prior to training and have a significant impact on model performance. To achieve the optimal model, hyperparameters must be carefully optimised, a complex task due to their large number. The challenge is to find a solution that efficiently optimises each hyperparameter in the shortest time and consuming the least amount of resources possible.

Key NN hyperparameters include the number of hidden layers and the number of nodes per layer, which determine the complexity and the performance of the network. In addition, the learning rate, which controls the model's response to estimated errors during weight updates, is a critical parameter. Finding the right balance between small and large learning rates affects training efficiency. Other tunable hyperparameters include dropout rates, optimisation algorithms such as Adaptive Moment estimation (Adam), Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), Root Mean Squared Propagation (RMSProp), and so on. For this work, we use PyTorch, an open source framework for ML, and we exploit its tensor class for GPU-accelerated multidimensional array operations. It also introduces several libraries to support the development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications, including Optuna, which automates the search for hyperparameters and is exploited in this work [17].

IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

The following sections report and analyse the results of the experiments carried out on the acquired data. The data used in the developed models were obtained from the real manipulator shown in Figure 3, the Comau Racer-5-0.80 [18], an anthropomorphic robot with 6 DoF, guaranteeing fluidity of movement, high performance in terms of accuracy and repeatability, and safety.

A. Training results

As a first experiment, the training parameters and network hyperparameters have been tested and chosen by trial and error and are listed in Table I. All tested networks have

TABLE I
CHOSEN NEURAL NETWORK HYPERPARAMETERS

Number of hidden nodes	30 (single NN, cascade NN) 5,15,30 (Multiple NNs)
Activation function	Leaky ReLU
Optimisation algorithm	Adam
Learning rate	0.001
Loss function	MSE
Train Test split	70:30
Number of epochs	10

TABLE II
AVERAGE TEST MSE IN 10 EPOCHS WITH AND WITHOUT SCALING

	Scaling	Average test MSE
Single NN	without	$2.9953 \cdot 10^{-4}$
	with	$2.4363 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Multiple NNs	without	$3.4969 \cdot 10^{-4}$
	with	$2.4445 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Cascade NN	without	$2.9951 \cdot 10^{-4}$
	with	$2.5096 \cdot 10^{-4}$

one hidden layer and have been trained by removing the position of the first joint from the input dataset, as explained in Section III-A. Table II shows the results obtained by testing the three different types of network, both with and without pre-processing of the training dataset and trained in 10 epochs. The results consist of the test loss expressed in terms of MSE. In particular, the average of the total test loss in the 10 epochs is reported here.

Figure 5 shows for instance the evolution of the average MSE after training a single NN. In general, the graph shows a good fit, since as the epochs progress, both training and test losses decrease, until they become very similar and stabilise around the same value, once the model has sufficiently learned to generalise. Figure 4 instead compares the actual torques with those predicted by using the first implemented neural model. Clearly, predicting the first and the sixth torques is quite critical: while the reason why the former is more difficult to predict has been explained above, for the latter, being a free joint with no load on it, the data are not reliable and thus its torque computation is crucial. The same model is therefore tested also by removing the state variables of the sixth joint. As expected, its removal not only reduces the complexity, but also decreases the full loss, reaching an MSE value of $2.2470 \cdot 10^{-4}$. In any case, the consistent accuracy of predictions achieved through a single NN suggests that the combined effects of position, velocity and acceleration values may significantly influence the overall torque outcomes. Moreover, in general, the results obtained after standardising the input data show the usefulness of pre-processing for large datasets, as the loss is slightly lower and the convergence is faster.

B. Optimised networks

Network improvement can be achieved through an optimisation process (see Section III-C). For the purpose of this project, Optuna, an open source hyperparameter optimisation




Fig. 4. Actual and predicted torque values using a single NN after scaling




Fig. 5. Train and test average MSE using a single NN after scaling

framework, is used to automate the hyperparameter search by trial and error and to achieve higher performance. In particular, it uses a Bayesian optimisation algorithm called Tree-structured Parzen Estimator (TPE), which is the default sampler in Optuna and uses the history of previously evaluated hyperparameter values to sample the next ones. This sampler, based on independent sampling, fits a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM), for each trial and for each parameter, to the set of parameter configurations associated with the best possible objective value, in this case corresponding to the test loss.

In this work, the following three hyperparameters were optimised:

- 1) Number of hidden nodes: from 10 to 50;
- 2) Optimisers: SGD, Adam, RMSprop;
- 3) Learning rates: from $1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ to $1 \cdot 10^{-1}$.

The objective function to be optimised, minimised in our case, is the total test loss in terms of MSE. The process involves 10 trials and produces the results shown in Table III for each neural structure. As can be seen in Table IV, the results obtained by optimising the hyperparameters are very close to those obtained without optimisation. This means that the parameters initially chosen were already good enough. Furthermore, better optimisation would require larger search spaces and more trials, which would mean much longer run times. However, we need to consider the computational cost

TABLE III
OPTIMISED HYPERPARAMETERS

NN architecture	Number of hidden nodes	Optimisation algorithm	Learning rate
Single NN	36	Adam	$1.795849 \cdot 10^{-3}$
Separate NNs	49, 36, 37	Adam	$2.538958 \cdot 10^{-3}$
Cascade NN	26, 36, 48	Adam	$1.651993 \cdot 10^{-3}$

TABLE IV
LOSS IN 10 EPOCHS OBTAINED USING OPTIMISED HYPERPARAMETERS

	Full test loss (MSE)
Single NN	$2.376151 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Multiple NNs	$2.418988 \cdot 10^{-4}$
Cascade NN	$2.111828 \cdot 10^{-4}$

and make a trade-off between it and the accuracy of the prediction. Instead, by optimising the hyperparameters of the NN cascade, a slightly significant improvement and a lower test loss are obtained, confirming the validity of this model.

C. Discussion

Despite the fact that the error in terms of MSE is always of the order of 10^{-4} , the results obtained allow us to make some considerations and comparisons between the neural structures tested and the corresponding optimised networks. First of all, it should be noted that the pre-processing phase leads in any case to a significant performance improvement, up to a reduction of the test loss by $1.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$. Regarding the first experimental phase, in which the hyperparameters were chosen by trial and error, the best results were unexpectedly obtained by using a single NN including all the input and output data in the same model. This is an unexpected result, since it would be natural to think that the other two types of structure, which exploit the dependencies between the joint torques, would be more accurate. However, a possible explanation for this phenomenon is that although the study of the dataset shows significant independencies, the joints are never completely independent of each other. That is why even the cascade NN performs better than the three

separate networks. On the other hand, the parallel training of less complex networks involves a shorter run time, which is another aspect to take into account when dealing with large datasets.

In the optimisation phase, after various tests, the hyperparameters that minimise the test loss are identified for each network. In general, there is not much improvement over the previous case, which means that the hyperparameters selected by trial and error were already good enough. Instead, the effectiveness of exploiting the independent groups of joints is highlighted here. Indeed, after the optimisation process, the model that gives the most accurate results is the cascade network. This demonstrates the correct functioning of a model that exploits the dependencies between joints, while keeping a link between the three groups. Again, although the difference in error is not very significant, the single NN gives slightly better results than the multiple networks, indicating that the influence of one group of joints on the others is probably not completely negligible. Another useful consideration is that, due to time and computational constraints, the number of trials and the range of hyperparameter values were limited in the optimisation process. In addition, the motion profiles were run with a limited range of velocities and accelerations, so better performance is expected within this range. This is not a problem if the required application is repetitive and has a limited range of joint positions, velocities and accelerations.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper presents an effective approach to predict the joint torques of a robotic arm without relying on traditional model-based methods, which often require simplifications and a precise knowledge of all the system parameters. By using black-box models trained directly from experimental data - specifically NNs - the study provides promising results in accurately identifying nonlinear dynamics. The experiments were carried out with different types of NN architecture, including single NNs, multiple NNs, and cascade NNs. The results show that well-modelled NNs trained with appropriately pre-processed input data are able to accurately predict joint torques, even in the presence of parameter uncertainties and unconsidered dynamics such as friction and joint flexibility. The prior knowledge of the dependencies between joints not only reduces the computational cost, but also improves the prediction accuracy. Although hyperparameter optimisation yielded no significant improvements in error prediction due to already well chosen parameters, it validates the effectiveness of the cascade NN model in exploiting joint dependencies and linking all variables.

Future work may focus on further refining NN architectures and exploring additional pre-processing and optimisation techniques to improve robustness and generalisability, and to develop more intelligent and adaptive robotic systems. Moreover, despite their computational efficiency, NNs could lack physical plausibility. Physics Informed Learning (PIL) methods, integrating physical laws into black-box models, seem to be a promising way to improve their performance,

but require further research [19]. Investigating PIL models for Lagrangian systems, also incorporating contact forces, are possible directions for improved efficiency, generalisation and physical plausibility. Strategies to reduce dataset size while keeping significant information may also be useful for improving dynamic model accuracy and productivity in robotics applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. M. Close, D. K. Frederick, and J. C. Newell, *Modeling and analysis of dynamic systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 2001.
- [2] F. Vicentini, "Collaborative robotics: a survey," *Journal of Mechanical Design*, vol. 143, no. 4, 2021.
- [3] J. Fryman and B. Matthias, "Safety of industrial robots: From conventional to collaborative applications," 10 2012.
- [4] M. J. Rosenstrauch and J. Krüger, "Safe human-robot-collaboration-introduction and experiment using iso/ts 15066," in *2017 3rd International Conference on Control, Automation and Robotics (ICCAR)*, 2017, pp. 740–744.
- [5] M. L. Myrvold, "On estimating forces and torques in manipulators," Master's thesis, NTNU, 2020.
- [6] T. Gold, A. Völz, and K. Graichen, "External torque estimation for an industrial robot arm using joint torsion and motor current measurements," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 52, no. 15, pp. 352–357, 2019.
- [7] S. Shalev-Shwartz and S. Ben-David, *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.pt/books?id=Hf6QAwAAQBAJ>
- [8] R. Zakeri and P. Shankar, "Estimating joint torques of a robotic arm based on kinematics using neural networks," in *2018 IEEE Green Energy and Smart Systems Conference (IGESSC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [9] A. D. Libera and R. Carli, "A data-efficient geometrically inspired polynomial kernel for robot inverse dynamic," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 24–31, Jan. 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/LRA.2019.2945240>
- [10] G. Giacomuzzo, N. Turcato, A. Dalla Libera, and R. Carli, "Advantages of a physics-embedding kernel for robot inverse dynamics identification," in *2022 30th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation (MED)*, 2022.
- [11] M. Lutter, K. Listmann, and J. Peters, "Deep lagrangian networks for end-to-end learning of energy-based control for under-actuated systems," in *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 7718–7725.
- [12] M. Cranmer, S. Greydanus, S. Hoyer, P. Battaglia, D. Spergel, and S. Ho, "Lagrangian neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04630*, 2020.
- [13] A. Géron, *Hands-on machine learning with Scikit-Learn, Keras, and TensorFlow*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2022.
- [14] P. Misra and A. S. Yadav, "Impact of preprocessing methods on healthcare predictions," in *Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Advanced Computing and Software Engineering (ICACSE)*, 2019.
- [15] M.-C. Popescu, V. E. Balas, L. Perescu-Popescu, and N. Mastorakis, "Multilayer perceptron and neural networks," *WSEAS Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 579–588, 2009.
- [16] Z. Kadhim, H. Abdullah, and K. Ghathwan, "Artificial neural network hyperparameters optimization: A survey," *International Journal of Online and Biomedical Engineering (iJOE)*, vol. 18, pp. 59–87, 12 2022.
- [17] T. Akiba, S. Sano, T. Yanase, T. Ohta, and M. Koyama, "Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, 2019, pp. 2623–2631.
- [18] "Comau racer-5-0.80 cobot," Available: <https://www.comau.com>, accessed: Aug. 26, 2022. [Online].
- [19] M. Lutter and J. Peters, "Combining physics and deep learning to learn continuous-time dynamics models," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 83–107, 2023.