ABSTRACT

This paper provides examples of a new method used to analyze the motion characteristics of single-degree-of-freedom, closed-loop linkages with a designated input angle and one or two design parameters. The method involves the construction of a singularity trace, which is a plot that reveals changes in the number of geometric inversions, singularities, and changes in the number of branches as a design parameter is varied. This paper applies the method to Watt II, Stephenson III and double butterfly linkages. For the latter two linkages, instances where the input angle is able to rotate more than one revolution between singularities have been identified. This characteristic demonstrates a net-zero, singularity free, activation sequence that places the mechanism into a different geometric inversion. Additional observations from the examples are given. Instances where the singularity trace for Watt II linkages includes multiple coincident projections of the singularity curve. Cases are shown where subtle changes to two design parameters of a Stephenson III linkage drastically alters the motion. Additionally, isolated critical points are found to exist for the double butterfly, where the linkage becomes a structure and loses the freedom to move.

1 Introduction

Myszka et al. [1] developed a general method to produce a singularity trace for a planar, single degree-of-freedom (DOF), closed-loop linkage with a designated input angle and a design parameter. The singularity trace can be a convenient tool to classify the general motion characteristics of a linkage with respect to changes in the design parameter. The motion characteristics include the number of geometric inversions, singularities, circuits and critical points, and are described as follows.

When the design parameter is considered fixed, forward kinematic position analysis determines values of the linkage joint parameters for a given position of the input link [2]. Since the governing kinematic constraint equations of a closed-loop linkage are non-linear, multiple solutions are obtained for a single position of the input link. Erdman et al., [3] refer to each solution as a geometric inversion (GI) and is associated with an alternate configuration of the linkage at the specific input. The set of position equations is represented by a motion curve which exhibits the relationship between the joint variables.

Chase and Mirth [4] define a circuit of a mechanism as the set of all possible orientations without disconnecting any of the joints. Each distinct segment on the trace of the motion curve represents a different circuit. When a GI is found to lie on a
segment of the motion curve at a specific input link position, any movement of the input link move the GI along that motion curve segment.

For a single-DOF linkage with a fixed design parameter, singularity points exist when the driving link is no longer able to move the mechanism. At the singularity points, also called dead points, the mechanism becomes locked and the mechanical advantage reduces to zero [5,6]. Singularities appear on the motion curve as turning points with respect to the input parameter. As the design parameter changes, these singularity points sweep out a curve called the singularity trace.

Regions on a circuit between singularity points are defined as branches [4]. For single-DOF linkages, singularity points are the input limits for that branch. If a GI resides on a motion curve, it can be driven with a fully rotatable crank. As the design parameter changes, the number of branches and their connections, in short the topology of the motion curve, may change at certain critical points. Critical points are identified on the singularity trace as turning points with respect to the design parameter. Murray et al. [7] identified relationships of link lengths that defines a transition linkage as the border between topology. Myszka et al. [8] observed that critical points appearing as smooth extrema on the singularity trace are transition linkages. It was also observed that the Stephenson III linkage has the property that the input angle is able to rotate more than one revolution between singularities and this property is associated with critical points that appear as cusps on the singularity trace.

This paper illustrates the general analysis methodology for Watt II, Stephenson III and double butterfly linkages. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 applies the general method and develops governing equations for the Watt II linkage are developed. A singularity trace and associated observations for the Stephenson III is presented in Section 3. Section 4 develops the governing equations for the double butterfly linkage and provides observations from the resulting singularity trace.

2 Watt II Linkage

The Watt II linkage shown in Fig. 1 provides the first example. In the general analysis methodology, the linkage input variable is designated as $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and the design variable is $p \in \mathbb{C}$. All the remaining passive joint variables are $y \in \mathbb{C}^N$. For the Watt II linkage, the input angle is $x = \theta_1$ and the design parameter is $p = a_1$. The remaining passive joint variables are $y = \{\theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_6, \theta_7\}$. The physical parameters are $\theta_1$, $\theta_4$, $\alpha_{35}$, and $a_2, \ldots, a_8$.

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
g_1 := a_1 T_1 + a_2 T_2 + a_3 T_3 + a_4 T_4 &= 0 \\
g_2 := b_S T_3 + a_6 T_6 + a_7 T_7 + a_8 T_8 &= 0 \\
h_j := T_j T_j - 1 &= 0, \quad j = 2, 3, 6, 7
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

All of the $a_j$ are real link lengths, but $b_S$ is a complex stretch rotation to properly model the ternary link. That is, $b_S = a_5 (\cos \alpha_{35} + i \sin \alpha_{35})$, and $b_S'$ is the complex conjugate of $b_S$. Note that $T_4, T_6$, and $T_8$ model the ground link and are known. For a fixed design variable, the system of four equations describes a curve in the four dimensional space of $\{T_2, T_6, T_2, T_8\}$. In the numerical examples that follow, the values used for the physical parameters are: $a_2 = 4.5$, $a_3 = 5.0$, $a_4 = 6.0$, $a_5 = 4.5$, $a_6 = 2.5$, $a_7 = 2.0$, $a_8 = 5.5$, $\theta_4 = 3.1416$, $\theta_8 = 3.9270$, $\alpha_{35} = 0.5236$.
2.2 Forward Kinematics

Since the loop equations, \( g_1, g_2 \), and the conjugate loop equations, \( \bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_1 \) are all linear, Eq. 2 can be rewritten to eliminate variables. To this end, two variables per loop are eliminated by defining,

\[
\begin{align*}
R_2 &:= -a_2 T_2 = a_1 T_1 + a_3 T_3 + a_4 T_4, \\
R_2 &:= -a_2 T_2 = a_1 T_1 + a_3 T_3 + a_4 T_4, \\
R_7 &:= -a_7 T_7 = b_5 T_3 + a_6 T_6 + a_8 T_8, \\
R_7 &:= -a_7 T_7 = b_5 T_3 + a_6 T_6 + a_8 T_8.
\end{align*}
\]

(3)

With \( a_i \neq 0, i = 2,7, a_i^2 h_i = 0 \) is formed to achieve

\[
\begin{align*}
H_2 &= R_2 R_2 - a_2^2 = 0, \\
H_7 &= R_7 R_7 - a_7^2 = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

(4) (5)

The identities corresponding to the remaining joint variables are

\[
\begin{align*}
h_1 &= T_1 T_1 - 1 = 0, \\
h_3 &= T_3 T_3 - 1 = 0, \\
h_6 &= T_6 T_6 - 1 = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

(6) (7) (8)

For forward kinematics, the input angle \( \theta_1 \) is given, and therefore \( T_1 \) and \( T_1 \) are known and Eq. 6 is not used. The forward kinematics solutions are the roots of Eqs. (4),(5),(7),(8), a system of four bilinear equations in the two-homogeneous variable groups \( \{T_1, T_3, \}, \{T_1, T_3, T_6, \} \). Solution of the polynomial systems can be readily accomplished by numerical polynomial continuation [11] using the Bertini software package [12]. “Real” solutions are those for which \( |T_3| = |T_6| = 1 \). At any point on the curve, the remaining angles can be solved by using

\[
\begin{align*}
T_2 &= -R_2/a_2, & T_7 &= -R_7/a_7.
\end{align*}
\]

(10)

2.3 Singularity Points

Given a linkage with a fixed design parameter, it is desirable to find all branches of the motion with respect to the designated input parameter. As described in [4], the branches meet at the singularity points of the curve, where the mechanism moves differentially without any motion at the input. The mechanism is locked at a singularity point, but can be driven smoothly from the input along each motion branch. The singularity points occur when \( \Delta y \neq 0 \) with \( \Delta x = 0 \), which implies that the Jacobian of the loop equations with respect to the passive joint variables loses rank

\[
D(p, x, y) := \det \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = 0.
\]

(11)

Accordingly, the singularity points are given by a system of equations consisting of the five loop closure conditions Eqs. (6)–(8) along with one additional condition,

\[
D := \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \theta_2} \\ \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial \theta_2} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(12)

It is not that \( \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \theta_6} = 0 \) since \( T_6 \) does not appear in \( R_2 \). This system of six equations in the six unknowns, separated into two-homogeneous variable groups \( \{T_1, T_6, \} \). Solving the system using Bertini [12], at most 8 turning points are found in a general example. When \( a_1 = 2.0, 2 \) of 16 singularity points are real. When \( a_1 = 6.0 \) and \( a_1 = 12.0, 4 \) of 16 singularity points are real. When \( a_1 = 9.0, 6 \) of 16 singularity points are real.

2.4 Motion Curve

A trace of a motion curve with \( a_1 = 2.0 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_6 \) plane and shown in Fig. 2. Note that the linkage has one circuit and two singularity points at \( \theta_1 = -0.2061, \) \( 2.0652 \). Zero GIs exist for \( \theta_1 < -0.2061 \) and \( \theta_1 > 2.0652 \). Two GIs exist for \( -0.2061 < \theta_1 < 2.0652 \).

![Figure 2: Trace of the motion curve for the Watt II linkage, with \( a_1 = 2.0 \), projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_6 \) plane.](image)

A second trace of a motion curve with \( a_1 = 9.0 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_6 \) plane and shown in Fig. 3. Note the motion curve has two circuits and six of singularity points at \( \theta_1 = -0.2427, \) \( 0.6019, 0.6314, 1.2277, 1.3205, 1.3205 \). Notice that two singularities occur at the same value of \( \theta_1 \). This is associated with singularity within the first four-bar loop, for which two inversions of the second four-bar loop exist. The linkage has zero GIs for \( \theta_1 < -0.2427, 0.6019, 0.6314 \) and \( \theta_1 > 1.3205 \). Two
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GIs exist for \(-0.2427<\theta_1<0.6019\) and \(0.6314<\theta_1<1.227\).
Four GIs exist for all values of \(1.2277<\theta_1<1.3205\).

Figure 3: Trace of the motion curve for the Watt II linkage, with \(a_1=9.0\), projected onto the \(\theta_1-\theta_6\) plane.

2.5 Critical Points
The process of determining the critical points proceeds analogously to finding singularity points, replacing \(x\) by \(p,\) \(y\) by \((x,y),\) and \(f\) by \((f,D).\) The critical points occur when \((\Delta x,\Delta y)\neq0\) with \(\Delta p=0,\) which implies,

\[
E := \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial D}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial D}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (13)
\]

Considering \(a_1\) as a variable, the critical points for the Watt II are determined by the solution of Eq. (6)–(5),(12) along with,

\[
E := \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \alpha_1} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha_1} & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial \alpha_1} \\ \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \alpha_2} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha_2} & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial \alpha_2} \\ \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial \theta_1} \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (14)
\]

It is noted that \(\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \theta_6} = 0,\) since \(T_6\) does not appear in \(R_2,\) and \(\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \alpha_1} = 0,\) since \(T_1\) does not appear in \(R_7.\) This system of seven equations in the seven unknowns \(a_1,\{T_1,T_2,T_6\},\{T_1,T_2,T_6\}.\)

Using Bertini to solve, critical points appear in pairs, existing at \(a_1 = 0.4614, 5.7107, 6.2872, 6.4642, 7.5578, 9.4614, 15.2132, 15.2872.\)

2.6 Singularity Trace
The singularity trace is shown in Fig. 4. The critical points signify local extrema of the singularity curve. Critical points that appear on the singularity trace as smooth extrema represent transition linkages, where there is a change in the number of circuits.

Sampling the motion curve between critical points determines the number of circuits. As identified in [8], the singularity trace separates the plot into zones having the same number of GIs. Solving the forward kinematic problem for one sample point within each zone determines the number in GIs in the zone, as indicated in Fig. 4. It commonly occurs that the number of GIs in adjacent regions differ by two. With the symmetry in the Watt II motion curves, some of the arcs observed on the singularity trace are actually two coincident arcs. As mentioned, this is associated with a singularity within the first four-bar loop, for which two GIs of the second four-bar loop exist for the same input angle. In these cases, the number of GIs in adjacent regions differ by four, as is seen in the upper right portion of this singularity trace.

3 Stephenson III Linkage
For the Stephenson III shown in Fig. 5, \(x = \theta_1\) is considered the input angle and the design parameter is designated as \(p = a_1.\) The remaining joint variables are \(y = \{\theta_2,\theta_3,\theta_6,\theta_7\}.\)

The physical parameters are \(\theta_1, \theta_4, \alpha_{35},\) and \(a_2,\ldots,a_8.\) In the numerical examples that follow, the values used for the physical parameters are: \(a_2 = 4.0, a_3 = 3.5, a_4 = 4.1, a_5 = 8.0, a_6 = 8.0, a_7 = 8.0, a_8 = 5.0, \theta_1 = 1.5708, \theta_6 = 5.8832,\) and \(\alpha_{38} = 0.7752.\)
The governing loop, singularity and critical point equations were developed in [1], so only the resulting equations are presented.
here. The loop closure equations are

\[
\begin{align*}
R_2 &:= a_2T_2 = -(a_1T_1 + a_3T_3 + a_4T_4 + a_5T_5), \\
\overline{R}_2 &:= a_2\overline{T}_2 = -(a_1\overline{T}_1 + a_3\overline{T}_3 + a_4\overline{T}_4 + a_5\overline{T}_5), \\
R_7 &:= a_7T_7 = -(b_3T_3 + a_4T_4 + a_6T_6), \\
\overline{R}_7 &:= a_7\overline{T}_7 = -(b_3\overline{T}_3 + a_4\overline{T}_4 + a_6\overline{T}_6),
\end{align*}
\]  

(15)

Using (15), the closure conditions become

\[
\begin{align*}
h_1 &= T_1T_1 - 1 = 0, \\
H_2 &= R_2\overline{R}_2 - a_2^2 = 0, \\
h_3 &= T_3T_3 - 1 = 0, \\
h_4 &= T_4T_4 - 1 = 0, \\
H_7 &= R_7\overline{R}_7 - a_7^2 = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

(16)–(20)

The singularity condition is

\[
D := \det \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial T_1} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial T_3} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial T_4} \\
\frac{\partial H_7}{\partial T_1} & \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial T_3} & \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial T_4}
\end{bmatrix} = 0.
\]

(21)

Lastly, the condition for critical points is

\[
E := \det \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial T_1} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial T_3} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial T_4} & \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial T_1} & \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial T_3} & \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial T_4} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial D}{\partial T_1} & \frac{\partial D}{\partial T_3} & \frac{\partial D}{\partial T_4}
\end{bmatrix} = 0.
\]

(22)

### 3.1 Critical Points

The system of equations for determination of critical points consists of Eqs. (16)–(20),(21),(22). Considering \(a_1\) as a variable design parameter, this system of seven equations in the seven unknowns grouped into the homogenous system \(a_1, \{T_1, T_3, T_4\}, \{T_1, T_3, T_4\}\). Using Bertini to solve, critical points exist at \(a_1 = 1.1114, 2.0471, 2.0551, 5.9129, 5.9529, 5.9728, 7.4384, 7.5190, 8.7611, 8.8284, 10.0551, 10.9436, 13.7642, 13.9129, 17.4641, 18.9436\).

### 3.2 Singularity trace

The singularity trace with \(a_1\) as a variable is shown in Fig. 6. Unlike the Watt II linkage, some critical points appear as cusps on the singularity trace. Solving the forward kinematic problem for one sample point within each region bounded by the singularity curve determines the number of GIs in that entire region. The number of GIs are noted in Fig. 6. Additionally, the number of circuits changes by one at each non-cusp, extrema and are also noted in Fig. 6.
3.3 Motion Curves

A trace of the motion curve with \( a_1 = 1.1 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_3 \) plane and shown in Fig. 7. This value of \( a_1 \) is slightly less than the smallest critical point value (1.1114). Note that this lowest critical point appears as a cusp in Fig. 6. This linkage has two GIs for all values of \( \theta_1 \), two separate circuits and no singularities. Thus, two linkage configurations have continuously rotating cranks with \( a_1 < 1.1114 \).

A second trace of the motion curve with \( a_1 = 2.0 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_3 \) plane and shown in Fig. 8. This value of \( a_1 \) is slightly greater than the smallest critical point value (1.1114). This linkage has two GIs for \( \theta_1 < -1.6902 \) and \( \theta_1 > -1.4259 \), four GIs for \(-1.6902 < \theta_1 < -1.4259 \), two separate circuits and two singularities. The change of \( a_1 \) from 1.1 to 2.0 passes over a cusp in Fig. 6 and two singularities are introduced without additional circuit. Thus, the motion curve bends over itself as seen in Fig. 8. This results in a linkage that is able to rotate greater than one full revolution between singularities. As observed in [1] and witnessed again here, this net-zero, singularity-free actuation that places the linkage into a different GI is associated with cusps on the singularity trace.

The following analysis considers changes in two design parameters. The motion curve shown in Fig. 8 was generated with \( a_1 = 2.00 \) and \( a_4 = 4.10 \) and exhibited two circuits, one having a fully rotating crank and the other containing a greater than 360° branch. Figure 9 shows a pair of singularity traces with \( a_4 \) considered variable. The solid trace is with \( a_1 = 2.00 \) and the dashed trace is with \( a_1 = 2.09 \). Adjusting \( a_1 \) from 2.00 to 2.09 crosses a critical point in Fig. 6. Additionally, adjusting \( a_4 \) from 4.10 to 4.15 crosses the critical point on both traces in Fig. 9. The motion curve shown in Fig. 10 was generated with \( a_1 = 2.09 \) and \( a_4 = 4.15 \). After making both subtle adjustments, the two circuits in Fig. 8 have been merged and no GI is full able to rotate. Moreover, an additional circuit with two branches has been formed. Thus, subtle adjustments to two link lengths, each crossing a corresponding critical point, results in drastically different motion characteristics.

4 Double Butterfly Linkage

This section applies the general analysis methodology to the double butterfly linkage, as shown in Fig. 11. For this case, the input angle is \( x = \theta_1 \) and the design parameter is designated as \( p = a_1 \). The remaining joint variables are \( y = \{ \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_7, \theta_8, \theta_{11} \} \). The physical parameters are \( \theta_1, \theta_5, \theta_{12}, \alpha_2, \alpha_4, \alpha_7, \) and \( a_2, \ldots, a_{12} \).

4.1 Loop Closure

The double butterfly linkage has three loops. The isotropic form of the loop closure conditions for the double butterfly link-
The identities corresponding to the remaining the joint valuables are

\[ h_2 := T_2 T_2 - 1 = 0, \quad h_4 := T_4 T_4 - 1 = 0, \quad h_7 := T_7 T_7 - 1 = 0, \]

For a given design, the solution of this system of six Eqs. (25)-(30) in the six unknowns, separated into two-homogeneous variable groups \( \{T_2, T_4, T_7\}, \{T_2, T_4, T_7\} \) is the motion curve of the linkage. As before, “real” solutions are those for which \( |T_2| = |T_4| = |T_7| = 1 \). At any point on the curve, the
remaining angles can be solved by using

\[ T_3 = \frac{R_3}{a_3}, \quad (31) \]
\[ T_8 = \frac{R_8}{a_8}, \quad (32) \]
\[ T_{11} = \frac{R_{11}}{a_{11}}, \quad (33) \]

4.3 Singularity Points

The singularity condition for double butterfly linkage is

\[
D := \det \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_4} \\
\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_5} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_6} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_7} \\
\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_4}
\end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (34)
\]

Note that \( \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_7} = 0 \) since \( T_7 \) does not appear in \( R_3 \), and \( \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \theta_4} = 0 \) since \( T_4 \) does not appear in \( R_8 \). The singularity points for double butterfly linkage are given by a system of equations consisting of the loop closure conditions Eq. (28)–(27) along with Eq. 34. To find singularity points at a given value of \( a_1 \), the system involves the following variable groups \( \{ T_1, T_2, T_4, T_7 \}, \{ T_1, T_2, T_4, T_7 \} \).

4.4 Motion Curve

A trace of the motion curve with \( a_1 = 0.198 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) plane and shown in Fig. 12. This linkage has six circuits, with no singularities and six GIs for all values of \( \theta_1 \). That is, the linkage can be assembled into six different configurations all having continuously rotating cranks. A trace of the motion curve with a slightly longer \( a_1 = 0.40 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) plane and shown in Fig. 13. This linkage has seven circuits, six of which have continuously rotating cranks. Additionally, the seventh circuit exhibits two singularity points. Thus, eight GIs exist for \(-1.5768 < \theta_1 < 0.3707\). A trace of the motion curve with a longer \( a_1 = 2.50 \) is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) plane and shown in Fig. 14. This linkage has six circuits, one of which has a continuously rotating crank. Of particular note is a circuit, where the linkage is able to rotate greater than one full revolution between singularities. This feature is seen as the “U” shape observed and noted in the motion trace of Fig. 14. Examples of this net-zero, singularity-free actuation that places the linkage into a different GI were identified for Stephenson III linkages in the previous section and in [1]. Those cases showed an “S” shape in the motion curve trace.

The final trace of the motion curve of a new double butterfly linkage with different parameters is projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) plane and shown in Fig. 15. This linkage has five circuits, none of which has a continuously rotating crank. Of note is a circuit, where the linkage is also able to rotate greater than one full revolution between singularities. Again, a net-zero, singularity-free actuation that places the linkage into a different GI is identified. However, this appears as a closed curve where the turning points (singularities) are separated by more than 360°.

4.5 Critical Points

The system to solve for the critical points of double butterfly linkage when \( a_1 \) considered the variable design parameter con-
Figure 14: Trace of the motion curve for the double butterfly linkage, with \( a_1 = 2.50 \), projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) plane.

Figure 15: Trace of the motion curve for another double butterfly linkage with different parameters, projected onto the \( \theta_1 - \theta_2 \) plane.

\[
E := \det \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_4} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_7} \\
\frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_4} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_7} \\
\frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_4} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_7} \\
\frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_2} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_4} & \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_7}
\end{bmatrix} = 0.
\] (35)

Note that \( \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_7} = 0 \) since \( T_7 \) does not appear in \( R_3 \), and \( \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_4} = 0 \) since \( T_4 \) does not appear in \( R_8 \). The system involves the following variables groups: \( \{ T_1, T_2, T_4, T_7 \}, \{ T_1, T_2, T_4, T_7 \} \).

However, the \( 4 \times 4 \) matrix in Eq. (35) is very complicated and its determinant is more difficult to calculate than the examples presented above. A new approach to simplify the calculation is to combine the design parameter variable \( a_1 \) and its angle \( T_1 \), \( T_1 \) by defining \( X_1 = a_1 T_1 \) and \( \bar{X}_1 = a_1 \bar{T}_1 \). Accordingly, the equation \( T_1 \bar{T}_1 - 1 = 0 \) is eliminated from the system. The resulting variables groups are \( \{ X_1, T_2, T_4, T_7 \}, \{ \bar{X}_1, \bar{T}_2, \bar{T}_4, \bar{T}_7 \} \). Thus, this method reduces one variable and one equation from system. The design parameter at critical points is determined as,

\[
a_1 = \sqrt{X_1^2 + \bar{X}_1^2}
\] (36)

4.6 Singularity Trace

The singularity trace of double butterfly linkage with a variable \( a_1 \) is extremely convoluted and shown in Fig. 16. As before, the singularity trace separates the plot into regions having the same number of GIs. Solving the forward kinematic problem for one sample point within each zone determines the number in GIs in that entire zone. Additionally, sampling the motion curve between critical points that appear as smooth extrema determines the number of circuits.

There are three isolated critical points \( P_1, P_2 \) and \( P_3 \) which do not lie on the singularity curve in Fig. 16. These critical points identify where a GI of the double butterfly linkage will lose a degree of freedom and become a fixed structure as indicated in Fig. 17.

A singularity trace of the double butterfly linkage with a
Figure 17: Double butterfly isolated critical position at P3.

Figure 18: Double butterfly linkage singularity trace with respect to \( a_3 \).

variable \( a_3 \) is also convoluted and shown in Fig. 18. Similar to the singularity trace with respect to \( a_1 \), there are many cusps, and the cusps are related to a net-zero, singularity free activation sequence that places mechanism into a different GI.

5 Conclusions

This paper illustrated a general method for computing the forward kinematics, singularity points, critical points, motion curve and singularity trace for single-degree-of-freedom, closed-loop linkages with a designated input angle and one design parameter in this paper. The method was applied to a Watt II, Stephenson III and double butterfly linkages. Singularity traces for each linkage was constructed and analyzed. Several instances where the input angle is able to rotate more than one revolution between singularities were illustrated. Instances where presented where the singularity trace includes multiple coincident projections of the singularity curve. Additionally, isolated critical points were identified where the linkage configuration be-comes a structure and looses the freedom to move.
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