Analysis and optimization of a Dual Mass-Spring-Damper (DMSD) wave-energy convertor with variable resonance capability

Zhongfei Chen a, Liang Zhang a,*, Ronald W. Yeung b, *

a College of Shipbuilding Engineering, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, 150001, China
b Director, The Berkeley Marine Mechanics Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

1. Introduction

Wave energy is probably the most promising type of renewable energy because of its high energy density and predictability [1]. The worldwide potential of wave energy is estimated about 2 Tera-Watts, which is almost equal to the world energy consumption [2]. In an open sea, wave frequency changes continuously in time scale of seconds, minutes, or hours. Traditional point absorber, which typically has one resonance frequency with a narrow bandwidth, cannot work as effectively at different wave periods. Compared to wind energy, which can start from small size to large ones gradually, working equally well regardless of the size, WEC has to be built to match the wave frequency for an effective energy capture. At 10s wave period, the required characteristic dimension would be 20 m [3], thus calling for an expensive capital outlay, a possible explanation of the slow development of the wave-energy industry. This paper represents a novel WEC concept called Dual Mass-Spring-Damper (DMSD) system. With two sets of mass and spring, the response of the system can be controlled so that the resonance frequency of the DMSD can better match the changing wave environment. The first set of mass-spring is the total mass of the floater with hydrostatic restoring associated with the waterplane area while another mass-spring system is inside the floater (Fig. 2.1 (a)). This contrasts the traditional arrangement shown, for example, in Ref. [4]. Because the resonance frequency of DMSD is controllable, this variable resonance capability provides the idea to examine a relatively small device in laboratory environment. Finally, as proposed here, all moving parts (internal mass, spring and linear generator etc.) are contained in a waterproof floater, so, the floater can be operating on the surface or submerged to avoid excessive loads due to storm. To be complete, there are also now control strategies to handle the typical traditional design in random waves to broaden the capturing bandwidth, see e.g., Tom & Yeung [5].

WEC with two mass system was studied by Parks [6], French [7], Chaplin [8], Wang et al. [9] etc. In Parks’ work, he used fixed spring stiffness though he varied the damping, whereas French also varied the spring. The device “Frog” described in Chaplin’s work was a WEC with a transverse mass block, working in pitch mode. Later, Korde [10,11] compared the performance between a WEC with
mass plate above the converter and WEC with plate submerged. The WEC with mass plate onboard as a motion compensator was examined. Wang et al. [9] studied a dual co-axial cylinder WEC, working in heave mode using linear generator as the power take-off (PTO).

This paper studies the resonance frequency of the Dual-MSD coupled system and the influence of internal properties on the motion and power response in the frequency domain. Optimization of capture width is first conducted by using frequency domain analysis. Since the relative motion is limited by the vertical extent of the encasing floater, so the capture width is not only a function of wave frequency but also a function of wave amplitude, a nonlinear

![Diagram of Dual-MSD concept](image)

**Fig. 2.1.** Schematic for (a) Dual-MSD concept with fixed-on earth coordinates (OXYZ) and moving coordinates (oxyz) and (b) forces on the moving floater and the internal mass.
feature of this problem. Time-domain analysis given here in irregular wave for the internal mass system working in heave mode is the first of its kind. The Impulse Response Function (IRF) method [12] is used with the ISSC [13] spectrum to simulate the behavior in irregular waves and serves also as a cross-check of the frequency-domain results. In irregular seas, excessive relative motion occurs sometimes because the irregularity of the waves, thus an “end-stop” is introduced, which is modeled by stiff spring, damper, traverse length. With proper design, the end-stop not only can effectively restrain the relative motion in irregular wave, but also cause little energy loss (around 1–2%).

2. Frequency-domain analysis

2.1. Hydrodynamics of the floater shell

As shown in Fig. 2.1 (a), the floater is a heaving axisymmetrical cylinder with a Berkeley-Wedge shaped bottom [14]. It is insensitive to the incident wave angle. The Berkeley Wedge is a patented two-dimensional shape, meant to decrease the viscous effect and to enhance larger motion and better energy capture. To define the hydrodynamic forces, we assume that the fluid is inviscid, incompressible and flow irrotational. The total velocity potential \( \Phi(x, y, z, t) \) is given by Eq. (2.1).

\[
\Phi(x, y, z, t) = \Re \left\{ A_w \phi_0(x, y, z) + \phi_7(x, y, z)e^{-\imath \omega t} \right\} + \Re \left\{ \phi_7(x, y, z)A_i(-\imath \omega)e^{-\imath \omega t} \right\} \tag{2.1}
\]

where \( \phi_0 \) is the incident wave spatial potential. \( \phi_7 \) is the diffraction wave spatial potential. \( \phi_i \) is the radiation spatial potential body for direction i. Because we only consider heave motion in this design, so \( i=3 \). The hydrodynamic added mass \( \mu_{ij} \) and radiation damping \( \lambda_{ij} \) act in j-direction due to the motion in the i-direction:

\[
\mu_{ij} + \frac{i \lambda_{ij}}{\omega} = \rho \int_{S_0} \phi_i n_j dS \tag{2.2}
\]

The wave-exciting force \( f_{ij} \) is given by incident wave and diffraction wave (Eq. (2.4))

\[
f_{ij} = \Re \left\{ A_w X_j e^{-\imath \omega t} \right\} \tag{2.3}
\]

\[
X_j = |X_j| e^{i \delta_j} = \imath \rho \omega \int_{S_0} \phi_0 + \phi_7 n_j dS \tag{2.4}
\]

\[
\zeta(x, t) = \Re \left\{ A_w e^{i (\omega x - \omega t)} \right\} \tag{2.5}
\]

where \( \zeta \) is the incident-wave elevation at x, time t; \( |X_j| \) is the wave-exciting force amplitude per unit wave amplitude and \( \delta_j \) is the phase angle, relative to incident wave elevation at x = 0.

These hydrodynamic quantities were solved using a semi-analytical theory developed by Yeung [15]. This in-house code is on a UC-Berkeley server for public access. For the convenience of the planned experimental work, the overall geometry of the floater is taken as: \( 2a/h = 0.271 \) and \( d/h = 0.288 \), where \( a \) is the radius, \( d \) is the draft of the cylinder, and \( h \) is the water depth. For the wave tank at UC Berkeley Richmond Field Station Physical-Model Testing Facility, the water depth is \( h = 1.5 \text{ m} \) [16]. In Fig. 2.1(a) the draft \( d \) is an equivalent draft, which so that submerged mass of The Berkeley Wedge will have the same resonance frequency of the Dual-MSD floater with the flat-bottom cylinder.

Fig. 2.2 shows the hydrodynamic properties (added mass, radiation damping and wave-excitation force) for the given geometry. The non-dimensionaizations are \( \pi_{33} = \frac{\mu_{33}}{\pi a^2 d}, \quad \lambda_{33} = \frac{\lambda_{33}}{\pi a^2 d} \quad X_3 = X_3 / \pi a^2 \) and \( v = \sqrt{\alpha^2/v g}, \quad C_3 = g \mu_{33} A_{wp}, \)

where \( A_{wp} \) is the waterplane area of the floater. To model realistic viscous effects on the floater, we recall some experimental data from Son [16], in which he took advantage of the Berkeley-Wedge shape and applied it to an axisymmetric geometry. It was found that the total damping (radiation damping plus equivalent linear viscous damping) became roughly one third of that of a flat bottom while the heaved added mass was not much changed. Thus, we can use a viscosity-modified hydrodynamic damping coefficients of a flat-bottom cylinder as follows:

\[
\lambda_T = (1 + f_{visc}) \lambda_{33} \tag{2.6}
\]

where \( f_{visc} \) is the viscous coefficient for damping and is body-shape dependent. For the Berkeley-Wedge shaped bottom, \( f_{visc} = 1.753 \). 1

2.2. Equations of motion of the coupled system

Under the linear-wave and small-motion assumption, the heave motion is decoupled with motions of other freedoms (see Cochet [17]). In Fig. 2.1(a), OXYZ is the earth-fixed (global) coordinate system fixed on the sea bed and oxyz is the moving coordinate fixed on the floater. \( x_T \) and \( x_{3mr} \) represent the absolute vertical position of the floater and the mass block, respectively, relative to the global coordinate system OXYZ, thus \( x_T = x_{3mr} - x_3 \) defines the position of the internal mass block relative to the floater position.

From Fig. 2.1(b), we can develop the force balance of each of the mass system [11]:

\[
(M - m) \ddot{x}_3 = f_{e3} - \mu_{33} \ddot{x}_3 - \lambda_T x_3 - C_3 x_3 + B_g \dot{x}_T + k_m x_T \tag{2.7}
\]

\[
m \ddot{x}_{3mr} = -B_g \dot{x}_T - k_m x_T \tag{2.8}
\]

with \( B_g \) being the PTO damper coefficient. Here \( M \) is the mass of the entire coupled system (including both floater and the internal mass block), \( m \) represents the mass of the mass block, and \( k_m \) represents

---

1 For the two-dimensional Berkeley Wedge [14], \( f_{visc} = 0 \). \( f_{visc} \) can be measured using a transient free-decay heaving test. For a three-dimensional (axisymmetric) wedge \( f_{visc} = 1.753 \) [16], whereas a similarly measured value of a flat, truncated-bottom cylinder of the same proportions was \( f_{visc} = 7.448 \).
the spring between the mass block and the floater. \( f_{e3} = R \{ A_{e} x_{3} e^{-i \omega t} \} \) is the wave excitation force given by Eq. (2.3).

According to Bachynski et al. [4], the mooring system only introduces a low frequency resonance frequency and does not change the wave-frequency response of WEC, thus does not need to be considered. In a real system, mechanical friction may exist, which can be considered easily by modifying the term \( B_g \) in Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8). However, it is neglected in the present paper. In matrix form, it is convenient to write this 2-DOF system as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
M - m + \mu_{33} & 0 \\
0 & m
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_3 \\
x_{3m}
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_f + B_g & -B_g \\
-B_g & B_g
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_3 \\
x_{3m}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
f_{e3} \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(2.9)

2.3. Coupled resonance frequencies of the Dual-MSD system

Similar in character to [11], this Dual-MSD has two undamped resonance frequencies \( \Omega_{1,2} \), the expressions for these are shown in Eqs. (2.11) with the damping neglected. Of interest, we observe that \( \Omega_1 \) is lower than the resonance frequency of the floater itself \( \omega_3 \), and that of the internal mass-spring \( \omega_m \) without consideration of coupling, while the other frequency \( \Omega_2 \) is higher.

\[
\omega_3 = \sqrt{C_3/(M + \mu_{33}(\omega_3))}, \quad \omega_m = \sqrt{k_m/m}
\]

(2.10)

\[
\Omega_{1,2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_3)}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2)} \left( \frac{\omega_3^2 + \omega_m^2}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2)} - \frac{1}{m} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left( \frac{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_3)(\omega_3^2 + \omega_m^2)}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2)} - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 - \frac{4 \omega_3^2 \omega_m^2}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2) - \frac{1}{m}}}
\]

(2.11)

with \( \Omega_1 < (\omega_3 < \omega_m < \Omega_2). \)

In the above, three non-dimensional mass-ratios surface:

\( \mu_{33}(\Omega_3) = \mu_{33}(\omega_3) / M \), and \( \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}) = \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}) / M^2 \) Here, \( m = m / M \) and \( \Omega = k_m / C_3 \) can be considered as parameters of the coupled system. For convenience, we rewrite Eq. (2.11) in non-dimensional with respect to \( \Omega_3 \) as

\[
\Omega_{1,2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_3)}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2)} \left[ 1 + \left( 1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_3) \right) \frac{\Omega_3}{M} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left( \frac{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_3) \Omega_3^2}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2)} - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 - \frac{\Omega_3^2}{1 + \mu_{33}(\Omega_{1,2}^2) - \frac{1}{m}}}
\]

(2.12)

where \( \Omega_{1,2} = \Omega_{1,2} \sqrt{a/g} \) are the non-dimensional resonance frequencies of the fully coupled system, which need iterative solution using the added mass function, with the understanding that \( \mu_{33}(\Omega_3) \) is taken as constant once (2.10) has been iteratively solved.

The solution of Eq. (2.11) was obtained numerically by iteration using the known added-mass function \( \mu_{33}(\Omega) \) from numerical data of Fig. 2.2. Fig. 2.3 displays \( \Omega_{1,2} \) as a function of \( \Omega \) and \( \mu \). For certain given resonance frequency of \( \Omega_3 \), more than one combination of \( m \) and \( \Omega \) were possible. In addition, for a given or specified \( \Omega_3 \), one may consider \( \Omega = Q(m) \). Thus, a specific combination of \( m \) and \( \Omega \) would yield a lower resonance-frequency value of such a Dual-MSD system. Finally, when \( m \to 0 \) it implies that the DMSD system degenerates to a Single-MSD, \( \Omega_1 \to \Omega_3 \), that is, the lower resonance frequency approaches that of a single-mass system, while the higher resonance frequency \( \Omega_2 \to + \infty \) since \( \omega_m = k_m/m \to + \infty \) in Eq. (2.11).

It is of more practical importance to work with the lower resonance frequency \( \Omega_1 \). First, there is more ocean energy in lower frequency waves. Second, per Fig. 2.3, achieving a specific \( \Omega_1 \) is easier than that for \( \Omega_2 \) because the former requires distinct values of \( m \) and \( \Omega \) values to achieve it.

2.4. Motion and power response in regular waves

For notational simplicity, we define an effective mass \( M' = M - m + \mu_{33} \) for the floater alone. The equation of motion of the Dual-MSD Eq. (2.9) now becomes:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
M' & 0 \\
0 & m
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_{3} \\
x_{3m}
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_f + B_g & -B_g \\
-B_g & B_g
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_3 \\
x_{3m}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
f_{e3} \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(2.13)

In regular waves, the motions of the floater, the internal mass, as well as the wave excitation force are time-harmonic:

\[
x_i = R \{ a_i e^{-i \omega t} \} i = 3 \text{ or } 3m
\]

(2.14)

\[
f_{e3} = R \{ A_{e3} x_{3} e^{-i \omega t} \}
\]

(2.15)

where \( a_3 \) and \( a_{3m} \) are complex motion amplitudes of the floater and internal mass, respectively. Inserting Eq. (2.14) and Eq. (2.15) into
Eq. (2.13), we obtain the following explicit expressions for the response per unit amplitude of incident wave:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c}
a_3/A_w \\
a_{3m}/A_w \\
\end{array} \right\} = \frac{X_c}{\det[Z]} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
-\omega^2 m + k_m + ioB_g \\
k_m + ioB_g \\
\end{array} \right\}$$

(2.16)

where the matrix $[Z]$ is given by:

$$[Z] = \begin{bmatrix}
-\omega^2 M' + (C_3 + k_m) + io(\lambda_T + B_g) \\
-k_m - ioB_g \\
-k_m + ioB_g \\
-\omega^2 m + k_m + ioB_g
\end{bmatrix}$$

(2.17)

with $\det[Z]$ being the complex determinant. The Response Amplitude Operator (RAO) of the relative motion, between the internal mass and floater, and the floater itself are:

$$\text{RAO}_r \equiv \frac{a_3}{A_w}, \quad \text{RAO}_3 \equiv \frac{a_3}{A_w}$$

(2.18)

The time-averaged power extraction by the PTO damper $B_g$ from the internal mass is driven by the relative motion:

$$P_M(\overline{\xi}) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T B_g |\dot{a}_r|^2 dt = \frac{1}{2} M_{\overline{\xi}} \overline{\xi}^2 \lambda_T(\overline{\xi}) \overline{\omega}^2 \text{RAO}_r^2$$

(2.19)

where $\lambda_T(\overline{\xi}) = \lambda_T(\overline{\xi})/\omega_3 \pi a_0^2 d$ is the total nondimensional damping ratio ($\approx 0.032$ for the selected geometry) at the resonance frequency of the floater alone at $\omega_3$ without internal mass, $\overline{\lambda}_T\equiv B_g/\lambda_T(\overline{\xi})$ is the damping ratio of the generator to fluid damping, $\overline{\xi} = \omega_3 \sqrt{a/g}$ is the non-dimensional wave frequency.

The time-averaged wave power per unit width of wave front is well-known:

$$P_W = \rho g A_w^2 V_g$$

(2.20)

where $V_g = \frac{1}{2} V_p[1 + 2k_0 h / \sinh(2k_0 h)]$ is the group velocity and $V_p = (g/\omega) \tanh(k_0 h)$ is the phase velocity of the wave. From Eqs. (2.19) and (2.20), the energy capture width of the system (normalized by the floater diameter) can be defined as:

$$\overline{\tau}_w = \frac{P_M}{2P_W d}$$

(2.21)

Hence, the non-dimensional capture width is a function of mass ratio $\overline{m}$, spring ratio $\overline{s}$ and PTO damping ratio $\overline{B}_g$, that is, $\overline{\tau}_w = \overline{\tau}_w(\overline{m}, \overline{s}, \overline{B}_g)$. The three parameters determine the interim result of $\text{RAO}_r$ before it is used in (2.21).

To study the influence of the mass ratio $\overline{m}$, spring ratio $\overline{s}$ and
generator damping ratio $B_g$ on the motion and power response of the Dual-MSD WEC, it is appropriate to recall the traditional heave point absorber concept (Single-MSD or SMSD [4]) for comparison. PTO system is hidden inside the floater for Dual-MSD concept but the Single-MSD concept needs a reference point for motion (which may be the seabed or on-shore structure etc.). For the SMSD, it is a well-known conclusion that the power is maximized when $B_g = l_T$ at resonance (see e.g. Ref. [18]). We take the radius and the draft of the SMSD as $a$ and $d$ respectively, which are same as the Dual-MSD, so that the resonance frequency of the floater is the same. In each of these studies, we present the $\text{RAO}_3$, $\text{RAO}_r$, and $C_w$ computed from Eqs. (2.18) and (2.21).

2.4.1. Effect of PTO damping ratio $B_g$

Figs. 2.4–2.6 show that small $B_g$ does not change the location of the resonance peaks, but does affect the amplitude of the motion and power response. However, if $B_g$ is too large. The two peaks vanish and the troughs in the response of both floater and internal mass evolve to a new peak at the resonance frequency of the floater $\omega = \omega_1$. This is rather remarkable! In long waves, when wave frequency approaches to $\omega = 0$, $\text{RAO}_3$, the response of the floater of the Dual-MSD, approaches the limit of 1, the same as the traditional Single-MSD WEC. However, for the relative motion, $\text{RAO}_r \to 0$ in both high frequency and zero frequency limits. For small enough $B_g$, a larger capture width is attainable at longer wave period.

2.4.2. Effects of mass ratio $\pi$ and internal spring constant $\tau$

Figs. 2.7–2.9 show that $\pi$ not only can change the location of the resonance frequency but also the amplitude of $\text{RAOs}$, thus the capture width. The lower resonance frequency $\omega_1$ is more sensitive to the value of $\pi$.

Figs. 2.10–2.12 show similar behavior as that due to the mass ratio $\pi$, namely, spring ratio $\tau$ can change both the location of the

![Fig. 2.6. Non-dimensional Capture width $C_w$ with $\pi = 0.3$, $\tau = 0.1$ and varying $B_g$.](image)

![Fig. 2.7. Floater motion RAO with $\tau = 0.1$, $B_g = 0.2$ with varying $\pi$.](image)

![Fig. 2.8. Relative motion RAO with $\tau = 0.1$, $B_g = 0.2$ and varying $\pi$.](image)

![Fig. 2.9. Non-dimensional capture width $C_w$ with $\pi = 0.1$, $B_g = 0.2$ and varying $\pi$.](image)

![Fig. 2.10. Floater motion RAO with $\pi = 0.5$, $B_g = 0.5$ and varying $\pi$.](image)
resonance frequency and the amplitude of the motion and power response. However, the effect of $s$ is highly non-linear as opposed to $m$. Experimental validation in the shift in resonance peaks are shown in Appendix B, which lends credence to this theoretical model.

2.5. Optimizing capture width of the Dual-MSD

2.5.1. Damping ratio optimization

To optimize the capture width $C_w$ for a given wave frequency $\bar{m}$, we first consider determining the optimal damping ratio $\bar{B}_g$. Equation (2.21) can be rearranged into the following quotient form:

$$C_w = \frac{E}{2P_W a} \frac{\bar{B}_g}{(A + B\bar{B}_g)^2 + (C + D\bar{B}_g)^2} \quad (2.22)$$

where

$$A = \bar{m}^2 (1 + \bar{p}_{33}(\bar{m}) - m) + \frac{(1 + \bar{p}_{33})^2}{\bar{m}^2} - [\bar{m}(1 + \bar{p}_{33}(\bar{m})) + m] (1 + \bar{p}_{33})$$

$$B = -\bar{m}_T(\bar{m})\bar{\lambda}_T \quad (2.23)$$

$$C = \frac{\bar{T}(\bar{m})}{\bar{m}} \left[ (1 + \bar{p}_{33}) \bar{s} - \bar{m}^2 \bar{m} \right] \quad (2.25)$$

$$D = (1 + \bar{p}_{33})^2 \bar{T} - \bar{m}_T(\bar{m}) (1 + \bar{p}_{33}(\bar{m})) \quad (2.26)$$

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \bar{m}_T(\bar{m})^2 \bar{T}^2 \bar{m}_T(\bar{m}) \left( \left( 1 + \bar{p}_{33}(\bar{m}) \right) \bar{m} \right)^2 \quad (2.27)$$

where $\bar{T}$ and $\bar{p}_{33}$ without the frequency argument are understood to be the total damping coefficient and the added-mass coefficient, respectively, at the resonance frequency of the stand-alone floater $\bar{m}$.

As illustrated in Fig. 2.13 typically, as $\bar{B}_g$ varies, $C_w$ first increase then decrease, and only one maximum exists. We can differentiate Eq. (2.22) with respect to $\bar{B}_g$ and set it to zero to obtain the optimal $\bar{B}_{g,opt}$:

$$\frac{dC_w}{d\bar{B}_g} = \frac{E}{2P_W a} \left[ \frac{(A^2 + C^2) - (B^2 + D^2)\bar{B}_g^2}{(A + B\bar{B}_g)^2 + (C + D\bar{B}_g)^2} \right] = 0 \quad (2.28)$$

$$\bar{B}_{g,opt} = \sqrt{\frac{A^2 + C^2}{B^2 + D^2}} \quad (2.29)$$

Furthermore, if we substitute Eq. (2.29) into Eq. (2.22), we can obtain the optimal capture width as:

$$C_{w,opt} = \frac{E}{4P_W a} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(A^2 + C^2)(B^2 + D^2) + (AB + CD)}} \quad (2.30)$$

Subsequent to derivation of these exact optimal expressions, they were also applied to a double-float WEC problem in Zhang et al. [22].

2.5.2. Optimization procedure for capture width without limitations on motion

To conduct the optimization of capture with for a given wave frequency $\bar{m}$ (say, $\bar{m} = 0.8\bar{m}_3$, for example), first, we tune the mass ratio and the spring ratio to achieve the resonance frequency of the
DMSD system to match the wave frequency \( \Omega_1 = \mathbf{m} = 0.8\mathbf{m}_3 \) using Eq. (2.12). In section 2.3, it was already pointed out that the capture width is a function of mass ratio, spring ratio, generator-damping ratio, i.e., \( \mathbf{C}_w = \mathbf{C}_w(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{B}_g) \) for a given wave frequency. Next, putting the optimized damping ratio of Eq. (2.29) into Eq. (2.21), we can obtain the optimal capture width as a function of the mass ratio and spring ratio, namely, \( \mathbf{C}_{w,\text{opt}} = \mathbf{C}_{w,\text{opt}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{s}) \). However, for a given frequency, the spring ratio is a function of the mass ratio \( \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{m}) \) (as mentioned in section 2.3). Hence, the optimal capture width becomes a function of only the mass ratio \( \mathbf{C}_{w,\text{opt}} = \mathbf{C}_{w,\text{opt}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{m})) \).

Thus, we can display the optimal capture width versus mass ratio and with the matching optimal damping ratio, spring ratio, floater RAO, and relative motion RAO all in one figure. Fig. 2.14 illustrates that as \( \mathbf{m} \) increases, the optimized \( \mathbf{B}_g \) and \( \mathbf{s} \) increase, the \( \mathbf{R}_0 \), decrease, and the \( \mathbf{C}_w \) first increases and then approaches asymptotically \( \mathbf{C}_w = 1.21 \), for the specific sample geometry under consideration. Of interest, we note the plateau behavior of the curve of \( \mathbf{C}_w \) suggests a fairly flexible choice of mass ratio to achieve this value. Different choice of \( \mathbf{m} \), however, leads to different motion responses (both relative motion and floater motion). The most interesting curve is RAO. Generally, the RAO curve increases as \( \mathbf{m} \) increases, but when \( \mathbf{m} \rightarrow 0 \), RAO \( \rightarrow 1.45 \) which corresponds to the case that the Dual-MSD has degenerated to a Single-MSD when \( \mathbf{m} \) is very small. RAO is rather large as \( \mathbf{m} \) becomes small, so the discussion following will focus on the \( \mathbf{C}_w \) and RAO.

### 2.5.3. Limitations on design choices of internal mechanical system

When optimizing the capture width of the Dual-MSD, we have to consider several limitations because of the geometry and internal mechanism: these being the relative motion, internal mass, spring, damping, etc. This paper will focus the discussions on two limitations (relative motion and internal mass) because the specific design for changing \( \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{s} \) and \( \mathbf{B}_g \) are separately reported [19].

Here, for illustration, let’s consider \( \mathbf{D}_1 = \mathbf{m} = 0.8\mathbf{m}_3 \). First, because the internal mass is moving inside the floater of limited space, so the relative motion is limited. Since \( \mathbf{C}_{w,\text{opt}} = \mathbf{C}_{w,\text{opt}}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{m})) \), we should select \( \mathbf{m} \) large enough so that the relative motion is less than \( \mathbf{x}_{\text{max}} \) while retaining the maximum capture width value \( \mathbf{C}_w = 1.21 \), based on Fig. 2.14. If \( \mathbf{x}_{\text{max}} = \mathbf{x}_{\text{max}}/\mathbf{d} = 1.0 \), as a cap, it leads to a limitation of relative motion \( \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{A}0,\text{max}} = \mathbf{x}_{\text{max}}/\mathbf{A}_w = 1/\mathbf{A}_w \) (Fig. 2.15), where the wave amplitude is non-dimensionalized as \( \mathbf{A}_w = \mathbf{A}_w/\mathbf{d} \). Furthermore, Fig. 2.14 shows that we can choose a larger \( \mathbf{m} \) for a given wave frequency so that the RAO, is smaller while the maximum value of \( \mathbf{C}_w \) is still attainable. Thus, for each wave amplitude \( \mathbf{A}_w \), we can interpolate from Fig. 2.14 by using the maximum relative motion criterion: \( \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{A}0,\text{max}} = 1/\mathbf{A}_w \) to obtain the corresponding \( \mathbf{B}_g, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{s} \), and \( \mathbf{C}_w \) (Fig. 2.15). Thus, Fig. 2.15 shows that as \( \mathbf{A}_w \) increases, the \( \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{A}0,\text{max}} \) decreases, and accordingly, the optimal \( \mathbf{B}_g, \mathbf{m} \) and \( \mathbf{s} \) increase while \( \mathbf{C}_w \) can retain the maximum value. This suggests a larger internal mass ratio \( \mathbf{m} \) is more favorable. In other words, the internal mass does not need to be varied in real application, and it should be the larger the better.

Second, Fig. 2.15 illustrates that the mass ratio \( \mathbf{m} \) could be too large to be practical for higher wave amplitude \( \mathbf{A}_w \). For example, if \( \mathbf{A}_w = 0.25 \) then the limitation of relative motion \( \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{A}0,\text{max}} = 4.0 \), which will give the optimized mass ratio (from Fig. 2.15) as \( \mathbf{m} = 0.76 \) under this relative motion criterion. The remedy then is to introduce a maximum of mass ratio \( \mathbf{m}_{\text{max}} \). If \( \mathbf{m}_{\text{max}} = 0.5 \), is taken as the choice, then, at same wave amplitude \( \mathbf{A}_w = 0.25 \), we simply have to increase the damping ratio rather than having an impractically large mass ratio \( (\mathbf{m} = 0.76) \) to meeting the relative motion \( \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{A}0,\text{max}} = 4.0 \). In this situation, the PTO damping would not be the optimal damping (from Eq. (2.29)) anymore, so the capture width cannot achieve the maximum value \( \mathbf{C}_w = 1.21 \). Fig. 2.16 shows the final achievable value of \( \mathbf{C}_w \) and corresponding \( \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{A}0,\text{max}}, \mathbf{B}_g, \mathbf{m}, \) and \( \mathbf{s} \) under concurrently the relative motion limitation and maximum
mass ratio limitation. Note that the capture width remains optimal at smaller wave amplitude but decreases at large wave amplitude because of the mass-ratio limitation. Since wave power is proportional to $A^2$ and small drop in $C_w$ still retains significant amount of energy capture.

2.5.4. Optimization for different incident wave frequency and wave amplitude under motion limitations

The above optimization procedure is summarized in Fig. 2.17 as a flow chart. Following the same procedure, we can plot the optimal $\tilde{\tau}_w$ in terms of wave amplitude $\tilde{\omega}$ and target wave frequency $\tilde{\omega}$ in Fig. 2.18 under both relative motion limitation and mass ratio limitation. Each dot in Fig. 2.18 is the optimized capture width ratio (under limitations) at given wave frequency and amplitude, with the $\bar{m} = \bar{m}_{\text{max}}$ but the $\tilde{s}$ and the $\tilde{B}_w$ varying. It seems that we do not have to change the mass ratio but only varying the spring ratio to match the resonance frequency of the DMSD to the encounter wave frequency. Nevertheless, the limitations considered in this paper are just relative motion and mass ratio, there may be other limitations in spring or damping systems too [19,20]. Thus, in practice, all of these three parameters ($B_w$, $s$, $\tilde{B}_w$) may have to be changeable. Also, from Fig. 2.18, the optimal $\tilde{\tau}_w$ is not only a function of wave frequency, but also wave amplitude. Additionally, comparing to SMSD, Dual-MSD’s have larger capture width especially in lower wave frequencies.

3. Time-domain analysis in irregular waves

The motion and power response on the average in irregular waves are different from the regular-wave cases addressed earlier. Since waves in the open sea are random or irregular, it is of practical interest to understand how to model this system in irregular waves. Further, in order to confine the excessive relative motion in irregular wave, an end-stop device should be employed, which time domain simulation is needed.

3.1. Equation of motion in the time domain

The impulse response function method (IRF) [12] can be used to calculate the motion and power response in the time domain. Eq. (3.1) is the coupled equation of motion for Dual-MSD in the time domain.

\[
\begin{align*}
(M_{33} - m + \mu_{33\omega})\ddot{x}_3 + \int_0^t K_{33}(t - \tau)\dot{x}_3(\tau)d\tau + B_g\dot{x}_3 + (C_3 + k_m) - B_g\dot{x}_{3m} - k_nx_{3m} &= f_{33}(t) \\
mx_{3m} + B_g\dot{x}_{3m} + k_nx_{3m} - B_g\dot{x}_3 - k_mx_3 &= 0
\end{align*}
\]
where $K_{33}(t)$ is the retardant kernel function, which can be calculated from damping by below:

$$K_{33}(t) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \left[ \lambda_T(\omega) - \lambda_T(\infty) \right] \cos \omega t \, d\omega$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

An assumption is made that the viscous correction effects are not frequency-dependent, thus not affecting the normal frequency-domain to time-domain relations. As mentioned before, for the convenience of experiment, the geometry of the floater is $2a/h = 0.271$ and $d/h = 0.288$ (Appendix A). Since time domain calculation is more time-consuming than frequency-domain analysis, so only peak wave frequency $\sigma_p = 0.8\sigma_m$ ($\sigma_m = 3.38$ rad/s, $T_p = 1.86s$) will be explored as an example. The system is treated as a passive device with PTO damping $B_g$ taken as parameter, but constant in value.

To verify the correctness of the time-domain code, the authors compare the time-domain results with those from regular-wave excitation. Fig. 3.1, Fig. 3.2 and Fig. 3.3 are the results of floater motion RAO and relative motion RAO in time domain (dots) and frequency domain (lines). They match well, especially at low wave frequencies, lending confidence to the procedure.

3.2. General irregular wave simulation of a DMSD absorber

Irregular waves response simulations use ISSC spectrum, namely a modified Pierson-Moskowitz spectrum [13], to construct the irregular wave elevation time history $\zeta(t)$.

$$S(\omega) = H_s^2 T_1 \left( \frac{\omega T_1}{2\pi} \right)^5 \exp \left[ -0.44 \left( \frac{\omega T_1}{2\pi} \right)^{-4} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

$$T_1 = 0.7713 T_p$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

$$A(\omega_j) = \sqrt{2S(\omega_j)\Delta\omega}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

$$\zeta(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N A(\omega_j) \sin(\omega_j t + \phi_j + \epsilon_j)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

$$f_{33}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N [X_3(\omega_j)] A(\omega_j) \sin(\omega_j t + \phi_j + \epsilon_j)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)

$$P_w = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\beta c_g^2}{4\omega_j} A(\omega_j)^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{2k_0(\omega_j)h}{\sinh(2k_0(\omega_j)h)} \right] \tanh(k_0(\omega_j)h)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

where $H_s = 2A_k$ is the significant wave height, $T_p = 2\pi/\omega_p$ is the peak period, $A(\omega_j)$ is the wave amplitude of each frequency component, and $\epsilon_j$ is the random phase angle, which uniformly distributes between $[0, 2\pi]$ and is constant in time. Eq. (3.7) and Eq. (3.8) are the wave excitation force in heave mode and the wave power of irregular wave in unit frontal width.

3.3. Motion response and power capture in irregular waves

In the frequency domain, the optimization procedure was shown in Section 2.5, an example was given in Fig. 2.16 when peak wave frequency is $\sigma_p = 0.8\sigma_m$. In the time domain using the same mass ratio $m$, spring ratio $s$, and damping ratio $B_g$ as in Fig. 2.16, Fig. 3.4 and Fig. 3.5 plot the non-dimensional capture width $C_w$ and maximum relative motion $x_{max} = x_{max}/d$ and maximum relative motion $x_{max} = x_{max}/d$. Capture width is smaller in irregular waves (maximum $C_w$ is around 0.24) than in regular waves (Fig. 2.16). Furthermore, the optimal constant $B_g$ in irregular wave is larger than in regular waves. In this $\sigma_p = 0.8\sigma_m$ example, the optimal $B_g = 3.0$. However, the $C_w$ is still smaller than that in regular waves. This is because the bandwidth of the capture width of the DMSD WEC is relatively narrow, and irregular waves contain all frequency components. To compensate the reduction because of the narrow bandwidth, a larger PTO damping is in need.
However, even with enlarged optimal PTO damping, the capture width is still lower than that in the regular waves. Fig. 3.5 illustrates that owing to the irregularity of the waves, the maximum relative motion $x_{r_{\text{max}}}$ can be larger than unity even with enlarged optimal $B_g$ for irregular waves when the significant wave height is large. Hence an end-stop device is needed to confine the excessive relative motion.

3.4. End-stop modeling and effect

Because the Dual-MSD has an internal mass moving inside the floater, so the relative motion between the internal mass and floater has limitation $x_{r_{\text{max}}}$ and mean power $P_m$. As mentioned earlier in this work, the maximum relative motion is set at $x_{r_{\text{max}}}/d = 1.0$. In irregular waves, the relative motion response sometimes exceeds this bond $x_{r_{\text{max}}}$ (Fig. 3.5). To limit the relative motion and protect the internal structure, an end-stop must be implied. As shown in Fig. 3.6, the end-stop in this paper is a system consisting of spring and damper, such as shock absorbers for automobiles. Thus, the end-stop has three parameters: spring constant $k_e$, damping constant $B_e$ and end-stop length $L_e$. The normalization of...
these three parameters are as follows: \( \overline{k}_w = k_w/C_3 \), \( \overline{B}_w = B_w/(\omega T) \), and \( \overline{m} = m/e \).

In irregular waves, when excessive relative motion occurs, the internal mass hits the end-stop and the end-stop pushes the internal mass by spring and damper to decrease the motion. The effect of length, damping and spring of end-stop are discussed in Fig. 3.10, Fig. B.1, and Fig. B.2, where the mean power is normalized by the wave power in the range of floater width \( \overline{P}_m = P_m/2aPw \).

Fig. 3.7 illustrates that as the end-stop length \( L_e \) increasing, the maximum relative motion \( \overline{x}_{\text{max}} \) decrease as well as the mean power \( \overline{P}_m \). The same property is found for end-stop damping \( \overline{B}_w \) (Fig. 3.8) and spring \( \overline{k}_w \) (Fig. 3.9), but the decreasing rate is very small. The capture width curve is almost flat when the \( \overline{B}_w \) and \( \overline{k}_w \) is varying in Figs. 3.8 and 3.9. The existence of damping \( \overline{B}_w \) consumes energy. The spring \( \overline{k}_w \) does not consume energy but changes response property, because the spring constant in the range of end-stop is not optimal anymore. Thus, the most influential parameter is the end-stop length \( L_e \). The small \( L_e \) means low possibility of end-stop interfering the movement of the internal mass. Fortunately, with a proper designed end-stop \( (\overline{B}_w = 5.0, \overline{k}_w = 0.5, L_e = 0.2) \), the relative motion is confined effectively (Fig. 3.5) while the energy absorption does not drop much (Fig. 3.4). In Fig. 3.4, the power response remains almost the same, only have 1–2% declination at \( \lambda_e = 0.6 \). Fig. 3.10 gives an example of time history of the floater motion and the relative motion with and without the end-stops. Clearly, we can see that when the wave force is small, the relative motion does not reach the end-stop, so that the motion response is the same with and without end-stop. Nevertheless, when the wave force is larger, the relative motion becomes larger and the internal mass hit the end-stop. Because of the spring and damping of the end-stop the internal mass is pushed back so that the relative motion is limited. At the same time, the motion of floater becomes larger due to the force of the end-stop. As time progresses, the waves force becomes smaller again and the responses of the motions become the same with and without end-stop. We note that elaborate control of such constrained system in the time domain had been developed using Nonlinear Model-Predictive Control (Son & Yeung [21]).

4. Conclusions

Owing to the coupling effects between the two sets of mass-spring-damper in the Dual-MSD WEC, the response of motions and power have two resonance peaks, which can be manipulated by varying the internal mass and spring. Thus, building a relatively small ( economical) device but working in lower wave frequencies is possible. The damping does not influence the locations of the resonance much, but to achieve optimal wave energy capture width, the damping of the PTO also needs to be adjustable, based on a new formula that has been developed. When optimizing the capture width, there are limitations (such as relative motion, internal mass, spring and damping etc.) which come from the geometry of the floater and internal mechanisms. In this paper, the limitations being considered are the relative motion and internal mass. Under these two limitations and using regular waves in the frequency domain, the optimal capture width turns out to be not only a function of wave frequency but also wave amplitude. The IRF method is used to simulate the motion and power response in irregular waves in time domain. It turns out that the mean power \( \overline{P}_m \) is smaller in irregular waves than that in regular waves, because of the narrow bandwidth of the capture width curve and the use of a constant PTO damping. Excessive relative motion occurs because of the irregular behavior of the waves. To limit the excessive relative motion, an end-stop is employed. With a properly designed end-stop, there is very little energy loss ( less than 2%). The frequency-domain results of the model have been validated by a specially designed DMSD WEC fitted with “The Berkeley Wedge” bottom.
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Appendix A

Table of particulars of the floater for illustrative computations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water depth</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance frequency</td>
<td>( w_3 )</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance Period</td>
<td>( 2\pi w_3 )</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added mass coefficient at resonance</td>
<td>( p_{21}(w_3) )</td>
<td>0.2742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation damping coefficient at resonance</td>
<td>( p_{31}(w_3) )</td>
<td>0.0324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscous correction (flat-bottom)</td>
<td>( f_{vis} )</td>
<td>1.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B. Experimental validation of modeling of a variable resonance-frequency WEC device.

Figure B.1 below, courtesy of Virey and Park [19,20] shows a comparison of the responses from the theory as presented and those from a variable frequency-resonance WEC, which was specially fitted with a Berkeley-Wedged shape bottom [14] (see Figure B.2), undergoing a one-degree of freedom motion. The measured value of \( f_{vis} \) was 1.543 for this shape. Details of the design to achieve specific values of \( \sigma, m, \) and hydraulic-cylinder power takeoff \( B_g \) (labeled as \( \bar{B}_g \)) are described in Refs. [19,20].

Fig. B.1. Measured response for WEC device shown in Fig. B.2, at \( m = 0.1062, \) with varying \( \pi. \)

Fig. B.2. Rendering of DMSD-WEC device in wave-excited heaving motion mounted on a platform.