OPTIMIZATION OF DESIGN PARAMETERS OF GO-KART
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Abstract— the objective of the design is to optimize the working and performance of go-kart considering various factors. The modeling of our Go-kart was done using CATIA V5 software. The Finite Element Analysis was analyzed by ANSYS R18.2 software. Our central idea was to focus on designing a safe and functional vehicle that could be manufactured and be capable to compete in the market. This article summarizes the advances of vehicle dynamics which includes braking system, transmission system and steering system. Some of the attributes of the vehicle dynamics related to geometric attributes, attributes based on the mass and its distribution and attributes which are tire specific are also discussed in this paper.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Go-kart is an open wheel car powered by an I.C. engine/electric motor. It may be considered as a small prototype consisting of basic automobile components. The vehicle is required to be made with a combination of a frame and other integral parts such as steering, braking, transmission, etc. As weight serves critical in any vehicle operating on a small engine, there should be an optimum weight to power ratio. The frame has been designed accordingly [“Thavai et al. (2015) in their paper discussed about the material selection & modelling of the frame”]. Particular capabilities on basis of which the go-kart is judged includes static as well as dynamic.

The design of the go-kart focuses on the following objectives: Safety, Strength, Standardization, Cost, Driver ease, Ergonomics and Aesthetic consideration.

II. DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS AND ASTHETICS

Preliminary, several design considerations are to be defined before beginning the design of the frame and different parts. These decisions include transmission, intended steering, braking, assembly, fabrication methods. Besides these considerations the rules regarding the frame geometry, driver safety must also be considered [“Kyung G. et al. (2009) in their paper concentrated on the driver ease, working space & driving postures for ergonomic design”]. Our main aim was to design a Go kart which is cost effective, giving out low emissions, light in weight, high performing and safe and easy to fabricate as well[“Gandhi et al. (2014) in their work addressed challenges related to safety, future fuels & reducing pollution in other words a smart Go-kart”]. CATIA V5 software has been utilized to model the design. Different views of the Go kart have been added here.

Figure 1: Front View of CAD Model of Go- Kart

Figure 2: Side View of CAD Model of Go- Kart
Material selection is one of the major key points in designing the frame which increases the reliability, strength & performance of the Kart [“Yongfeng et al. (2018) in their work emphasizes on the lightweight material for the weight reduction for automobile applications.”]. For this, extensive research has been done & various materials are compared in different categories which include cost, strength & weight. So, the material that best suited our design values is AISI 1020 square pipe with 2mm wall thickness. This material has been chosen because of its weld ability, light weight, cost, strength & ductility.

### Table 1. Mechanical Properties of Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Value (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Density (x1000 kg/m²)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Poisson’s Ratio</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Elastic Modulus (GPa)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tensile Strength (MPa)</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Yield Strength (MPa)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Elongation (%)</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Chemical Composition of Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Element(S)</th>
<th>Weight %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manganese, Mn</td>
<td>0.30 - 0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Carbon, C</td>
<td>0.18 – 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sulphur, S</td>
<td>.05 (Max)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Phosphorus, P</td>
<td>.04 (Max)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Iron, Fe</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS (FEA):**

After the designing the analysis of the frame is done using ANSYS R18.2 software. Loads were calculated theoretically and placed on the frame at critical point to calculate the amount of deformation and stress generation at the time of collision, method best known as Finite Element Method. [“Pattansethi et al. (2016) in their work deals with the Design and Analysis of frame for the Go Kart using Finite Element Analysis under various stresses and forces”]. Front, side & rear impacts are the cases that were simulated. These impact values are calculated according to maximum performance of vehicle and global NCAP (New Car Assessment Program). Front, side & rear cases of impacts are calculated by the procedure given below:

**A.1. Front impact**

The velocity of the Kart is assumed to be 70 km/hr i.e. 19.44 m/s (V). Collision duration is small, so the duration is assumed to be 0.2 sec (t). Gross vehicle weight (assumed) = 150 kg (M), so the value of front impact force is calculated by mass moment equation:
Now, the calculated force is applied on the frame by keeping the rear part fixed and the result is shown in the image below:

\[
F = \frac{M \times V}{t} \tag{1}
\]
\[
F = \frac{14.580}{10} \tag{2}
\]

Now, the calculated force is applied on the frame by keeping the front fixed and the result is shown in the image below:

\[
F = \frac{M \times V}{t} \tag{1}
\]
\[
F = \frac{16.665}{10} \tag{2}
\]

A.2. Side Impact

Assumed velocity of the vehicle is 60 km/hr i.e. 16.67 m/s. Assumed duration of time \( t=0.2 \text{sec} \).

Gross Vehicle Weight= 150kg. So the value of side impact force is calculated by mass moment equation:-

\[
F = \frac{M \times V}{t} \tag{1}
\]
\[
F = \frac{12502.5}{10} \tag{2}
\]

A.3. Rear Impact

The velocity of the Kart is assumed to be 75km/hr i.e. 22.22 m/s (V). Collision duration is small, so the duration is assumed to be 0.2 sec (t). Gross vehicle weight (assumed) = 150 kg (M). So the value of rear impact force is calculated by mass moment equation.

\[
F = \frac{M \times V}{t} \tag{1}
\]
\[
F = \frac{150}{10}
\]

After the impact testing is done, the factor of safety is calculated by the formula.

\[
F.O.S = \left( \frac{\text{material strength}}{\text{generated stress}} \right)
\]

Hence the result Provided from these analysis modes are accurate for the amount of loading that was applied to the frame. With the collected data from FEA the safety factor has been found to be 2.01. However, this result does not depict the actual scenario of the collision as the test was conducted by fixed the parts in spite of moving parts (dynamic form) during the real collision ["Renuke (2012) in their work discussed about modifying the frame according to the analysis of the frame related to the disturbances and natural frequencies on ANSYS"].
IV. CENTER OF GRAVITY:

![Figure 11. Weight distribution of Go-kart](image)

A. DESIGN PARAMETERS

Wheel base (l) = 1062mm = 41.811 inches  
Track width (t) = 910 mm = 35.827 inches  
\( tf = 910 \text{ mm} = 35.827 \text{ inches} \)  
\( tr = 960 \text{ mm} = 37.795 \text{ inches} \)

The weight distribution of vehicle is assumed to be 2:3. The total weight of the vehicle without driver is 90 kg.

Calculations:

\[ w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 = w \]  
\[ (3) \]

Let, \( w_1 = 18 \text{ kg}, w_2 = 18 \text{ kg}, w_3 = 27 \text{ kg}, w_4 = 27 \text{ kg} \)

\[ w = 90 \text{ kg} \]

\[ d = tr - tf/2 \]  
\[ (4) \]

\[ = 50 \text{ mm} \]

\[ wf = 36 \text{ kg}, \]  
\[ \text{w}r = 54 \text{ kg} \]

Now (Taking moment about rear axis)

\[ b = (wf \times 1/w) \]  
\[ (5) \]

\[ = (36 \times 1062)/90 \]  
\[ = 424.8 \text{ mm} \]

\[ a = l - b \]  
\[ = 1062 - 424.8 \]  
\[ = 637.2 \text{ mm} \]

\[ y' = w_3 \times (tf - d)/w - w_1 \times (d)/w + w_4 \times tr/w \]  
\[ (6) \]

\[ = 18 \times (910 - 25)/90 - 18 \times (25)/90 + (27 \times 960)/90 \]  
\[ = 177 - 5 + 288 \]  
\[ = 460 \text{ mm} \]

Lateral Shift (With driver on board, W= 150kg)

\[ y' = w_2 \times tr \times d/w - w_1 \times (d)/w + w_4 \times tr/w - tr/2 \]  
\[ (7) \]

\[ = 18 \times (910 - 25)/150 - 18 \times (25)/150 + (27 \times 960)/150 - 960/2 \]  
\[ = 106.2 - 3 + 172.88 - 480 = -203.92 \text{ mm} \]

Negative sign denotes shifting of C.G to the front.

The co-ordinates of C.O.G are (424.8, 460) from rear axle (with driver).

Thus the center of gravity of the kart is calculated ["Mango N. (2004) in their work emphasizes the calculation of vehicle’s Centre of Gravity (CG) affecting the performance parameters of the car & the method used by racing teams.”].

V. STEERING SYSTEM DESIGN AND CALCULATIONS:

The steering system converts the rotation of the steering wheel into a swiveling movement of the road wheels in such a way that the steering-wheel rim turns a long way to move the road wheels a short way. It is used for changing the direction of the vehicle. Vehicle steering is not only required on a curved road but also on maneuvering on the busy traffic roads. A steering system must offer sufficient precision for the driver to actually sense what is happening at the front tyres contact patch as well as enough “feel” to sense the approach to cornering limit of the front tyres. It must be structurally stiff to avoid components deflections and for this purpose Ackermann steering mechanism has been used ["Zhao J.S.et al. (2013) studied about different types of mechanism related to the steering geometry & investigating the turning geometry for steering wheels in their work.”].

A. OBJECTIVE

The basic aim of steering is to ensure that the wheels are pointing in the desired directions. This is typically achieved by a series of linkages, rods, pivots and gears. The main goal for steering is to have turning radius 3m or less. It is designed to withstand the stress of safely maneuvering the vehicle.

B. DESIGN

The steering system must be able to turn the front wheels sharply yet easily and smoothly. So while designing the steering system, the constraints that we possessed were Centre alignment of steering system, track width human effort at the steering wheel and the desired response of the steering system.

The co-ordinates of C.O.G are (424.8, 460) from rear axle (without driver).
While designing the important angles kept in mind were:

B.1. Caster angle

It is the angle between the pivot line (in a car - an imaginary line that runs through the Centre of the upper ball joint to the Centre of the lower ball joint) and vertical. Caster angle can be adjusted to optimize a car’s handling characteristics for particular driving situations.

B.2. Camber Angle

Camber (or camber angle) is the angle of the tire from zero degrees (meaning straight up and down) when viewed from the front of the vehicle. If the bottom of the tire is further out than the top of the tire, this is known as Negative Camber Angle. And if the top of the tire is further out than the bottom, this is known as Positive Camber Angle.

B.3. King Pin Inclination

The king pin is tilted at the top towards the vehicle in order that the weight of the load will be thrown towards the tire Centre. It is used to give self-centering effect of the vehicle.

For correct steering:

$$\cot \theta \cdot \cot \theta = \frac{w}{L}$$

(8)

For inner angle: $$\tan \theta = \frac{L}{(R - w/2)}$$

(9)

For outer angle: $$\tan \theta = \frac{L}{(R + w/2)}$$

(10)

The Wheel Base of vehicle, L = 1220mm Width to wheel base ratio is 0.852

Fundamental steering equation is $$\cot \theta \cdot \cot \theta = \frac{w}{L}$$

To get a turning radius of 1800mm

$$\tan \theta = \frac{L}{(R + w/2)}$$

$$\tan \theta = 1220/(1800+1040/2)$$

$$\theta = 27.73^\circ$$

$$\tan \theta = \frac{L}{(R-w/2)}$$

$$\tan \theta = 1220/(1800-1040/2)$$

$$\theta = 43.62^\circ$$

Angle made by outer sub axle should be 27.73° and inner stub axle should be 43.62°. Putting these values in fundamental equation of steering and checking if they are satisfying or not.

$$\cot \theta \cdot \cot \theta = \frac{w}{L}$$

$$\cot 27.73^\circ \cdot \cot 43.62^\circ = 0.645 \frac{w}{L} = 0.645$$

For Ackermann angle,

$$\tan \alpha = \frac{\sin \theta - \sin \Theta}{(\cos \Theta + \cos \theta - 2)}$$

(11)

$$\tan \alpha = \frac{\sin 27.73^\circ - \sin 43.62^\circ}{(\cos 43.62^\circ + \cos 27.73^\circ - 2)}$$

$$\alpha = 29.4^\circ$$

Value of Ackermann angle is 29.4°.

Where, $$\theta$$ = outer angle of the wheel (During turning), $$\Theta$$ = inner angle of the wheel (During turning), R = turning radius of the wheels, w = width of the car, L = Wheel base of the car.

C. STEERING SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wheel Base</td>
<td>1220mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Track Width</td>
<td>1040mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pin to Pin (spindle)</td>
<td>603.2mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Turning Radius</td>
<td>1800mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Outer Turn Angle</td>
<td>27.73°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Inner Turn Angle</td>
<td>43.62°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ackermann Angle</td>
<td>29.4°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ackermann angle %</td>
<td>148.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Steering Wheel dia.</td>
<td>304.8mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Steering Ratio</td>
<td>6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Steering Wheel Torque</td>
<td>13.24Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Turns (lock to lock)</td>
<td>1220mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>King Pin Inclination</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Caster Angle</td>
<td>8°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Camber Angle</td>
<td>2°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. BRAKING SYSTEM

The brakes of a vehicle have to absorb the energy given to the vehicle by the engine plus that due to the momentum of the vehicle [“Zulkifly M.B.,(2007) in their work addressed issues related to suitable braking system keeping in consideration the speed of the car, weight of the car etc. & they also discussed the challenges and the troubleshooting related to the braking system”]. The brake must also pull up the vehicle smoothly and is a straight line.

Fig. 13: Disk Brake Arrangement
A. DESIGN METHODOLOGY:

Following are the optimum brake parts which are combination help to achieve target. Optimize brake design. Major components of braking system are:

- Brake pedal.
- Master cylinder.
- Brake line.
- Brake disc.
- Brake caliper.

B. DESIGN OF BRAKING SYSTEM:

Brake pedal: we assumed pedal ratio of 4:1 i.e. when driver applies 1N force it gets multiplied by 4 times to produce a 4N force. Master cylinder: Maruti Suzuki 800. Caliper & rotor: We compared the rotor assemblies of Apache RTR 160 and Honda Aviator finally we zeroed on Apache RTR which had following dimension- Diameter of rotor = 200mm. Caliper piston diameter = 32mm.

C. BRAKING CALCULATION

Maximum force a driver applies on brake pedal = 22g. Pedal ratio = 4:1.
Force on master cylinder piston (FMC) = 22 x 9.81 x 4 = 863.28 N.
Area of master cylinder (AMC) = \[ \frac{\pi \times (0.018)^2}{4} \] = 2.545 x 10^-4 m^2.
Pressure develops in the system = \( \frac{FMC}{AMC} \) (12) = 3.392 MPa.

According to Pascal’s law states-“that a pressure change occurring anywhere in a confined incompressible fluid is transmitted throughout the fluid such that the same change occurs everywhere”.

Area of brake caliper \( A = \frac{\pi \times 0.032^2}{4} \) = 8.042 x 10^-4 m^2.
Therefore, the force on brake caliper \( F = P \times A_{CAL} \) (13) = 2728.089 N.

Total force on rotor = 2728.089 x 2.
= 5456.178 N.
Total friction force = clamp force \times coefficient of friction.
= 5456.178 N x 0.65
= 3546.51 N.
Torque on rotor = Frictional force \times effective radius of rotor
= 2728.165 x 0.085.
= 283.723N-m.

Force acting on one tire = Torque on rotor / radius of tyre
= 283.723/0.1397
= 2026.581 N
Total brake force using selected brake force
= 1659.94 x 2
= 4053 N.

Deceleration = force / mass of vehicle
= 4053/140
= 28.95 m/s^2
= 2.95g.

Stopping distance:
At 40 Km/h
\( \text{Stopping distance} = \frac{(\text{maximum velocity})^2}{2 \times \text{deceleration}} \)
= (11.11)^2 / (2 x 28.95)
= 2.13 m.
At 60 Km/h
\( \text{Stopping distance} = \frac{(\text{maximum velocity})^2}{2 \times \text{deceleration}} \)
= (16.66)^2 / (2 x 28.95)
= 4.8 m.
At 80 Km/h
\( \text{Stopping distance} = \frac{(\text{maximum velocity})^2}{2 \times \text{deceleration}} \)
= (22.22)^2 / (2 x 28.95)
= 8.53 m.

Table 4: Braking System Specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Types of Brakes</th>
<th>Disk brake arrangement system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Disc diameter</td>
<td>200mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Thickness of disc</td>
<td>4.5mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Effective radius of disc</td>
<td>85 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Brake pedal force</td>
<td>22g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pedal ratio</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Coefficient of friction</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Torque on rotor</td>
<td>283.723N-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Stopping distance (at 60kmph)</td>
<td>4.8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Disc diameter</td>
<td>200mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. DRIVETRAIN DESIGN:

The drivetrain includes the transmission, the driveshaft, the axles, and the wheels. Simply put, it works in conjunction with the engine to move the wheels. The drivetrain system is an
essential component of a vehicle and the transmission is an integral part of the drivetrain.

Figure 15: Engine coupled at rear axle.

A. CALCULATIONS:

Vehicle design criteria:

Gross vehicle weight (GVW): 140Kg = 1372 N
Weight on each drive wheel (WW): 35Kg = 343 N
Radius of wheel/tire (Rw): 0.14 m
Desired top speed (Vmax): 20.83 m/s
Desired acceleration time (ta): 10 sec
Maximum incline angle (β): 3 degree
Working surface: Asphalt (good)

It is necessary to determine the total tractive effort (TTE) requirement for the vehicle to select motors capable of producing enough torque to propel the kart.

\[ TTE = RR + GR + FA \]  

Where:

TTE = total tractive effort [N]  
RR = force necessary to overcome rolling resistance [N]  
GR = Grade resistance to climb a slope [N]  
FA = force required to accelerate to final velocity [N]

The components of this equation will be determined in the following steps.

Step One: Determine Rolling Resistance

Rolling Resistance (RR) is the force necessary to propel a vehicle over a particular surface. The worst possible surface type to be encountered by the vehicle should be factored into the equation.

\[ RR = GVW \times Crr \]  

\[ RR = 1372 \times 0.017 = 23.324N \]

Where:

RR = rolling resistance [N]  
GVW = gross vehicle weight [N]  
Crr = surface friction (0.017 for fair asphalt)

Step Two: Determine Grade Resistance

Grade Resistance (GR) is the amount of force necessary to move a vehicle up a slope or “grade”. This calculation must be made using the maximum angle or grade the vehicle will be expected to climb in normal operation.

To convert incline angle, α, to grade resistance:

\[ GR = GVW \times \sin(\alpha) \]  

\[ GR = 1372 \times \sin(3\degree) = 71.80N \]

Where:

GR = grade resistance [N]  
GVW = gross vehicle weight [N]  
α1 = maximum incline angle [degrees]

Step Three: Determine Acceleration Force

Acceleration Force (FA) is the force necessary to accelerate from a stop to maximum speed in a desired time.

\[ FA = \frac{GVW \times Vmax}{(9.8 \times t_{a})} \]  

\[ FA = 1372 \times \frac{20.83}{(9.8 \times 10)} = 291.62N \]

Where:

FA = acceleration force [N]  
GVW = gross vehicle weight [N]  
Vmax = maximum speed [m/s]  
ta = time required to achieve maximum speed [s]

Step Four: Determine Total Tractive Effort

The Total Tractive Effort (TTE) is the sum of the forces calculated in steps 1, 2, and 3. (On higher speed vehicles friction in drive components may warrant the addition of 10%-15% to the total tractive effort to ensure acceptable vehicle performance.)

\[ TTE = RR + GR + FA \]  

TTE = 386.74N

Step Five: Determine Wheel Motor Torque

To verify the vehicle will perform as designed in regards to tractive effort and acceleration, it is necessary to calculate the required wheel torque (Tw) based on the tractive effort.

\[ Tw = TTE \times Rw \times RF \]  

\[ Tw = 386.74 \times 0.14 \times 1.1 = 59.55Nm \]

Where:

Tw = wheel torque [Nm]  
TTE = total tractive effort [N]  
Rw = radius of the wheel/tire [m]  
RF = “resistance” factor [-]

The “resistance factor” accounts for the frictional losses between the caster wheels and their axles and the drag on the motor bearings. Typical values range between 1.1 and 1.15 (or 10 to 15%).

Step Six: Reality Check

The final step is to verify the vehicle can transmit the required torque from the drive wheel(s) to the ground. The maximum tractive torque (MTT) a wheel can transmit is equal to the normal load times the friction coefficient between the wheel and the ground times the radius of the drive wheel.
\[ MTT = \frac{W_w \mu}{R_w} \] 

\[ MTT = 412 \times 0.6 \times 0.14 \times 34.608 \text{ Nm} \] 

Where:
- \( W_w \) = weight (normal load) on drive wheel [N]
- \( \mu \) = friction coefficient between the wheel and the ground (~0.7 for slick tyre on asphalt) [-]
- \( R_w \) = radius of drive wheel/tire [m]

An appropriate acceleration time must be chosen such that the required \( T_w < MTT \times \text{number of drive wheels} \). 

53.50 < 34.608 x 2 i.e. true

**VIII. OVERALL SPECIFICATIONS**

So the best suited and available components for the above values are:
- **Engine**: Honda Stunner 125cc or similar engine of rated capacity.
- **Capacity**: 124.7cc
- **Power (PS)**: 11@8000 rpm
- **Torque (Nm)**: 11@6500 rpm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Reduction (Bigger Sprocket)</th>
<th>3.071</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Reduction (Smaller Sprocket)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IX. CONCLUSION**

After various calculations and research we came to the conclusion that the optimization of the various design parameters including vehicle dynamics parameters achieved by us is best to our consideration which involves the factors such as steering calculations, braking calculations and various design calculations.

In our research we achieved Ackermann angle of 29.4 degrees, stopping distance (60km/hr.) of 4.8 m, whereas we achieved the overall Factor of Safety (F.O.S) of 2.01.

**Table 5: Conclusion of the safety analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Test Parameters</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Torsion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Load (N)</td>
<td>70 Km/hr</td>
<td>60 Km/hr</td>
<td>75 Km/hr</td>
<td>150 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Deformation (m)</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equivalent Stress</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor of Safety</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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