

Next-Generation Multi-Motor Electric All-Wheel Drive and Quad Wheel Drive (QWD) Powertrains: A Comprehensive Review of Architecture, Control Topologies, and Comparative Vehicle Dynamics

¹shaikh amir mehimud, ²pawar swapnil dattatray, ³Dhotre Vikramsinh Shivaji

¹Assistant Professor Department of Mechanical Engineering, S. B. Patil College of Engineering, Indapur, Savitribai Phule Pune University

²Assistant Professor Department of Mechanical Engineering, S. B. Patil College of Engineering, Indapur, Savitribai Phule Pune University

³Assistant Professor Department of Mechanical Engineering, S. B. Patil College of Engineering, Indapur, Savitribai Phule Pune University

Abstract

—The shift from internal combustion engines to electric propulsion platforms has unlocked unprecedented paradigms in vehicular dynamics control. Foremost among these advancements is the emergence of Quad Wheel Drive (QWD) and independent multi-motor electric all-wheel-drive configurations. By completely eliminating conventional mechanical links, including central propshafts, heavy transfer cases, viscous couplings, and hydraulic differentials, QWD systems introduce a software-defined propulsion topology. This review paper provides an exhaustive, multi-faceted engineering analysis of next-generation QWD architectures. We delineate the mechanical decoupling advantages of dual, triple, and quad-motor layouts, investigate the electro-mechanical dynamics of millisecond-level torque vectoring, and evaluate the mathematical formalisms underpinning electronic slip regulation. Furthermore, this paper conducts a comprehensive, data-driven technical comparison against conventional mechanical all-wheel-drive and four-wheel-drive powertrains across twenty technical vectors. Finally, we explore advanced intelligent terrain response control loops, analyze multi-wheel regenerative energy harvesting efficiencies, and deliberate upon the unresolved engineering bottlenecks—including unsprung mass penalties, power electronic thermal management, and functional safety fail-safes—critical to the next decade of high-performance electric vehicle development.

Keywords—Quad Wheel Drive (QWD), Electric All-Wheel Drive, Torque Vectoring, Slip Regulation, Vehicle Dynamics, Multi-Motor Electrification, Regenerative Braking, Drivetrain Decoupling, Active Yaw Control.

I. INTRODUCTION

For over a century, the architectural layout of all-wheel-drive (AWD) and four-wheel-drive (4WD) automotive systems was rigorously bound by the physical constraints of centralized power generation. Internal combustion engines (ICE) generate torque within a narrow operational speed band, outputting power through a centralized crankshaft. To distribute this mechanical energy to all four contact patches, vehicle engineers designed increasingly elaborate mechanical networks. These systems comprised multi-speed transmissions, heavy transfer cases with low-range reduction gears, central longitudinal propshafts, and a minimum of three distinct mechanical differentials (front, center, and rear). While highly optimized for mechanical durability, these traditional drivetrains possess deep thermodynamic and dynamic limitations, including high rotational inertia, significant parasitic friction losses, and fixed, reactive latency periods inherent to hydraulic and mechanical actuators.

The rapid maturation of high-voltage automotive electrification has fundamentally disrupted this architectural status quo. Electric vehicles (EVs) decouple power generation from a singular localized block, allowing multiple independent, highly compact electric machines to be deployed directly across the vehicle's structural axles or wheel hubs. This design paradigm, frequently termed Quad Wheel Drive (QWD) or Multi-Motor Electric AWD, transforms all-wheel drive from a heavy, purely mechanical asset into a highly agile, software-defined control variable. By establishing independent electrical power routes to the front and rear axles—or to each individual wheel contact point—QWD platforms entirely bypass the physical propshafts and physical locking mechanisms that have defined traditional off-road and high-performance vehicles for generations.

The technological imperative driving QWD integration is not merely restricted to the extraction of supercar-level acceleration, but extends directly into vehicle safety, active stability, energy management, and extreme terrain adaptability. In a conventional ICE vehicle, a traction control intervention requires a highly reactive, indirect process: the wheel speed sensor detects slip, the engine control unit (ECU) commands a throttle reduction, or the electronic stability control (ESC) triggers hydraulic brake clamping at the slipping corner. This multi-step process incurs a latency response window ranging from 100 to 500 milliseconds. In contrast, permanent magnet synchronous motors (PMSM) or induction motors (IM) utilized within QWD systems can modulate torque outputs bidirectionally (both propulsion and regenerative braking force) within less than 5 to 10 milliseconds. This represents a near two-orders-of-magnitude reduction in latency, enabling proactive, predictive structural stability control that operates well within the threshold of human perception.

This extensive review paper aims to map the current state-of-the-art in electric vehicle QWD technology. Section II establishes a clear structural classification of multi-motor layouts, analyzing the mechanical and packaging nuances of dual, triple, and quad independent motor configurations. Section III investigates the core electronic and mathematical control paradigms, including electronic slip regulation (ESR) and yaw rate tracking equations. Section IV delivers a meticulous, twenty-parameter comparative matrix contrasting QWD against conventional mechanical AWD/4WD platforms. Section V evaluates terrain response sub-routines and digital differential simulation. Section VI analyzes the economic, packaging, and lifecycle efficiency benefits, while Section VII explores critical engineering bottlenecks, such as unsprung mass penalties and functional safety fail-safes. The document concludes with an outlook on the global integration of software-defined chassis towards 2035.

II. STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF MULTI-MOTOR QWD ARCHITECTURES

The structural execution of all-wheel traction within electric vehicles varies extensively based on target packaging constraints, vehicle segments, and performance requirements. QWD architectures can be systematically classified into three distinct multi-motor topologies: Dual-Motor Independent Axle Drive, Tri-Motor Asymmetric Drive, and Quad-Motor Fully Independent Drive.

A. Dual-Motor Independent Axle Topology

The standard implementation of electric AWD, found in mainstream premium platforms such as Tesla's Dual-Motor series and Tata Motors' upcoming QWD architecture for the Harrier.ev and Sierra.ev, relies on two completely decoupled electric machines. One electric motor is mounted on the front subframe, driving the front wheels through a single-speed reduction gearbox and a standard open differential. The second motor is mounted on the rear subframe, driving the rear wheels through an identical or differently geared reduction setup. There is zero physical connection—no propshaft, no mechanical center differential, no hydraulic clutch pack—linking the front and rear axles.

The front and rear axles are synchronized exclusively through software running across a centralized vehicle domain controller and dual power inverters. This allows for asymmetric motor scaling: for instance, a manufacturer can deploy an ultra-efficient, low-drag induction motor on the front axle to handle steady-state highway cruising (deactivating completely when not required to prevent drag losses), while placing a high-torque, permanent magnet synchronous motor on the rear axle to execute rapid acceleration and high-load traction. This axle-level decoupling achieves highly optimized structural weight distribution and maximizes platform modularity.

B. Tri-Motor Asymmetric Topology

To elevate lateral vehicle dynamics without incurring the cost and complexity of four independent motors, several high-performance EV platforms incorporate a tri-motor configuration. Typically, this setup utilizes a single motor linked to an open differential on the front axle, while the rear axle features two completely separate, independent electric motors positioned back-to-back. Each rear motor is directly dedicated to a single rear wheel via an independent single-speed reduction gear.

By splitting the rear axle into two distinct electrical paths, the tri-motor architecture eliminates the need for a rear mechanical differential entirely. When the vehicle enters a high-speed corner, the controller can actively command the outboard rear motor to apply positive propulsive torque while simultaneously commanding the inboard rear motor to execute regenerative braking. This creates an explicit, software-controlled mechanical yaw moment that pivots the vehicle around its vertical axis, dramatically reducing understeer and optimizing cornering stability without requiring any friction brake intervention.

C. Quad-Motor Fully Independent Wheel Drive Topology

The absolute pinnacle of QWD technology is the quad-motor configuration, which deploys four completely distinct electric machines, each dedicated to an individual wheel corner. This can be achieved through two distinct sub-configurations: Centralized Inboard Quad-Motor Drive and In-Wheel/Hub Quad-Motor Drive. In the inboard configuration, four separate motors are packaged within the vehicle chassis frame, driving the wheels via traditional articulating half-shafts and CV joints. In the in-wheel configuration, highly specialized, ultra-compact out-runner motors are embedded directly within the wheel rim barrel itself.

The quad-motor layout represents the complete virtualization of the vehicle drivetrain. Every single tire contact patch becomes an independent, bidirectional actuator capable of generating independent positive or negative tractive forces. This setup enables radical secondary capabilities, such as 'tank turns' (counter-rotating the left and right side motors to spin the vehicle on its center point) and instantaneous diagonal torque vectoring to perfectly counteract localized wheel-slip on multi-surface terrain.

III. ELECTRONIC SLIP REGULATION AND TORQUE VECTORING PARADIGMS

The operational superiority of QWD technology originates from its software-defined control architecture. In traditional vehicles, traction management is governed by mechanical delay loops. In a QWD vehicle, the control system operates as an ultra-high-speed closed-loop electronic feedback matrix.

A. Millisecond Traction Control Loop Architecture

The control sequence of a high-performance QWD platform is executed inside the central Vehicle Dynamics Control (VDC) unit. High-resolution wheel encoders monitor rotational velocities at frequencies exceeding 1,000 Hz. Concurrently, an onboard 6-axis Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) continuously tracks longitudinal acceleration, lateral acceleration, roll, pitch, and actual vehicle yaw rate. If a single wheel encounters a low-friction surface (e.g., sheet ice or wet grass) during acceleration, its rotational velocity will spike rapidly relative to the vehicle's true ground speed, signaling micro-slip.

In a conventional vehicle, correcting this slip requires adjusting gas engine throttle positions or applying friction brakes, both of which are slow and waste kinetic energy. In a QWD system, the VDC communicates directly with the power electronics inverter via high-speed automotive Ethernet or CAN-FD buses. The inverter alters the pulse-width modulation (PWM) switching frequency of the current supplied to that specific motor, reducing its electromagnetic torque output to match the road's true adhesion limit within 5 milliseconds. The excess electrical energy can be instantly redistributed to the other three motors possessing secure traction, maintaining uninterrupted vehicle momentum.

B. Mathematical Formulation of Active Yaw Control

The core mathematical objective during high-speed cornering or transient lane-change maneuvers is to minimize the error between the driver's intended yaw rate and the vehicle's actual yaw rate. The desired yaw rate is calculated based on steering wheel angle, vehicle longitudinal velocity, and chassis geometry. The vehicle domain controller continuously computes the required corrective yaw moment M_z to stabilize the chassis:

$$M_z = d/2 \cdot (F_{xr_outer} + F_{xf_outer}) - (F_{xr_inner} + F_{xf_inner}) \quad (1)$$

where d represents the vehicle track width, F_{xf} and F_{xr} represent the longitudinal propulsive forces generated by the front and rear motors respectively, and the subscripts identify the inner and outer wheels relative to the cornering arc. By explicitly modulating these forces independently via the QWD control matrix, the vehicle can generate a decisive stabilizing torque instantaneously, entirely avoiding the thermal degradation and kinetic energy wastage associated with traditional hydraulic brake clamping.

IV. QUANTITATIVE ENGINEERING COMPARISON: QWD VS. CONVENTIONAL POWERTRAINS

To establish a data-driven foundation for this review, a systematic comparative analysis must be performed to contrast next-generation QWD architectures against premium conventional mechanical all-wheel-drive and four-wheel-drive powertrains.

Table I provides an exhaustive engineering matrix outlining twenty distinct design, performance, and operational variables characterizing both technologies as of 2026.

Technical Metric / Parameter	Conventional Mechanical 4WD	AWE Next-Generation Architecture	EV	QV
Traction Response Latency	100 to 500 millisecon (Mechanical/Hydraulic)	2 to 10 milliseconds (Pure Electromagnetic)		
Power Distribution Mechanism	Propshafts, multi-plate clutches, differentials	Independent inverters & software code execution		
Front-to-Rear Torque Flexibility	Restricted (0:100 to 100:0 via heel clutch slippage)	Infinite (0:100 to 100:0 full continuous seamlessly)		
Left-to-Right Torque Vectoring	Requires complex mechanical torque-vectoring diffs	Instantaneous via independent motor control		
Drivetrain Parasitic Drag	High (Constant friction in gear shafts, bearings)	Negligible (Axle-disconnect via software control)		
Powertrain Mass Penalty	Heavy (100–250 kg for transfer case, shafts, diffs)	Low (Integrated into structural subframes, zero shafts)		
Particulate / Friction Brake Wear	High (Relies heavily on ESC brake clamping for slip)	Ultra-Low (Blends motor regeneration for stabilization)		
Low-Range Torque Multiplier	Requires physical low-range gears in transfer case	Achieved digitally via low-speed maximum motor current		
Regenerative Braking Capacity	0% (Energy lost as friction heat through disks)	Up to 90% kinetic energy recovery via multi-motor regen		
Mechanical Maintenance Burden	High (Frequent differential oil change, clutch fluid changes)	Virtually Zero (Sealed gearbox, zero wearable clutches)		
Chassis Packaging Flexibility	Poor (Central tunnel restricts cab floor space)	Excellent (Skateboard platform with flat cabin floor)		
System Moving Parts Count	300+ structural gears, bearings, links, shafts	<50 moving elements across independent reduction gears		
Acoustic / NVH Penetration	Variable (Propshaft vibrations, gear whine at high load)	Ultra-Quiet (Decoupled structure to isolate cabin NVH)		
Bidirectional Torque Control	No (Engine cannot spin backward to actively brake wheel)	Yes (Full positive/negative torque loop per corner)		
Tank Turn Capability	Physically Impossible	Native (Counter-rotation left/right motor banks)		

Terrain Tuning Adaptability	Rigid (Bound by fixed mechanic locking settings)	Infinite (Software flashing allow instant custom tuning)
System Reliability / Wear Risk	High (Clutch wear, seal leaks, shaft balance issues)	Extremely Low (Solid-state electronics, brushless motors)
Diagnostics Infrastructure	Complex (Requires teardown mechanical pressure tests)	Digital (Instant error codes via OBD / OTA cloud streaming)
Manufacturing Cost Matrix	High mechanical tooling & close tolerance assembly	High power electronic & rare material (Neodymium) cost
Maximum System Torque Output	Limited by transmission and driveshaft shear limits	Unprecedented (Instantaneous peak motor torque from 0 RPM)

A. Elaborated Analysis of Latency and Power Paths

The quantitative variance in response latency (2-10 ms for QWD vs. 100-500 ms for mechanical systems) marks a structural milestone in vehicle engineering. In a conventional mechanical system, when a wheel breaks traction, the physical mass of the spinning drivetrain components must be accelerated or decelerated. The physical propagation of pressure through hydraulic control lines and the subsequent mechanical movement of clutch plates create a non-trivial time delay. During this delay, the slipping tire can transition from micro-slip into macro-slip, rapidly polishing the ice or mud surface and drastically lowering its dynamic friction coefficient.

QWD systems completely eliminate these physical propagation steps. Because the control loop is purely electromagnetic, the magnetic flux within the stator windings can be altered almost instantaneously. This allows the system to catch a slipping wheel the exact microsecond it transitions past its peak adhesion coefficient, holding it precisely at its optimal slip ratio. The result is an absolute maximization of tractive force, ensuring unparalleled security on mixed-mu surfaces (such as asymmetrical snow and asphalt patches).

B. Parasitic Losses and Architectural Efficiency

A conventional mechanical AWD powertrain suffers from continuous, unevadable parasitic energy losses. Even when operating in steady-state highway cruising where all-wheel traction is unnecessary, the front and rear differentials, universal joints, propshaft bearings, and internal gear teeth are forced to rotate via the rolling motion of the wheels. This 'churning loss' and mechanical drag account for a 5% to 12% reduction in overall fuel efficiency, depending on system complexity.

In a QWD architecture, software completely isolates the axles. When cruising on an open highway at constant velocity, the central controller can open the electronic gates of the inverter supplying the secondary axle, dropping the current to zero. If the secondary motor is an induction machine, it spins completely free with zero magnetic drag losses. If it is a permanent magnet machine, localized switching algorithms minimize cogging torque. This software-enabled axle disconnect allows the vehicle to revert to a highly efficient single-axle drive layout dynamically, instantly engaging all-wheel QWD capability within milliseconds the moment an erratic steering input or wheel slip is detected.

V. TERRAIN ADAPTABILITY AND VIRTUAL DIFFERENTIAL CODES

Traditional heavy-duty off-road vehicles rely on physical locking differentials to navigate extreme topography like sand dunes, deep mud ruts, and vertical rock crawls. A locking differential mechanically binds the left and right axle shafts together, forcing both wheels to rotate at identical speeds regardless of resistance. While highly effective, this mechanical setup severely restricts steering maneuverability, induces extreme torsional stress on the half-shafts, and can cause catastrophic mechanical failure if engaged on high-friction surfaces.

QWD platforms completely virtualize this process via specialized terrain-response sub-routines embedded within the vehicle's firmware. Instead of physically locking an axle, the software implements a 'Virtual Differential Lock' by precisely executing speed and torque synchronization algorithms across the independent motors.

Under Sand Mode settings, the controller alters throttle mapping to deliver smooth, progressive torque, avoiding sudden power spikes that would break the fragile crust of sand and dig the tires into deep ruts. In Mud & Ruts Mode, the system deliberately permits controlled wheel spin to allow the aggressive tire tread blocks to sling out accumulated mud via centrifugal force, restoring contact with firmer ground. For Rock Crawling, the QWD configuration delivers maximum low-speed torque and utilizes the precise positioning capabilities of brushless motors to crawl over jagged obstacles without requiring a mechanical low-range transfer case. This virtualization maximizes off-road performance while protecting the drivetrain from mechanical stress.

VI. PACKAGING, WEIGHT DISTRIBUTION, AND LIFECYCLE EFFICIENCY

The mechanical simplification enabled by QWD architectures translates directly into profound chassis packaging advantages. By eliminating the central propshaft and structural transfer cases, vehicle designers can completely remove the intrusive longitudinal driveline tunnel that bisects the cabin floor in conventional ICE all-wheel-drive vehicles. This enables the realization of a flat-floor 'skateboard' chassis layout, drastically expanding usable passenger volume and storage capacity within identical vehicular footprints.

Furthermore, mounting independent motor-inverter assemblies directly within the front and rear subframe structures allows for near-perfect 50:50 front-to-rear weight distribution. This lowering of the polar moment of inertia optimizes the vehicle's handling dynamics, reducing body roll and improving transient stability during high-speed cornering maneuvers.

From a lifecycle efficiency standpoint, QWD configurations represent a major advancement over conventional drivetrains. When a conventional mechanical vehicle undergoes deceleration, its entire kinetic energy is converted into waste thermal energy through the friction brake calipers and discs. A QWD vehicle leverages its multi-motor configuration to execute comprehensive multi-wheel regenerative braking. During a deceleration phase, all active motors switch their operational mode to function as generators, harvesting kinetic energy from both axles simultaneously. This multi-wheel regeneration matrix captures up to 90% of the kinetic energy that would otherwise be lost, routing it back through the dual inverters to replenish the high-voltage battery pack, thereby extending the vehicle's real-world driving range by 20% to 30%.

VII. CRITICAL ENGINEERING CHALLENGES AND RESEARCH HORIZONS

While QWD architectures offer undeniable advantages over traditional drivetrains, their deployment introduces a unique set of complex engineering challenges that remain focal areas of active global research.

A. Unsprung Mass Penalties in Hub-Motor Topologies

When vehicle engineers transition from centralized inboard quad-motor systems to true in-wheel hub-motor QWD configurations, they encounter a critical ride-and-handling trade-off: the unsprung mass penalty. In a conventional vehicle, the heavy propulsion components are supported by the vehicle suspension springs (sprung mass). In a hub-motor setup, the entire mass of the electric motor, reduction gear, and localized cooling jacket is placed directly inside the wheel rim, becoming entirely unsprung mass.

Increasing the unsprung mass severely compromises the suspension system's ability to maintain consistent tire contact over uneven, rough road surfaces. The high inertia of the wheel assembly causes it to oscillate violently when hitting bumps, degrading ride comfort and reducing lateral cornering grip. Active research is focused on developing ultra-lightweight carbon-fiber rotor sleeves, integrated structural suspension-motor brackets, and high-frequency active damping systems to mitigate this inherent mass penalty.

B. High-Density Power Electronic Thermal Management

Orchestrating up to four independent electric motors operating at peak power outputs requires an extraordinary throughput of electrical current, placing intense thermal loads on the power electronic inverters. Silicon Carbide (SiC) Metal-Oxide-Semiconductor Field-Effect Transistors (MOSFETs) are widely deployed due to their high switching frequencies and reduced thermal losses compared to traditional Silicon IGBTs. However, during continuous high-load operations—such as heavy off-road towing or high-speed track lapping—the junction temperatures inside the inverter modules can spike rapidly.

To prevent thermal runaway or protective power de-rating, QWD platforms require highly sophisticated multi-channel liquid cooling circuits. These systems often utilize direct-immersion dielectric oil cooling or parallel micro-channel cold plates linked to intelligent thermal management software that balances fluid flow rates across the individual corner inverters based on real-time localized heat generation.

C. Functional Safety and Software Fail-Safe Architectures

In a conventional vehicle, if a drivetrain component fails, the vehicle simply loses power or coasts to a stop. In a quad-motor QWD vehicle, a sudden software error or localized inverter short-circuit could theoretically cause a single wheel to apply maximum regenerative braking while the opposite wheel continues to apply full propulsive torque. This asymmetric torque distribution would generate an extreme, uncommanded yaw moment, violently destabilizing the vehicle at highway speeds.

To satisfy the rigorous requirements of the ISO 26262 Automotive Safety Integrity Level D (ASIL-D) standard, QWD control architectures must incorporate multi-layered electronic redundancy. This includes dual-core lockstep microcontrollers, redundant wheel-speed cross-verification algorithms, and rapid-acting pyrotechnic disconnect fuses capable of isolating a malfunctioning inverter phase within less than 2 milliseconds, safely dropping the affected motor into a zero-torque free-wheel state.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Quad Wheel Drive (QWD) and multi-motor electric all-wheel-drive systems represent a fundamental paradigm shift in automotive engineering, successfully virtualizing the entire vehicle drivetrain. By replacing rigid mechanical connections with high-speed electronic software control loops, QWD platforms achieve exceptional millisecond-level traction responses, infinite front-to-rear torque flexibility, and precise lateral yaw stabilization that completely surpasses the capabilities of conventional mechanical AWD/4WD systems.

While traditional powertrains remain constrained by mechanical friction, high inertia, and structural packaging compromises, QWD technology unlocks a flat-floor chassis architecture, optimized 50:50 weight distribution, and highly efficient multi-wheel energy harvesting. As active global research continues to overcome the design hurdles of unsprung mass penalties, thermal management, and ASIL-D functional safety compliance, the software-defined QWD powertrain will solidify its position as the standard foundation for high-performance, secure, and intelligent mobility across the global transportation ecosystem.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Harris and M. Patel, "The evolution of electric vehicle all-wheel drive: From mechanical transfer cases to electronic decoupling," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 4112–4124, Apr. 2023.
- [2] S. Singh, "Multi-motor configurations and software-defined chassis layouts in next-generation SUVs," *SAE Int. J. Electrified Veh.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 185–198, May 2024.
- [3] J. Center, "Advanced vehicle dynamics and active yaw control via independent wheel torque vectoring," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 1430–1448, Jul. 2024.
- [4] Y. Kim and D. Lopez, "Millisecond-level electronic slip regulation loops utilizing permanent magnet synchronous machines," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 320–331, Jan. 2024.
- [5] Tata Motors Powertrain Division, "Technical whitepaper on QWD technology: Integrating intelligent dual-motor AWD in electric SUV platforms," *Tata Tech. Review*, vol. 19, pp. 8–14, Mar. 2025.
- [6] R. Zhang, "Analysis of tri-motor asymmetric drivetrains and lateral stability control under high-speed cornering," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 1102–1114, Jun. 2024.
- [7] K. Takahashi, "In-wheel hub motors: Structural design challenges, unsprung mass penalties, and suspension mitigation strategies," *Int. J. Automotive Eng.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 89–101, Feb. 2025.
- [8] L. Miller, "Silicon Carbide (SiC) MOSFET integration in high-output multi-motor traction inverters," *IEEE Power Electron. Mag.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 44–52, Sep. 2024.
- [9] M. Fernandez, "Cradle-to-grave lifecycle assessment of dual-motor electric vehicles versus mechanical 4WD ICE utility vehicles," *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 4820–4833, Nov. 2024.
- [10] ISO 26262-4:2018, "Road vehicles — Functional safety — Part 4: Product development at the system level," International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, 2018.
- [11] O. Schindler, "Active rollover mitigation and multi-mode terrain response control logic for software-defined electric off-roaders," *SAE Technical Paper 2024-01-1523*, 2024.
- [12] H. Wagner and F. Braun, "Multi-wheel regenerative braking optimization algorithms for maximum energy harvesting efficiency," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 592, p. 233902, Jan. 2025.
- [13] P. Gupta and A. Kumar, "Parasitic drag quantification and churning loss analysis in traditional mechanical AWD transfer cases," *Mechanism and Machine Theory*, vol. 194, p. 105540, Apr. 2024.
- [14] J. Zhao, "High-resolution wheel encoder integration and sensor latency minimization inside centralized vehicle domain controllers," *IEEE Sensors J.*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 12045–12056, Apr. 2024.
- [15] E. Davies, "Virtual differential locks: Software simulation of physical mechanical locking mechanisms in multi-motor EVs," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 1650–1662, Sep. 2024.
- [16] G. Rossi, "Thermal management optimization of independent multi-channel liquid cooling circuits for quad-motor configurations," *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 218, p. 124801, Feb. 2025.
- [17] X. Liu and Y. Wang, "Fail-safe topologies and lockstep microcontroller configurations for ASIL-D compliant electric drivetrains," *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 56210–56225, May 2024.

- [18] B. Johnson, "The polar moment of inertia reduction in flat-floor skateboard EV architectures," *Automotive Engineering International*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 22–29, Jan. 2026.
- [19] S. Ma et al., "Co-optimization of traction and steering via diagonal torque vectoring in quad-motor autonomous electric vehicles," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1845–1857, Feb. 2025.
- [20] W. Technical Council, "Drivetrain electrification outlook 2035: Mapping the complete virtualization of mechanical torque routes," *IEA Future Transport Report*, Paris, 2025.