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ATTITUDE OBSERVER-BASED ROBUST CONTROL FOR A TWIN ROTOR SYSTEM

Oscar Salas, Herman Castañeda and Jesus De Leon-Morales

In this paper, an angular tracking control based on adaptive super twisting algorithm (ASTA) for a Twin Rotor System is presented. With the aim of implementing the ASTA control and taking into consideration the difficulties of measuring some of its states, a Nonlinear Extended State Observer (NESO) is employed to estimate the vector state and furthermore unmeasured dynamics. This scheme increases robustness against unmodeled dynamics and external disturbance, reducing modeling difficulties due to the fact that it is not necessary to know all the parameters of the system. Furthermore, an analysis of stability is provided, where sufficient conditions are given in order to guarantee the stability of the closed-loop system. Experimental results demonstrate the feasibility of the control scheme and illustrate its performance under external disturbance.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Helicopter control has been a major issue in nonlinear systems control theory owing to its high nonlinearity, noisy measurements and complicated dynamics including air flow, coupling and blade dynamics. Contrary to conventional real-size helicopters where the aerodynamic force is controlled using the propeller blade angle, in the twin rotor system setup (see Figure 1) the blades of the rotors have a fixed angle of attack. For this reason, the control is achieved by controlling the speeds of the rotors, therefore the voltages that regulates the speeds of the rotors are the only control inputs.

The control of 2-DOF helicopters has been investigated under algorithms ranging from linear robust control to nonlinear control domains [12, 16]. A nonlinear tracking control developed by [4] is based on state-space generalized predictive control, the control has a wide operating range, however there is no guarantee of stability. The main drawback of model-based control approaches resides in the helicopter dynamic model variations and uncertainties.

Traditional sliding modes control is used in many applications; in nonlinear plants it enables high gain accuracy tracking and insensitivity to disturbances and plant parameter variations. A controller based on sliding mode technique is the super-twisting control algorithm, which is designed to converge in a finite-time and ensures robustness
under uncertainties. However, this controller needs to know the bounds of uncertainties and perturbations present on the system. In [2], 2-sliding mode techniques have been implemented in elevation and azimuth dynamics, however, tracking references were kept at constant values which reduces considerably cross-coupling dynamics effects. Adaptive Super Twisting Control represents an alternative to deal with uncertainties as it is not necessary to know their bounds. It has been successfully tested on a 3-DOF helicopter platform (see [17]). Nonetheless, the used experimental setup differs from the 2-DOF platform as the gyroscopic effects are canceled on tandem rotor configurations and furthermore is structurally constrained. The disturbance caused by gyroscopic effects is usually avoided as it leads to a dependence of the system on rotary frequency, for example quadrotor design intentionally circumvent its influence [24]. The fixed angle of attack of the rotor blades on the Twin Rotor platform adds an extra coupling caused by the reaction of the force necessary to change the propeller speed, instead of removing any of the essential couplings present on a conventional helicopter that need to be illustrated (see [15] for more details). Additionally, it tends to be a non minimum phase system exhibiting unstable zero dynamics [3].

On the other hand, with the aim of implementing a controller, information of the states of the system is necessary. However, it is not always possible to measure the states. This difficulty can be overcome by means of the use of observers, which estimates the states of the system from systems inputs and outputs. Before to design an observer, it is necessary to verify the observability of the system. Observability of nonlinear systems depends on the input. There exist inputs that render the system unobservable, which are called singular inputs. However, there exists a class of system which is observable for any input, this class of systems are called uniformly observable. Nonlinear systems which are uniformly observable can be transformed via a suitable change of coordinates into a canonical form with a triangular structure. There exist different kind of observers for uniformly observable systems, such as observers based on sliding modes techniques, which have a finite time convergence. Those based on high-gain with asymptotic convergence. A class of high-gain observer is the Extended State Observer, which have a remarkable performance to deal with dynamic uncertainties, disturbances, sensor noise and furthermore it is simple to tune [5, 20, 23]. In this case, parametric uncertainties and unmodeled dynamics of the system are considered as an additional state variable. Then, the perturbation can be compensated by canceling its estimate and thus each subsystem is controlled by a stand-alone controller.

This paper deals with the angular tracking of the twin rotor aerodynamic system. To solve the angular tracking control problem, an adaptive super twisting control algorithm is proposed. Moreover, in order to implement such controller, information about unmeasurable states is necessary. Then, a nonlinear extended state observer is proposed for estimating the required unmeasurable states, as well as parametric uncertainties and external disturbances. Furthermore, stability of the closed-loop system is demonstrated, where sufficient conditions are given. The performance of the proposed scheme is illustrated through experimental results.

The layout of this paper is as follows: In section 2, the problem statement and a system description containing a mathematical model of a Twin Rotor helicopter with 2-DOF are briefly introduced. In section 3 an Adaptive Super-Twisting Control is derived
with the aim of providing robustness under parametric uncertainties and unmodeled
dynamics. Moreover, in order to estimate the angular speed as well as external distur-
bances, a Nonlinear Extended State Observer is presented in section 4. In section 5 the
stability in closed-loop of the proposed Observer is proven. Experimental results are given
in section 6, to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed scheme. Finally, conclusions
of this work are drawn.

2. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The Twin Rotor platform consists of a beam pivoted on its base in such a way that it
can rotate freely both in the horizontal and vertical planes (Figure 1). At both ends of
the beam there are rotors (main and tail rotors) driven by DC motors. A counterbalance
arm with a load at its end is fixed to the beam at the pivot. The state of the beam
is described by four process variables: horizontal and vertical angles ($\psi$, $\theta$) measured
by position sensors fitted at the pivot, and two corresponding angular velocities ($\dot{\psi}$, $\dot{\theta}$).
Two additional state variables are the angular velocities of the rotors ($\omega_r$, $\omega_v$), measured by tacho-generators coupled to the motors.

A dynamical model of a 2-DOF helicopter can be written as follows

\[ \Sigma_1 : \begin{cases} \dot{\theta} = \frac{1}{J_v}(l_m k_{F_v} \omega_v + k_{h_v} u_2 - R_v \theta - k_{f_v} \dot{\theta}), \\ \dot{\omega}_v = \frac{1}{\mu_1}(u_1 - \omega_v k_{H_v}), \end{cases} \]

\[ \Sigma_2 : \begin{cases} \dot{\psi} = \frac{1}{J_h}(c_\theta l_t [k_{F_h} \omega_h + k_{v_h} u_1] - k_{f_h} \dot{\psi} - \theta s_\theta [k_{v_h} u_1 + l_t k_{F_h}]), \\ \dot{\omega}_h = \frac{1}{\mu_2}(u_2 - \omega_h k_{H_h}), \end{cases} \]  

where $k_{H_h}, k_{H_v}, k_{F_h}, k_{F_v}$ represent the velocity and thrust coefficients of the rotors,
they are determined by linearization from the corresponding rotor static characteristics.
$k_{f_h}, k_{f_v}$ are the friction coefficients in the vertical and horizontal axes. $k_{h_v}, k_{v_h}$ are
the coefficients of the rotor cross moments. $\mu_1, \mu_2$ represent the moments of inertia
of the set rotor-propeller. $l_m, l_t$ correspond to the length from pivot to main and tail
rotors, respectively. Furthermore, the system inputs are $u_1$ and $u_2$, corresponding to
the voltage supplied to main and tail rotors respectively. \( s(\cdot) = \sin(\cdot) \), \( c(\cdot) = \cos(\cdot) \). The gain \( R_v \), related to the coefficient of the returning torque corresponding to gravity forces, is described by the equation \( R_v = k_1s_\theta - k_2c_\theta \), for constants \( k_1, k_2 \). \( J_v \) is the sum of moments of inertia with respect to the horizontal axis. The inertial moment around vertical axis, \( J_h \), is denoted by the following equation \( J_h = k_3c^2_\theta + k_4 \), where the constants \( k_3, k_4 \) are determined by mass and geometric measures of the physical setup. More details about the parameters can be found in [1].

Taking the dynamics of the whole system [1] into account, it will be partitioned in two subsystems as follows: First subsystem, represented by \( \Sigma_1(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \omega_v) \), consists of the big propeller which drives the rotation in vertical plane. Second subsystem, \( \Sigma_2(\psi, \dot{\psi}, \omega_h) \), consists of the small propeller driving the angular rotation in horizontal plane.

Now, based on physical considerations, we introduce the following assumptions:

**Assumption A1.** The moments of inertia of the rotors \((\mu_1, \mu_2)\), are negligible with respect to rigid body inertias \((J_v, J_h)\) (see [13]). i.e.

\[
(\mu_1, \mu_2) \ll (J_v, J_h).
\]

According to (A1), the dynamics of subsystems \((\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)\) can be represented in two time scales [9, 10], as follows:

- **Fast dynamic** represents the actuator dynamics, i.e. motor-propeller groups.
- **Slow dynamic** corresponds to the pitch and azimuth dynamics of the helicopter.

Then, a mathematical model of a Twin Rotor helicopter can be represented by the following MIMO singular perturbed form

\[
\begin{align}
\dot{\chi}_1 &= \chi_2, \\
\dot{\chi}_2 &= f_1(\chi_1, \chi_2) + h_i(\chi_1)\zeta_i + g_i(\chi_1)u_i, \\
\mu_i\ddot{\zeta}_i &= \bar{h}_i\zeta_i + u_i, \quad i = 1, 2,
\end{align}
\]

where \( \chi_i = (\chi_{1i}, \chi_{2i})^T \), for \( i = 1, 2 \); represents the state vector of the slow subsystems (2a) (2b) such as \( \chi_1 = (\theta, \dot{\theta})^T \), \( \chi_2 = (\psi, \dot{\psi})^T \), while rotor speeds dynamic \( \zeta_1 = \omega_v \) and \( \zeta_2 = \omega_h \) correspond to the fast subsystem (2c). \( f_1(\cdot) = -\frac{1}{J_v}[R_v\chi_{11} + k_{fv}\chi_{12}] \),

\[ f_2(\cdot) = -\frac{1}{J_h}[k_{fh}\chi_{22} + l_ik_{Fh}s_{\chi_{11}\chi_{11}}], \quad h_1(\cdot) = (l_i k_{Fv})/J_v, \quad h_2(\cdot) = \frac{1}{J_h}[l_ik_{Fh}\chi_{11}], \]

\[ g_1(\cdot) = k_{hv}/J_v, \quad g_2(\cdot) = \frac{k_{hv}}{J_h}[c_{\chi_{11}} - s_{\chi_{11}\chi_{11}}], \quad \bar{h}_1 = -1/k_{hv}, \quad \bar{h}_2 = -1/k_{hh}. \]

Taking into account the magnitude of the moment of inertia of the rotors, whose experimental values satisfy

\[ \mu_i \ll 1, \quad i = 1, 2; \]

several methods can be applied to reduce the order of the model.

The classic quasy-steady-state represents a simple approach [21]. By applying this technique, the rotor speeds can be taken as approximately constant and as a result only
the slow dynamics \((\theta, \psi)\) from (2a–2c) will be considered. Thus, setting \(\mu_i = 0\), in the fast dynamic subsystem, it follows that \(0 = \bar{h}_i \zeta_i + u_i\), for \(i = 1, 2\). Solving last equation for \(\zeta_i\) and substituting in (2b), we obtain the *Slow System*

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\chi}_{i1} &= \chi_{i2}, \\
\dot{\chi}_{i2} &= f_i(\chi_{i1}, \chi_{i2}) + G_i(\chi_{i1}) u_i + w_i(\chi_{i1}, u_1, u_2), \quad i = 1, 2,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(G_1(\chi_{i1}) = \frac{l_i k_{Fv} J_h}{J_v} \), \(G_2(\chi_{i1}) = l_i k_{Fh} J_h \), \(w_1(\chi_{i1}, u_1, u_2) = \frac{k_{h,v}}{f_v} u_2 \), and \\
\(w_2(\chi_{i1}, u_1, u_2) = \frac{k_{h,h}}{J_h} \{c_{\chi_{i1}} - s_{\chi_{i1}} \chi_{i1} \} u_1 + l_i k_{Fh} k_{Hh} (c_{\chi_{i1}}/J_h) u_2 \).

It is clear that, due to parameters variations and uncertainties, model (2a–2c) is an approximation of the behavior of the whole system. Accurate models can be found in literature, e.g. [19]. However, its derivation is not a trivial issue and requires a considerable effort.

From assumption \(A1\), the subsystems (3), in the state space representation, can be written as

\[
\Sigma_i : \begin{cases} \chi_i = \mathcal{F}_i(\chi_i) + \mathcal{G}_i u_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \end{cases}
\]

where \(\mathcal{F}_i(\chi_i) = (\chi_{i2}, F_i(\chi_i))^T\) and \(\mathcal{G}_i = (0, G_i)^T\), for \(i = 1, 2\). Furthermore, \(u_i\) represents the motor voltage input, \(F_i(\chi_i) = f_i(\chi_i) + w_i(\chi_i)\), include dynamics, parametric uncertainties and external disturbances lumped together, for each subsystem, while \(G_i\) is a constant vector.

**Assumption A2.** The angles \(\theta, \psi\) and rotor speeds \(\omega_v, \omega_h\) are the measurable outputs. Angular velocities \(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\psi}\), are assumed to be unmeasurable, and terms \(F_i\), for \(i = 1, 2\); are unknown.

Then, in order to implement the proposed control laws, the terms \(F_i, i = 1, 2\); will be estimated by means of extended state observers.

Now, we can establish the control and observation objectives.

**Control objective.** To design a controller able to track a desired angular reference \((\theta_d, \psi_d)\), regardless of uncertainties in modelling and crossed dynamics.

**Observation objective.** Considering that the only available measurements are the angular positions, the observation objective is to reconstruct the angular velocities and the uncertain terms of the system.

### 3. Adaptive Super-Twisting Control Algorithm

In this section, the synthesis of control law based on a super-twisting adaptive control algorithm, which has been proposed in [22], is presented. Under this approach, the gains of the controller are adapted in order to attenuate the chattering. Furthermore, the bounds of uncertainties and perturbations present on the system are not required to be known. The main advantage of such algorithm is that it combines the advantage of the
chattering reduction and the robustness of the high order sliding mode approach. The designed controller ensures its convergence in a finite-time and ensures the robustness of the system under uncertainties.

Now, consider the super-twisting control algorithm (see [11]), which is given by

\[ u = -K_1|s|^{1/2} \text{sign}(s) + v, \]
\[ \dot{v} = -K_2 \text{sign}(s), \tag{5} \]

where \( u \) represents the control signal, \( K_1, K_2 \) are the control gains and \( s \) is a sliding variable.

From the adaptive super-twisting control algorithm (ASTA) approach, the gains \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are chosen such that they are functions of the sliding surface dynamics as follows

\[ K_1 = K_1(t, s, \dot{s}) \quad \text{and} \quad K_2 = K_2(t, s, \dot{s}). \tag{6} \]

Now, in order to design an adaptive super-twisting control for the uncertain nonlinear system

\[ \dot{x} = f(x, t) + g(x, t)u, \tag{7} \]

where \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the state, \( u \in \mathbb{R} \) the control input, \( f(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a continuous function.

We introduce the following assumptions.

**Assumption B1.** The sliding variable \( s = s(x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \) is designed so that the desired compensated dynamics of the system \([7]\) are achieved in the sliding mode \( s = s(x, t) = 0 \).

**Assumption B2.** The relative degree of the system \([7]\), with respect to control variable \( u \), is equal to 1 and the internal dynamics are stable.

Then, the dynamics of the sliding variable \( s \) is given by

\[ \dot{s} = a(x, t) + b(x, t)u, \tag{8} \]

where \( a(x, t) = \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} f(x, t), \quad b(x, t) = \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} g(x) \).

**Assumption B3.** The function \( b(x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \) is unknown and different from zero \( \forall x \) and \( t \in [0, \infty) \). Furthermore, \( b(x, t) = b_0(x, t) + \Delta b(x, t) \), where \( b_0(x, t) \) is the nominal part of \( b(x, t) \) which is known, and there exists \( \gamma_1 \) an unknown positive constant such that \( \Delta b(x, t) \) satisfies

\[ \left| \frac{\Delta b(x, t)}{b_0(x, t)} \right| \leq \gamma_1. \]

**Assumption B4.** There exist \( \delta_1, \delta_2 \) unknown positive constants such that the function \( a(x, t) \) and its derivative are bounded

\[ |a(x, t)| \leq \delta_1|s|^{1/2}, \quad |\dot{a}(x, t)| \leq \delta_2. \tag{9} \]
The objective of ASTA approach is to design a continuous control without overestimating the gain, to drive the sliding variable $s$ and its derivative $\dot{s}$ to zero in finite time, under bounded additive and multiplicative disturbances with unknown bounds $\gamma_1, \delta_1$ and $\delta_2$.

Then, the closed loop system (8) becomes

$$\dot{s} = a(x,t) - K_1 b(x,t)|s|^{1/2}\text{sign}(s) + b(x,t)v,$$
$$\dot{v} = -K_2\text{sign}(s).\quad(10)$$

Now, consider the following change of variable

$$\varsigma = (\varsigma_1, \varsigma_2)^T = (|s|^{1/2}\text{sign}(s), b(x,t)v + a(x,t))^T.\quad(11)$$

Then, the system (10) can be written as

$$\dot{\varsigma} = \tilde{A}(\varsigma_1)\varsigma + \tilde{g}(\varsigma_1)\bar{\rho}(x,t),\quad(12)$$

where

$$\tilde{A}(\varsigma_1) = \frac{1}{2|\varsigma_1|} \begin{pmatrix} -2b(x,t)K_1 & 1 \\ -2b(x,t)K_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{g}(\varsigma_1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\bar{\rho}(x,t) = \dot{b}(x,t)v + \dot{a}(x,t) = 2\rho(x,t)\frac{s}{|s|^{1/2}}$. To prove the closed loop stability of the system,

**Assumption B5.** $\dot{b}(x,t)v$ is bounded with unknown boundary $\delta_3$, i.e. $|\dot{b}(x,t)v| < \delta_3$.

Then, system (12) can be rewritten as follows

$$\dot{\varsigma} = \tilde{A}(\varsigma_1)\varsigma, \quad \tilde{A}(\varsigma_1) = \frac{1}{2|\varsigma_1|} \begin{pmatrix} -2b(x,t)K_1 & 1 \\ -2b(x,t)K_2 & 2\rho(x,t) \end{pmatrix},\quad(13)$$

where $|\varsigma_1| = |s|^{1/2}$, it is appealing to consider the quadratic function

$$V_0 = \varsigma^T \tilde{P}\varsigma,\quad(14)$$

where $\tilde{P}$ is a constant, symmetric and positive matrix, as a strict Lyapunov candidate function for (5). Taking its derivative along the trajectories of (13), we have

$$\dot{V}_0 = -|s|^{-1/2} \varsigma^T \tilde{Q}\varsigma,\quad(15)$$

almost everywhere, where $\tilde{P}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ are related by the Algebraic Lyapunov Equation

$$\tilde{A}^T \tilde{P} + \tilde{P}\tilde{A} = -\tilde{Q}.\quad(16)$$

Since $\tilde{A}$ is Hurwitz if $b(x,t)K_1 > 0, 2b(x,t)K_2 + 2\rho(x,t) > 0$, for every $\tilde{Q} = \tilde{Q}^T > 0$, there exist a unique solution $\tilde{P} = \tilde{P}^T > 0$ for (16), so that $V_0$ is a strict Lyapunov function.
Remark 1. The stability of the equilibrium \( \varsigma = 0 \) of (13) is completely determined by the stability of the matrix \( \bar{A} \). However, classical versions of Lyapunov’s theorem cannot be used since they require a continuously differentiable, or at least locally Lipschitz continuous Lyapunov function, though \( V_0 \) (19) is continuous but not locally Lipschitz. Nonetheless, as it is explained in Theorem 1 in [14], it is possible to show the convergence properties by means of Zubov’s theorem [18], that requires only continuous Lyapunov functions. This argument is valid in all the proofs of the present paper, so that no further discussion of these issues will be required.

From Assumption B4 and B5, it follows that

\[
0 < g(x, t) < \delta_2 + \delta_3 = \delta_4.
\]

Notice that, while \( \varsigma_1 \) and \( \varsigma_2 \) converge to 0 in finite time, it follows that \( s \) and \( \dot{s} \) converge to 0 in finite time, too.

The control design based on ASTA approach is formulated in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. (Shtessel et al. [22]) Consider the system (7) in closed-loop with the control (5), expressed in terms of the sliding variable dynamics (8). Furthermore, the assumptions B1 – B5 for unknown gains \( \gamma_1, \delta_1, \delta_2 > 0 \) are satisfied. Then, for given initial conditions \( x(0) \) and \( s(0) \), there exists a finite time \( t_F > 0 \) and a parameter \( \iota \), as soon as the condition

\[
K_1 > \frac{(\lambda + 4\epsilon_*)^2 + 4\delta_4^2 + 4\delta_4(\lambda - 4\epsilon_*)^2)}{16\epsilon_*\lambda},
\]

holds, if \( |s(0)| > \iota \), so that a real 2-sliding mode, i.e. \( |s| \leq \eta_1 \) and \( |\dot{s}| \leq \eta_2 \), is established \( \forall t \geq t_F \), under the action of Adaptive Super-Twisting Control Algorithm (5) with the adaptive gains

\[
\begin{align*}
K_1 \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\omega_1 \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_1}{2}} \text{sign}(|s| - \iota), & \text{if } K_1 > K_*, \\
K_*, & \text{if } K_1 \leq K_*
\end{array} \right. \\
K_2 = 2\epsilon_2 K_1,
\end{align*}
\]

(17)

where \( \epsilon_*, \lambda, \gamma_1, \omega_1, \iota \) are arbitrary positive constants, and \( \eta_1 \geq \iota, \eta_2 > 0 \).

Proof. For analyzing the stability analysis of the closed loop system (13), consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

\[
V(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) = V_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\gamma_i} (K_i - K_i^*)^2 \right\},
\]

(18)

where

\[
V_0 = \varsigma^T \tilde{P} \varsigma, \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{P} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda + 4\epsilon_*^2 & -2\epsilon_* \\ -2\epsilon_* & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\]

(19)

and \( \lambda, \epsilon_*, \gamma_2, K_1^* \) and \( K_2^* > 0 \). Notice that the matrix \( \tilde{P} \) is positive definite if \( \lambda > 0 \) and \( \epsilon_* \in \mathbb{R} \).
Then, the symmetric matrix $\tilde{Q}$ is given by
\[
\tilde{Q} = \frac{1}{2 |s|^2} \begin{pmatrix}
4b(x,t) \left[ K_1 (\lambda + 4\epsilon^2) - 2K_2 \epsilon^* \right] + 8\rho\epsilon^* & \epsilon^* \\
-\lambda - 4\epsilon^2 - 2b(x,t) [2K_1 \epsilon^* - K_2] - 2\rho & 4\epsilon^*
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (20)

By selecting
\[
K_2 = 2\epsilon^* K_1,
\] (21)
then, from assumptions $B3 - B5$, it is easy to see that the matrix $\tilde{Q}$ will be positive definite with a minimal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\text{min}}(\tilde{Q}) \geq 2\epsilon^*$ if
\[
K_1 > \frac{(\lambda + 4\epsilon^2)^2 + 4\delta^2 + 4\delta_1 (\lambda - 4\epsilon^2)}{16\epsilon^* \lambda\gamma_1}.
\] (22)

Now, taking the time derivative of the Lyapunov function candidate (18) along the trajectories of (13), it follows that
\[
\dot{V}(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) = \dot{V}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{\gamma_i} (K_i - K_i^*) \dot{K}_i,
\] (23)
where
\[
\dot{V}_0 = \varsigma^T \{ \tilde{A}(\varsigma_1)^T \tilde{P} + \tilde{P} \tilde{A}(\varsigma_1) \} \varsigma \leq -\frac{1}{|s_1|} \varsigma^T \tilde{Q} \varsigma.
\] (24)

Since $\tilde{Q}$ is positive definite with a minimal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\text{min}}(\tilde{Q}) \geq 2\epsilon^*$, the following inequality is satisfied
\[
\dot{V}_0 \leq -\frac{1}{|s_1|} \varsigma^T \tilde{Q} \varsigma \leq -\frac{2\epsilon^*}{|s_1|} \| \varsigma \|^2,
\] (25)
and, from the norm equivalence, we have
\[
\lambda_{\text{min}}(\tilde{P}) \| \varsigma \|^2 \leq \varsigma^T \tilde{P} \varsigma \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(\tilde{P}) \| \varsigma \|^2,
\] (26)
where $\| \varsigma \|^2 = |s| + \varsigma^2$, and
\[
|s_1| = |s|^{1/2} \leq \| \varsigma \| \leq \frac{\sqrt{V_0(\varsigma)}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(\tilde{P})}.
\]

Then, choosing a suitable selection of the gains according to (21),(22), it follows that
\[
\dot{V}_0 \leq -rV_0^{1/2}, \quad r = 2\epsilon^* \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\text{min}}(\tilde{P})}{\lambda_{\text{max}}(\tilde{P})}}.
\] (27)

From equations (23) and (27), we have
\[
\dot{V}(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) \leq -rV_0^{1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \epsilon_{K_i} \dot{K}_i^*,
\] (28)
where $\epsilon_{K_i} = (K_i - K_i^*)$ for $i=1,2$. By adding $\pm \sum_{i=1}^2 \left\{ \frac{\omega_{2\gamma_i}}{\sqrt{2\gamma_i}} |\epsilon_{K_i}| \right\}$ to (28), it follows that
\[
\dot{V}(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) \leq -rV_0^{1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\omega_{2\gamma_i}}{\sqrt{2\gamma_i}} |\epsilon_{K_i}| + \sum_{i=1}^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \epsilon_{K_i} \dot{K}_i^* + \frac{\omega_{2\gamma_i}}{\sqrt{2\gamma_i}} |\epsilon_{K_i}| \right\}.
\] (29)
Since \((x^2 + y^2 + z^2)^{1/2} \leq |x| + |y| + |z|\), the following inequality holds

\[-r V_0^{1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{\omega_i}{\sqrt{2 \gamma_i}} |\epsilon_{K_i}| \leq -\eta_0 \sqrt{V(\varsigma, K_1, K_2)},\]  

(30)

with \(\omega_2 > 0\), \(\eta_0 = \min(r, \frac{\omega_1}{\sqrt{2 \gamma_1}}, \frac{\omega_2}{\sqrt{2 \gamma_2}})\). According to the inequality (30), the equation (28) can be rewritten as

\[
\dot{V}(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) \leq -\eta_0 \sqrt{V(\varsigma, K_1, K_2)} + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \epsilon_{K_i} \dot{K}_i + \frac{\omega_i}{\sqrt{2 \gamma_i}} |\epsilon_{K_i}| \right\}. \tag{31}
\]

Now, recalling on the definition of the adaptive gains (17), a solution in the domain \(\iota < |s| \leq \eta_1\) can be constructed as

\[
K_1 = K_1(0) + \omega_1 \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_1}{2}} t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq t_F. \tag{32}
\]

\(K_1\) is thus bounded. As \(K_2 = 2 \epsilon_\star K_1\), the adaptive gain \(K_2\) is also bounded.

Inside the domain \(|s| \leq \iota\), the control gains \(K_1\) and \(K_2\) are decreasing. Therefore, the gains \(K_1\) and \(K_2\) are bounded in the real 2-sliding mode.

Then, there exist positive constants \(K_1^*, K_2^*\) such that \(K_i - K_i^* < 0, \forall t \geq 0, i = 1, 2\). Therefore, the equation (31) can be reduced to

\[
\dot{V}(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) \leq -\eta_0 \sqrt{V(\varsigma, K_1, K_2)} + \hat{\epsilon}, \tag{33}
\]

where

\[
\hat{\epsilon} = -\sum_{i=1}^{2} |\epsilon_{K_i}| \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \dot{K}_i - \frac{\omega_i}{\sqrt{2 \gamma_i}} \right). \tag{34}
\]

Then, if \(|s| > \iota\) and \(K_1 > K_1^*, \forall t \geq 0\), it follows that

\[
\dot{K}_1 = \omega_1 \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\epsilon} = -|\epsilon_{K_2}| \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \dot{K}_2 - \frac{\omega_2}{\sqrt{2 \gamma_2}} \right). \tag{35}
\]

Thus, by selecting \(\epsilon_\star = \frac{\omega_2}{2 \omega_1} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}}\), we have

\[
\dot{K}_2 = \omega_2 \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_2}{2}}. \tag{36}
\]

From (35), the term \(\hat{\epsilon}\) in (33) becomes \(\hat{\epsilon} = 0\), it follows that

\[
\dot{V}(\varsigma, K_1, K_2) \leq -\eta_0 \sqrt{V(\varsigma, K_1, K_2)}. \tag{36}
\]

Integrating (36), we have

\[
\sqrt{V(t, \varsigma, K_1, K_2)} \leq \sqrt{V(t_0, \varsigma, K_1, K_2)} - \frac{\eta_0}{2} t. \tag{37}
\]
Let $\sqrt{V(t_0, \varsigma, K_1, K_2) - \frac{\eta_0}{2} t_F} = 0$, then the convergence time $t_F$ is given by

$$t_F = \frac{2\sqrt{V(t_0, \varsigma, K_1, K_2)}}{\eta_0}.$$  \hfill (38)

Therefore, for $t > t_F$ we have $V(t) = 0$.

On the other hand, when $|s| < \iota$, $K_1$ is given by (17), and the term $\hat{\epsilon}$ becomes

$$\hat{\epsilon} = \begin{cases} 2 |K_1 - K_1^*| \frac{\omega_1}{\sqrt{2} \gamma_1}, & \text{for } K_1 > K_*, \\ -|K_* - K_1^* + \eta t| \left( \frac{\eta}{\gamma_1} - \frac{\omega_1}{\sqrt{2} \gamma_1} \right), & \text{for } K_1 \leq K_* \end{cases}.$$ \hfill (39)

Therefore, during the adaptation process the sliding variable $s$ reaches the domain $|s| \leq \iota$ in finite time. If $s$ leaves the domain for a finite time, it is guaranteed that it will holds in a larger domain $|s| \leq \eta_1, \eta_1 > \iota$ in a real sliding mode.

Within the domain $|s| \leq \iota$, the value $|\dot{s}|$ can be estimated according to system (10) and from gain equations (17) – (21) as

$$|\dot{s}| \leq \left\{ (1 - \gamma_1) K_1 + \delta_1 \right\} \iota \frac{1}{2} + 2 \epsilon_* K_1 (1 - \gamma_1) (t_2 - t_1) = \bar{\eta}_1,$$ \hfill (40)

where $t_1, t_2$ are the time when $s$ enters and leaves the domain $|s| \leq \iota$, respectively.

If $\iota < |s| \leq \eta_1$, similarly we have

$$|\dot{s}| \leq (1 + \gamma_1) \sqrt{\eta_1 + \epsilon_*} (K_1(t_2) + \omega_1 \sqrt{\frac{\eta_1 \gamma_1}{2}})(t_3 - t_2) + \delta_1 \sqrt{\eta_1} = \bar{\eta}_2,$$ \hfill (41)

where $t_2, t_3, t_3 > t_2$, are the time instants when $s$ leaves and enters the domain $|s| \leq \iota$ respectively.

From these conditions (40) – (41), we obtain

$$|\dot{s}| \leq \max(\bar{\eta}_1, \bar{\eta}_2) = \eta_2,$$ \hfill (42)

and thus is proved the existence of the real sliding mode domain

$$W = \{ s, \dot{s} : |s| \leq \eta_1, |\dot{s}| \leq \eta_2, \eta_1 > \iota \}.$$ \hfill (43)

This ends the proof. \hfill $\square$

Notice that, according to subsystems (4), the sliding surface for the control (5) – (6) is defined as

$$s = \begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \chi_{12} - \dot{\theta}(t) + \lambda_1 (\chi_{11} - \theta(t)) \\ \chi_{22} - \dot{\psi}(t) + \lambda_2 (\chi_{21} - \psi(t)) \end{bmatrix},$$ \hfill (44)
whose time derivatives are given by
\[
\dot{s} = \begin{pmatrix}
F_1 - \hat{\theta}_d(t) + \lambda_1 \left( \chi_{12} - \hat{\theta}_d(t) \right) + b_1 v_1 \\
F_2 - \hat{\psi}_d(t) + \lambda_2 \left( \chi_{22} - \hat{\psi}_d(t) \right) + b_2 v_2
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 + b_1 v_1 \\ a_2 + b_2 v_2 \end{pmatrix}
\]

where \((\theta_d(t), \psi_d(t))\) are the desired angular trajectories and \((v_1, v_2)\) are the control inputs defined according to (5) – 17.

However, to implement the proposed controller, it is necessary to know the values from \((\chi_{12}, \chi_{12})\), as well as the unknown dynamics of \(F_i\), for \(i=1,2\). Then, to overcome this difficulty, the estimation of unmeasurable terms will be addressed in next section.

4. NONLINEAR EXTENDED STATE OBSERVER DESIGN

In this section, a Nonlinear Extended State Observer (NESO) is designed for estimating angular velocities \(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\psi}\) and unknown terms \(F_i\) in subsystems \((\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)\). In order to design such observer, subsystems [4] are first extended into the following form

\[
\tilde{\Sigma}_i : \begin{align*}
\dot{\chi}_{i1} &= \chi_{i2} \\
\dot{\chi}_{i2} &= \chi_{i3} + b_{i0} u_i \\
\dot{\chi}_{i3} &= \eta_i(\chi) \\
y &= \chi_{i1}, \quad i = 1, 2,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(b_{i0}\) represents nominal value of \(b_i\), with \(b_i = b_{i0} + \Delta b_i\) and the additional states \(\chi_{i3} = F_i(\chi_i) + \frac{\Delta b_i}{b_{i0}} u_i\) are the augmented states, estimating the total disturbance for every subsystem.

**Assumption C1.** \(F_i(\cdot)\), \(u_i\) and theirs derivative \(\eta_i(\cdot) = \hat{F}_i(\chi_i) + \frac{\Delta b_i}{b_{i0}} u_i\), \(i = 1, 2\); are locally Lipschitz in their arguments and bounded within the domain of interest. Besides, the initial conditions are assumed as \(F(\cdot)|_{t=0} = 0\), and \(\hat{F}_i(\cdot)|_{t=0} = 0\).

**Assumption C2.** The output \(y_i = \chi_{i1}\), for \(i = 1, 2\); and its derivatives up to 4th order are bounded.

Then, the following system

\[
O_i : \begin{align*}
\dot{z}_{i1} &= z_{i2} - \beta_{i1} fal(\hat{e}_{i1}(t), \hat{\gamma}_{i1}, \hat{\delta}_i), \\
\dot{z}_{i2} &= z_{i3} - \beta_{i2} fal(\hat{e}_{i1}(t), \hat{\gamma}_{i2}, \hat{\delta}_i) + b_{i0} u_i, \\
\dot{z}_{i3} &= -\beta_{i3} fal(\hat{e}_{i1}(t), \hat{\gamma}_{i3}, \hat{\delta}_i), \quad i = 1, 2,
\end{align*}
\]

is an observer estimating the unmeasurable states of \((46)\), where \(\hat{e}_{ij}(t) = \chi_{ij} - z_{ij}\) for \(j = 1, 2, 3\); is the estimation error, \(\beta_i = (\beta_{i1}, \beta_{i2}, \beta_{i3})^T\) are the observer gains and \(Z_i = (z_{i1}, z_{i2}, z_{i3})^T\), for \(i = 1, 2\); is estimation state vector for each subsystem \((46)\).

The function \(f_{al}(\cdot)\) is defined as follows

\[
f_{al}(e, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\delta}) = \begin{cases} 
|e| \hat{\gamma} \text{sign}(e), & |e| > \hat{\delta}, \\
\frac{e}{|e| - \hat{\gamma}}, & |e| \leq \hat{\delta},
\end{cases}
\]

(48)
where $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\delta}$ are design parameters.

The nonlinear function (48) is used to increase the rate of convergence of the signals. As $\hat{\gamma}$ is chosen between 0 and 1, $f \alpha l(\cdot)$ yields high gain when error is small, while large errors correspond to smaller gains. If $\hat{\gamma}$ is chosen as unity, then the observer is equal to the well-know Luenberger observer. $\hat{\delta}$ is a small number used to limit the gain in the neighborhood of origin (see Figure 2). Starting with linear gain $f \alpha l(\cdot) = e$, the pole placement method can be used for the initial design of this observer (see [7]), before the nonlinearities are added to enhance the performance.

Fig. 2: Linear and nonlinear gains comparison.

Several analytical techniques can be used to find the parameters $\beta_{i1}, \beta_{i2}, \beta_{i3}$, of the observer. To simplify, the poles of characteristic equation are placed in one location ($\hat{\omega}_i$) and the observer gains can be expressed as

$$\beta_{ij} = l_{ij}\hat{\omega}_i^j, \quad i = 1, 2; \quad j = 1, 2, 3; \quad \text{(49)}$$

where the parameters $l_{ij}$, $i = 1, 2; \quad j = 1, 2, 3$; are selected such that the characteristic polynomial $s^3 + l_{i1}s^2 + l_{i2}s + l_{i3}$ is Hurwitz. $\hat{\omega}_i > 0$ is a design parameter, the bandwidth of the output signal of the observer. It is common to choose the parameter $\hat{\omega}_i$ as a trade-off between convergence speed of states estimation and the influence of noise and sampling time. A study of the convergence of this observer is given in [8].

5. STABILITY OF THE CONTROLLER-OBSERVER SCHEME

In section 3, the controller has been designed considering that the states are available for measurement. However, in practice it is not possible to measure all components of the state of the system, then the observer provided the estimates which converge near of the actual state. In order to guarantee the correct performance of the proposed observer-controller scheme a stability analysis of the system in closed-loop is necessary.

Consider the case for subsystems (4) where the control depends on the estimated state

$$\dot{x}_i = \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) + \mathcal{G}_i u_i(z_i),$$

where $\mathcal{F}_i(x_i) = (x_{i2}, F_i(x_i))^T$ and $\mathcal{G}_i = (0, b_i)^T$, for $i = 1, 2$. Adding the term $\pm \mathcal{G}_i u_i(x_i)$, the system can be represented as follows

$$\dot{x}_i = \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) + \mathcal{G}_i u_i(x_i) + \mathcal{G}_i [u_i(z_i) - u_i(x_i)], \quad i = 1, 2. \quad \text{(50)}$$
Using the sliding mode surface \([44]\), then the derivatives of the sliding variables \(s = (s_1, s_2)^T\) can be written as

\[
\dot{s} = A(\chi) + B(\chi)u(\chi) + \Gamma(\epsilon),
\]

(51)

where \(A(\chi) = [a_1(\chi_1, t), a_2(\chi_2, t)]^T\), \(B(\chi) = diag [b_1(\chi_1), b_2(\chi_2)]\), \(\Gamma(\epsilon) = [\Gamma_1(\epsilon_1), \Gamma_2(\epsilon_2)]^T\), \(a_i(\chi_i, t) = \frac{\partial s_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial s_i}{\partial \chi_i} F_i(\chi_i)\), \(b_i(\chi_i, t) = \frac{\partial s_i}{\partial \chi_i} G_i\), \(u(\chi) = (u_1(\chi_1), u_2(\chi_2))^T\), \(\Gamma_i(\epsilon) = b_i(\chi_i)\left[u_i(Z_i) - u_i(\chi_i)\right]\). Furthermore, \(\Gamma_i(\epsilon)\) for \(i = 1, 2\); depend on the estimation errors \(\epsilon_i = Z_i - \chi_i\), for \(i = 1, 2\); and from theorem 2, they are bounded.

On the other hand, the terms \(a_i(\chi_i, t)\) and \(b_i(\chi_i, t)\), \(i = 1, 2\) satisfy Assumptions B3 and B4. Then, under these assumptions, system (50) in closed-loop with the control (5) - (6) is given by

\[
\dot{s}_i = -\kappa_{1i}|s_i|^{1/2}\text{sign}(s_i) + v_i + \Gamma_i(\epsilon_i),
\]

\[
\dot{v}_i = -\kappa_{2i}\text{sign}(s_i),
\]

(52)

where \(\kappa_{1i} = K_1 b_i, \kappa_{2i} = \frac{K_2}{2} b_i\).

Using the following change of variable \(\xi_i = (|s_i|^{1/2} \text{sign}(s_i), v_i + a_i(\chi_i, t))^T\), the system (50) is given by

\[
\dot{\xi}_{i1} = -\frac{1}{2|s_i|^{1/2}} \{\kappa_{1i} b_i(\chi_i, t) \xi_{i1} + \xi_{i2} + \Gamma_i(\epsilon_i)\},
\]

\[
\dot{\xi}_{i2} = -\frac{1}{2|s_i|^{1/2}} \{\kappa_{2i} \xi_{i1} + \dot{a}_i(\chi_i, t)\},
\]

(53)

Consider the following Lyapunov function

\[
V_i = \xi_i^T \tilde{P}_i \xi_i, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{P}_i = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 4\kappa_{2i} + \kappa_{1i}^2 & -\kappa_{1i} \\ -\kappa_{1i} & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

(54)

Now, the time derivative of the Lyapunov function (54) is given by

\[
\dot{V}_i = -\frac{1}{|s_i|^{1/2}} \xi_i^T Q_i \xi_i + \frac{\Gamma_i(\epsilon_i)}{|s_i|^{1/2}} q_1 T \xi_i,
\]

(55)

where

\[
Q_i = \frac{\kappa_{1i}^3}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\kappa_{2i} + \kappa_{1i}^2 & -\kappa_{1i} \\ -\kappa_{1i} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2\kappa_{2i} + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{1i}^2 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\kappa_{1i} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Following the same procedure as defined in [14], the term \(\Gamma_i(s_i, \epsilon_i)\) is assumed to be globally bounded, i.e.

\[
|\Gamma_i| \leq \rho_i |s_i|^{1/2}, \quad \rho_i > 0.
\]

Then, it follows that

\[
\dot{V}_i \leq -\frac{\kappa_{1i}}{2|s_i|^{1/2}} \xi_i^T \tilde{Q}_i \xi_i, \quad \tilde{Q}_i = \begin{pmatrix} 2\kappa_{2i} + \kappa_{1i}^2 & -\left(4\kappa_{1i} \rho_i / \kappa_{1i}\right) \rho_i \\ -\kappa_{1i} + 2\rho_i & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

(56)

Thus, if the controller gains satisfy the next relations

\[
\kappa_{1i} > 2\rho_i, \quad \kappa_{2i} > \kappa_{1i} \frac{5\rho_i \kappa_{1i} + 4\rho_i^2}{2(\kappa_{1i} - 2\rho_i)}.
\]

(57)
According to Theorem 3.1 and taking into account the asymptotically convergence from the term \( \Gamma_i \), a \( K_{1i} \) can be designed such that the following condition holds

\[
K_{1i} > 2b_i\rho_i, \quad \frac{K_{2i}}{2} > K_{1i} \frac{5\rho_i\kappa_{1i} + 4\rho_i^2}{2(\kappa_{1i} - 2\rho_i)}.
\]

(58)

Since \( \tilde{Q}_i > 0 \), implies the derivative of the Lyapunov function is negative definite.

6. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we provide experimental results carried out on the Two Rotor Aerodynamic System (TRAS) platform (Figure 3) to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed methodology. The TRAS system is interfaced through an external PC-based data acquisition and control system (RT-DAC4/USB). Controller and observer algorithms were developed in the MATLAB/Simulink environment, while the associated executable code was automatically generated by the RTW/RTWI rapid prototyping environment (see [1] for detailed information). The sampling time was set to 0.01s.

Controller and observer parameters are displayed in the Tables 1–2. Regarding the Control parameters: \( \omega_i, \iota_i, \xi_1, \) and \( \gamma_i \) are positive values arbitrary chosen between 0 and 1. \( \lambda_i \) is a positive value related to the sliding surface derivative action. With respect to Observer parameters: \( \delta_i \) and \( \tilde{\gamma}_{ij}, i = 1, 2; j = 1, 2, 3; \) are arbitrary chosen between 0 and 1. \( b_{0i} \) is related to motor-propeller time constant. \( \beta_{ij}, i = 1, 2; j = 1, 2, 3; \) are selected according to (49), where \( \tilde{\omega}_i, i = 1, 2; \) were selected as a trade-off between convergence speed and noise sensibility. Finally, parameters \( l_{ij}, i = 1, 2; j = 1, 2, 3; \) were selected as \( l_{i1} = 3, l_{i2} = 3 \) and \( l_{i3} = 1, i = 1, 2. \) In the first test, a sinusoidal reference of amplitude 0.2 rad with a frequency of 1/60Hz was given for pitch angle, while for azimuth angle a square reference of amplitude 0.4 rad with a frequency of 1/50Hz was chosen. In the second test, an extra weight of 25% has been attached to the main rotor 20 seconds after the beginning of the experiments, i.e. 15 grams have been added to observe the response under the perturbation aforementioned. In order to compare the performance of the NESO based ASTA scheme, a Cross-coupled PID and the fixed gain Super Twisting Algorithm (STA) using the estimates states from NESO were also tested.
Subsystem & $\omega_i$ & $\lambda_i$ & $\iota_i$ & $\gamma_i$ & $\epsilon_{ij}$ \\
Pitch (i=1) & 0.1 & 1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\
Azimuth (i=2) & 0.1 & 3 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\

| Subsystem | $\hat{\gamma}_{ij1}$ | $\hat{\gamma}_{ij2}$ | $\hat{\gamma}_{ij3}$ | $\delta_i$ | $b_{0i}$ | $\beta_{1i}$ | $\beta_{2i}$ | $\beta_{3i}$ \\
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch (i=1)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>1518.8</td>
<td>11391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azimuth (i=2)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. 1:** ASTA Control parameters.

**Tab. 2:** Extended Observer parameters.

Figure 4 shows profiles of angular responses. From the graphics it is possible to see that the strong coupling in the dynamics has been rejected by the proposed controllers. In Figure 6 can be seen the resulting speed on azimuth rotor, Figure 5 shows the corresponding main rotor speed, the profiles show a bigger demand by the proposed controller. However, tracking is preserved despite coupled dynamics. An error comparison is shown in Figure 7. Additionally, in Figure 8 adaptation of ASTA gain is presented, where gains for azimuth and pitch were initialized with different values. While for the rest of the graphics the time scale remains fixed to 90 seconds to make easier to observe the details of responses, for gain graphics the time scale has been extended in order to show the convergence. In the above graphics it is possible to see that, the controller ASTA in combination with NESO can reject the strong coupled dynamics of the platform TRAS. Several indexes of performance in the Table 3 illustrate the advantage of NESO based ASTA scheme.

Angular profiles under an increment of rotor mass are showed in Figure 9, it can be observed that for pitch tracking, Cross-PID control totally lost the reference, while az-
Fig. 5: Main rotor speed for first test.

Fig. 6: Tail rotor speed for first test.

Fig. 7: First test errors.

Fig. 8: First test adaptive gains.

Fig. 10: Cross-PID.

Fig. 11: NESO based ASTA.

Fig. 12: NESO based STA.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Azimuth Error</th>
<th>Pitch Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-PID</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based ASTA</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based STA</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitch tracking is reached by all the controllers. To prevent any damage to the platform, the control outputs are saturated, this can be observed as azimuth angle can not reject faster the perturbation as it has reached its saturation value. By increasing the mass of pitch rotor, controllers demand more performance, as can be seen in Figures 10 and 11. In the Figure 12 an error comparison for second test is presented. As Cross-PID control is unable to handle the increment of mass, it has a huge tracking error. Adaptive gains of the ASTA controller help to reject the perturbation applied to the 2-DOF helicopter. Figure 13 shows the behavior of the ASTA gains, from the extended time scale it is possible to see their convergence. According to performance indexes displayed in the Table 1 the proposed scheme present the best performance among the tested controllers.
7. CONCLUSIONS

An adaptive super-twisting control algorithm for a two degrees of freedom laboratory helicopter platform has been designed. With the aim of implementing the proposed controller, a nonlinear extended state observer was designed for estimating the unmeasurable states as well as external disturbances. An analysis of the stability of the system has been given, where sufficient conditions have been defined in order to guarantee the stability of the closed loop. Besides, a comparison among a Cross-PID and the Super Twisting Algorithm illustrate the advantages of the presented scheme. Experimental results demonstrate the robustness and the efficiency of the proposed methodology.
Attitude observer-based robust control for a twin rotor system

(a) Azimuth error.

Fig. 12: Second test errors.

(b) Pitch error.

Fig. 13: Second test adaptive gains.

Tab. 3: First test performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSE&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>ITAE&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>∥u∥&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based ASTA</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1916.645</td>
<td>47.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-PID</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>14126.229</td>
<td>43.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based STA</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1947.061</td>
<td>44.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azimuth control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based ASTA</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>37010.961</td>
<td>26.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-PID</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>36919.345</td>
<td>17.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based STA</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>47395.427</td>
<td>24.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Mean Square Error.
<sup>b</sup>Integral Time Absolute Error.

Tab. 4: Second test performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>ITAE</th>
<th>∥u∥&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitch control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based ASTA</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1963.227</td>
<td>64.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-PID</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>89474.449</td>
<td>50.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based STA</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1971.801</td>
<td>59.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azimuth control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based ASTA</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>62079.431</td>
<td>27.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-PID</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>40080.065</td>
<td>18.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESO based STA</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>81159.385</td>
<td>27.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Received February 27, 2013)

REFERENCES


Oscar Salas, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Nuevo Leon. México. e-mail: salvador.sp@gmail.com

Herman Castañeda, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Nuevo Leon. México. e-mail: hermancc08@gmail.com

Jesús DeLeón-Morales, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Nuevo Leon. México. e-mail: drjleon@gmail.com