

Integral Concurrent Learning: Adaptive Control with Parameter Convergence without PE or State Derivatives

Anup Parikh¹, Rushikesh Kamalapurkar¹, Warren E. Dixon¹

Abstract—Concurrent learning is a recently developed adaptive update scheme that can be used to guarantee parameter convergence without requiring persistent excitation. However, this technique requires knowledge of state derivatives, which are usually not directly sensed and therefore must be estimated. A novel integral concurrent learning method is developed in this paper that removes the need to estimate state derivatives while maintaining parameter convergence properties. A Monte Carlo simulation illustrates improved robustness to noise compared to the traditional derivative formulation.

Index Terms—Adaptive Control, Parameter Estimation

I. INTRODUCTION

Adaptive control methods provide a means to achieve a control objective despite uncertainties in the system model. Adaptive estimates are developed through insights from a Lyapunov-based analysis as a means to yield a desired objective. Although a regulation or tracking objective can be achieved with this scheme, it is well known that the parameter estimates may not approach the true parameters using a least-squares or a gradient based online update law without persistent excitation [1]–[3]. However, the persistence of excitation condition cannot be guaranteed *a priori* for nonlinear systems, and is difficult to check online, in general.

Motivated by the desire to learn the true parameters, or at least to gain the increased robustness and improved transient performance that parameter convergence provides (see [4]–[6]), a new adaptive update scheme known as concurrent learning (CL) was recently developed in the pioneering work of [6]–[8]. The principle idea of CL is to use recorded input and output data of the system dynamics to apply batch-like updates to the parameter estimate dynamics. These updates yield a negative definite, parameter estimation error term in the stability analysis, which allows parameter convergence to be established provided a finite excitation condition is satisfied. The finite excitation condition is a weaker condition than persistent excitation (since excitation is only needed for a finite amount of time) and can be checked online by verifying the positivity of the minimum singular value of a function of the regressor matrix. However, all current CL methods require

that the output data include the state derivatives, which may not be available for all systems. Since the naive approach of finite difference of the state measurements leads to noise amplification, and since only past recorded data, opposed to real-time data, is needed for CL, techniques such as online state derivative estimation or smoothing have been employed, e.g., [9], [10]. However, these methods typically require tuning parameters such as an observer gain, switching threshold, etc. in the case of the online derivative estimator, and basis, basis order, covariance, time window, etc. in the case of smoothing, to produce satisfactory results.

In this note, we reformulate the CL method in terms of an integral, removing the need to estimate state derivatives. Also, the only additional tuning parameter beyond what is needed for gradient-based adaptive control designs is the time window of integration, which is analogous to the smoothing buffer window that is already required for smoothing based techniques. Despite the reformulation, the stability results still hold (i.e., parameter convergence) and Monte Carlo simulation results suggest greater robustness to noise compared to derivative based CL implementations.

II. CONTROL OBJECTIVE

To illustrate the integral CL method, consider an example dynamic system modeled as

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), t) + u(t) \quad (1)$$

where $t \in [0, \infty)$, $x : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are the measurable states, $u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the control input and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the locally Lipschitz drift dynamics, with some unknown parameters. In the following development, as is typical in adaptive control, f is assumed to be linearly parametrized in the unknown parameters, i.e.,

$$f(x, t) = Y(x, t)\theta \quad (2)$$

where $Y : \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is a regressor matrix and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ represents the constant, unknown system parameters. To quantify the state tracking and parameter estimation objective of the adaptive control problem, the tracking error and parameter estimate error are defined as

$$e(t) \triangleq x(t) - x_d(t) \quad (3)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}(t) \triangleq \theta - \hat{\theta}(t) \quad (4)$$

where $x_d : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a known, continuously differentiable desired trajectory and $\hat{\theta} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is the

¹Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611-6250, USA Email: {anuppari, rkamalapurkar, wdixon}@ufl.edu

This research is supported in part by a Task Order contract with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Munitions Directorate at Eglin AFB, and Office of Naval Research Grant N00014-13-1-0151. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsoring agency.

parameter estimate. In the following, functional arguments will be omitted for notational brevity, e.g., $x(t)$ will be denoted as x , unless necessary for clarity.

To achieve the control objective, the following controller is commonly used:

$$u(t) \triangleq \dot{x}_d - Y(x, t)\hat{\theta} - Ke \quad (5)$$

where $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a positive definite constant control gain. Taking the time derivative of (3) and substituting for (1), (2), and (5), yields the closed loop error dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} &= Y(x, t)\theta + \dot{x}_d - Y(x, t)\hat{\theta} - Ke - \dot{x}_d \\ &= Y(x, t)\tilde{\theta} - Ke \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The parameter estimation error dynamics are determined by taking the time derivative of (4), yielding

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}}(t) = -\dot{\hat{\theta}}. \quad (7)$$

An integral CL-based update law for the parameter estimate is designed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{\theta}}(t) &\triangleq \Gamma Y(x, t)^T e \\ &\quad + k_{CL}\Gamma \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i^T \left(x(t_i) - x(t_i - \Delta t) - \mathcal{U}_i - \mathcal{Y}_i \hat{\theta} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $k_{CL} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are constant, positive definite control gains, $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is a positive constant, $t_i \in [0, t]$ are time points between the initial time and the current time, $\mathcal{Y}_i \triangleq \mathcal{Y}(t_i)$, $\mathcal{U}_i \triangleq \mathcal{U}(t_i)$,

$$\mathcal{Y}(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} 0_{n \times m} & t \in [0, \Delta t] \\ \int_{t-\Delta t}^t Y(x(\tau), \tau) d\tau & t > \Delta t \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(t) \triangleq \begin{cases} 0_{n \times 1} & t \in [0, \Delta t] \\ \int_{t-\Delta t}^t u(\tau) d\tau & t > \Delta t \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

$0_{n \times m}$ denotes an $n \times m$ matrix of zeros, and $\Delta t \in \mathbb{R}$ is a positive constant denoting the size of the window of integration. The concurrent learning term (i.e., the second term) in (8) represents saved data. The principal idea behind this design is to utilize recorded input-output data generated by the dynamics to further improve the parameter estimate. See [7] for a discussion on how to choose data points to record.

The integral CL-based adaptive update law in (8) differs from traditional state derivative based CL update laws given in, e.g., [6]–[8]. Specifically, the state derivative, control, and regressor terms, i.e., \dot{x} , u , and Y , respectively, used in [6]–[8] are replaced with the integral of those terms over the time window $[t - \Delta t, t]$.

Substituting (2) into (1), and integrating yields

$$\int_{t-\Delta t}^t \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau = \int_{t-\Delta t}^t Y(x, \tau)\theta d\tau + \int_{t-\Delta t}^t u(\tau) d\tau,$$

$\forall t > \Delta t$. Using the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and the definitions in (9) and (10),

$$x(t) - x(t - \Delta t) = \mathcal{Y}(t)\theta + \mathcal{U}(t) \quad (11)$$

$\forall t > \Delta t$, where the fact that θ is a constant was used to pull it outside the integral. Rearranging (11) and substituting into (8) yields

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}}(t) = \Gamma Y(x, t)^T e + k_{CL}\Gamma \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i^T \mathcal{Y}_i \tilde{\theta}. \quad (12)$$

III. STABILITY ANALYSIS

To facilitate the following analysis, let $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ represent a composite vector of the system states and parameter estimation errors, defined as $\eta(t) \triangleq [e^T \tilde{\theta}^T]^T$. Also, let $\lambda_{\min}\{\cdot\}$ and $\lambda_{\max}\{\cdot\}$ represents the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of $\{\cdot\}$, respectively.

Assumption 1. The system is sufficiently excited over a finite duration of time. Specifically, $\exists \underline{\lambda} > 0, \exists T > \Delta t : \forall t \geq T, \lambda_{\min} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i^T \mathcal{Y}_i \right\} \geq \underline{\lambda}$.

Theorem 1. For the system defined in (1) and (7), the controller and adaptive update law defined in (5) and (8) ensures bounded tracking and parameter estimation errors during the time interval $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof: Let $V : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a candidate Lyapunov function defined as

$$V(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}e^T e + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta}.$$

Taking the derivative of V along the trajectories of (1) during $t \in [0, T]$, substituting the closed loop error dynamics in (6) and the equivalent adaptive update law in (12), and simplifying yields

$$\dot{V} \leq -e^T K e, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

which implies the system states remain bounded via [11, Theorem 4.18]. Further, since $\dot{V} \leq 0$, $V(\eta(T)) \leq V(\eta(0))$ and therefore $\|\eta(T)\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1}} \|\eta(0)\|$, where $\beta_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \min\{1, \lambda_{\min}\{\Gamma^{-1}\}\}$ and $\beta_2 \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \max\{1, \lambda_{\max}\{\Gamma^{-1}\}\}$ ■

Theorem 2. For the system defined in (1) and (7), the controller and adaptive update law defined in (5) and (8) ensures globally exponential tracking in the sense that

$$\|\eta(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1} \right) \exp(\lambda_1 T) \|\eta(0)\| \exp(-\lambda_1 t), \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty). \quad (13)$$

Proof: Let $V : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a candidate Lyapunov function defined as

$$V(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}e^T e + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta}.$$

Taking the derivative of V along the trajectories of (1) during $t \in [T, \infty)$, substituting the closed loop error dynamics in (6) and the equivalent adaptive update law in (12), and simplifying yields

$$\dot{V} = -e^T K e - k_{CL}\tilde{\theta}^T \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i^T \mathcal{Y}_i \tilde{\theta}, \quad \forall t \in [T, \infty).$$

From Assumption 1, $\lambda_{\min} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i^T \mathcal{Y}_i \right\} > 0, \forall t \in [T, \infty)$,

which implies that $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i^T \mathcal{Y}_i$ is positive definite and therefore \dot{V} is upper bounded by a negative definite function of η . Invoking [11, Theorem 4.10], e and $\tilde{\theta}$ are globally exponentially stable, i.e., $\forall t \in [T, \infty)$,

$$\|\eta(t)\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1}} \|\eta(T)\| \exp(-\lambda_1(t-T))$$

where $\lambda_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{\beta_2} \min \{ \lambda_{\min} \{K\}, k_{CL}\lambda \}$. The composite state vector can be further upper bounded using the results of Theorem 1, yielding (13). ■

IV. SIMULATION

A Monte Carlo simulation was performed to demonstrate the application of the theoretical results presented in Section III and to illustrate the increased robustness to noise compared to the traditional state derivative based CL methods. The following example system was used in the simulations:

$$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^2 & \sin(x_2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \sin(t) & x_1 & x_1 x_2 \end{bmatrix} \theta + u(t)$$

where $x : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, the unknown parameters were selected as

$$\theta = [5 \quad 10 \quad 15 \quad 20]^T,$$

and the desired trajectory was selected as

$$x_d(t) = 10(1 - e^{-0.1t}) \begin{bmatrix} \sin(2t) \\ 0.4 \cos(3t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

For each of the 200 trials within the Monte Carlo simulation, the feedback and adaptation gains were selected as $K = K_s I_2$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_s I_4$, where $K_s \in \mathbb{R}$ was sampled from a uniform distribution on $(0.1, 15)$ and $\Gamma_s \in \mathbb{R}$ was sampled from a uniform distribution on $(0.3, 3)$. Also, the concurrent learning gain, k_{CL} , and the integration window, Δt , were sampled from uniform distributions with support on $(0.002, 0.2)$ and $(0.01, 1)$, respectively. After gain sampling, a simulation using each, the traditional state derivative based, and the integral based, CL update law was performed, with a step size of 0.0004 seconds and additive white Gaussian noise on the measured state with standard deviation of 0.3. For each integral CL simulation, a buffer, with size based on Δt and the step size, was used to store the values of x , Y , and u during the time interval $[t - \Delta t, t]$ and to calculate $x(t)$, $x(t - \Delta t)$, $\mathcal{Y}(t)$ and $\mathcal{U}(t)$. Similarly, for the state derivative CL simulation, a buffer of the same size was used as the input to a moving average filter before calculating the state derivative via central finite difference. The size of the history stack and the simulation time span were kept constant across all trials at $N = 20$ and 100 seconds, respectively.

Since the moving average filter window used in the state derivative CL simulations provides an extra degree of freedom, the optimal filter window size was determined *a priori* for a fair comparison. The optimal filtering window was calculated




Fig. 1. Mean state trajectory tracking errors across all trials.

TABLE I
AVERAGE STEADY STATE RMS TRACKING AND RMS PARAMETER ESTIMATION ERRORS ACROSS ALL SIMULATIONS.

	e_1	e_2	θ_1	θ_2	θ_3	θ_4
Integral	0.1078	0.2117	.0507	0.3100	0.1867	0.1121
Derivative	0.2497	0.6717	0.1802	1.3376	0.3753	0.2382

by adding Gaussian noise, with the same standard deviation as in the simulation, to the desired trajectory, and minimizing the root mean square error between the estimated and true \dot{x}_d . This process yielded an optimal filtering window of 0.5 seconds; however, the filtering window was truncated to Δt on trials where the sampled Δt was less than 0.5 seconds, i.e., $filter\ window = \min \{0.5, \Delta t\}$.

The mean tracking error trajectory and parameter estimation error trajectory across all trials are depicted in Figs. 1 and 2. To compare the overall performance of both methods, the RMS tracking error and the RMS parameter estimation error during the time interval $t \in [60, 100]$ (i.e., after reaching steady state) were calculated for each trial, and then the average RMS errors across all trials was determined. The final results of the Monte Carlo simulation are shown in Table I, illustrating the improved performance of integral CL versus state derivative CL.

V. CONCLUSION

A modified concurrent learning adaptive update law was developed, resulting in guarantees on the convergence of the parameter estimation errors without requiring persistent excitation or the estimation of state derivatives. The development in this paper represents a significant improvement in online system identification. Whereas PE is required in the majority of adaptive methods for parameter estimation convergence (usually ensured through the use of a probing signal that




Fig. 2. Mean parameter estimation errors across all trials.

is not considered in the Lyapunov analysis), the technique described in this paper does not require PE. Furthermore, the formulation of concurrent learning in this paper circumvents the need to estimate the unmeasurable state derivatives, therefore avoiding the design and tuning of a state derivative estimator. This formulation is more robust to noise, i.e., has better tracking and estimation performance, compared to other concurrent learning designs, as demonstrated by the included Monte Carlo simulation.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust Adaptive Control*. Prentice Hall, 1996.
- [2] K. Narendra and A. Annaswamy, *Stable Adaptive Systems*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1989.
- [3] S. Sastry and M. Bodson, *Adaptive Control: Stability, Convergence, and Robustness*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [4] M. A. Duarte and K. Narendra, "Combined direct and indirect approach to adaptive control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1071–1075, Oct 1989.
- [5] M. Krstić, P. V. Kokotović, and I. Kanellakopoulos, "Transient-performance improvement with a new class of adaptive controllers," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 451 – 461, 1993.
- [6] G. V. Chowdhary and E. N. Johnson, "Theory and flight-test validation of a concurrent-learning adaptive controller," *J. Guid. Control Dynam.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 592–607, Mar. 2011.
- [7] G. Chowdhary, "Concurrent learning adaptive control for convergence without persistency of excitation," Ph.D. dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology, Dec. 2010.
- [8] G. Chowdhary, T. Yucelen, M. Mühlegg, and E. N. Johnson, "Concurrent learning adaptive control of linear systems with exponentially convergent bounds," *Int. J. Adapt. Control Signal Process.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 280–301, 2013.
- [9] M. Mühlegg, G. Chowdhary, and E. Johnson, "Concurrent learning adaptive control of linear systems with noisy measurements," in *Proc. AIAA Guid. Navig. Control Conf.*, 2012.
- [10] R. Kamalapurkar, B. Reish, G. Chowdhary, and W. E. Dixon, "Concurrent learning for parameter estimation using dynamic state-derivative estimators," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, submitted (see also arXiv:1507.08903).
- [11] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.