

Control Synthesis for an Underactuated Cable Suspended System Using Dynamic Decoupling

Siddharth H. Nair¹, Ravi N. Banavar² and D.H.S Maithripala³

Abstract—This article studies the dynamics and control of a novel underactuated system, wherein a plate suspended by cables and with a freely moving mass on top, whose other ends are attached to three quadrotors, is sought to be horizontally stabilized at a certain height, with the ball positioned at the center of mass of the plate. The freely moving mass introduces a 2-degree of underactuation into the system. The design proceeds through a decoupling of the quadrotors and the plate dynamics. Through a partial feedback linearization approach, the attitude of the plate and the translational height of the plate is initially controlled, while maintaining a bounded velocity along the y and x directions. These inputs are then synthesized through the quadrotors with a backstepping and timescale separation argument based on Tikhonov's theorem.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quadrotor drones are increasingly gaining popularity in non-military security applications like surveillance, communication relays and civil applications like environmental monitoring, traffic control, disaster relief and construction [1]. Trajectory tracking controllers for quadrotors have been successfully studied in [2], [3], [4], [5] while control of quadrotor formations has been studied in [6], [7], [8]. Recent endeavours involve synthesizing control laws wherein quadrotors are required to transport loads from one point to another. In [9], a system consisting of a quadrotor and a flexible cable treated as serially-connected links is modelled in a coordinate-free form where the equations of motion are obtained using infinitesimal variations of elements belonging to a Lie group. First the desired forces on the links are derived so that the payload tracks a desired trajectory and next the thrust and moments acting on the quadrotor are derived so that these forces are in turn, generated by the quadrotor. In [10], multiple quadrotors carrying a point payload via rigid, massless links is considered while in [11], the suspended payload is a rigid body. The design philosophy is similar to that used in [9]- where they first design the desired forces in the links and then use the quadrotors to generate them. This work is extended in [12] to incorporate flexible cables. The development of such systems can find applications in real life situations like transportation and search and rescue

operations.

Much of the previous effort in the field of cable suspended systems focusses on fully actuated systems. Here, we introduce an element of underactuation into the system in the form of a freely moving ball on a plate, thereby increasing the control complexity of the problem. Designing control strategies to accommodate for underactuated payloads facilitates design of simpler mechanisms for transporting payload of various geometries. For example, a simple, flat platform would require a payload to comply with fewer geometric constraints than say, a sophisticated mechanical gripper. Secondly, the underactuated nature of the payload system adds inherent consideration for transporting delicate payloads (a fluid container, for instance). The work [13] considers 1-D version of the problem of balancing a ball on a rod connected to two quadrotors via rigid links. The quadrotors are restricted to move only vertically and the stabilization of the ball is achieved by employing a model predictive controller for the linearized model of the system. In this article, we consider the full 3-D problem. The control approach we adopt can be summarized as follows: First, the quadrotors are decoupled from the ball-and-plate system and then the desired forces in the tethers are synthesized such that the control objectives are met. The forces in the tethers create both the force and the torque to position and orient the plate. These forces are then generated by the respective quadrotors using a backstepping-like strategy seen in [11]. The response of the quadrotors are assumed significantly faster than the ball-and-plate dynamics. The underactuated subsystem leads us to employ partial feedback linearization into our control design.

The remaining article is organized as follows. Section II formally sets up the problem by describing the system of interest, fixing up naming conventions and deriving a coordinate-form of the equations of motion using Lagrangian mechanics. In section III, the control systems are constructed followed by numerical validation via simulations in section IV

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider three quadrotors with masses m_1 , m_2 and m_3 and inertias J_1 , J_2 and J_3 respectively, carrying a thin plate of mass m_p and inertia J_p via three inextensible cables of lengths l_1 , l_2 and l_3 respectively. The plate also carries a ball of mass m_b . The inertial coordinate system is set up as shown in figure 2.

¹Siddharth H. Nair is with the Department of Aerospace Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400076, India siddharth.nair@iitb.ac.in

²Ravi N. Banavar is with the Faculty of Systems and Control Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400076, India banavar@iitb.ac.in

³D.H.S Maithripala is with the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, University of Peradeniya, KY 20400, Sri Lanka smaithri@pdn.ac.lk




Fig. 1: The figure depicts a ball on a plate system slung by three quadrotors.

The location of the centre of mass of the plate in the inertial frame is denoted by $o_p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and its attitude is denoted by $R_p \in SO(3)$. Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be the vector from the centre of mass of plate to the point where the i -th cable is attached to the plate. These vectors are constant and lie in the coordinate system attached to the plate at its centre of mass. The vector $r_b \in \mathbb{R}^2$ represents the position of the ball on the plate. To represent r_b as a 3 dimensional vector, we define the matrix $E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, which when multiplied by r_b yields the ball's position in the plate's reference frame. In the inertial frame, the position of the ball is given by $o_b = o_p + R_p E r_b$.

Since the tethers are inextensible, the locus of the positions of the i -th quadrotor is a sphere of radius l_i and centered at x_i in the plate's coordinate system. Thus, its position in the inertial coordinate system is given by $o_i = o_p + R_p x_i + l_i q_i$ where $q_i \in S^2$ is a unit vector aligned along the i -th cable. Assuming that the tethers aren't hinged to the quadrotors rigidly, the attitude of the i -th quadrotor is denoted by $R_i \in SO(3)$. To consolidate, the states of the system as a whole evolve over the configuration manifold \mathbf{Q} given by

$$\mathbf{Q} = \underbrace{SO(3) \times \mathbb{R}^3}_{\text{Plate}} \times \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^2}_{\text{Ball}} \times \underbrace{(S^2 \times SO(3))^3}_{\text{Quadrotors}}$$

The coordinates $\left(\underbrace{(o_p, R_p)}_{\text{Plate}}, \underbrace{r_b}_{\text{ball}}, \underbrace{((q_1, R_1), (q_2, R_2), (q_3, R_3))}_{\text{Quadrotors}} \right)$ describe the state of the system.

As the name suggests, each quadrotor is propelled using 4 motors which generate a net thrust along the yaw axis and a moment. Let the thrust force and moment generated by the i -th quadrotor in its coordinate system be given by $f_i e_3$ and M_i respectively where f_i is the magnitude of the thrust and e_3 is the unit vector aligned along the quadrotor's yaw axis. Thus $\{f_i, M_i\}_{i=1,2,3}$ are the control inputs to the system.

The objective is to design $\{f_i, M_i\}_{i=1,2,3}$ for the quadrotor so as to stabilize the attitude at $R_p = I$ and the height of the centre of mass of the plate while simultaneously stabilizing the ball at the plate's centre of mass.

A. Equations of Motion

The rotational kinematics of the i th link, quadrotor and plate, respectively, are given by

$$\dot{q}_i = \omega_i \times q_i = \hat{\omega}_i q_i \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{R}_i = R_i \hat{\Omega}_i \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{R}_p = R_p \hat{\Omega}_p \quad (3)$$

where ω_i is the angular velocity of the tether expressed in the inertial frame. The tether is assumed to be taut and further, there is no component of its angular velocity along the tether axis. We express this as $\omega_i \cdot q_i = 0$. Ω_p and Ω_i are the angular velocities of the plate and i -th quadrotor respectively in their respective coordinate systems, and the operator $\hat{\cdot}$ is the map from \mathbb{R}^3 to the space of skew-symmetric matrices as defined by

$$\hat{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -x_3 & x_2 \\ x_3 & 0 & -x_1 \\ -x_2 & x_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

for $x = [x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

The equations of motion are derived using a variational approach. The kinetic energy and potential energy of the system are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} m_p \|\dot{o}_p\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \Omega_p^T J_p \Omega_p}_{\text{Plate}} \\ &+ \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} m_i \|\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p x_i + l_i \hat{\omega}_i q_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \Omega_i^T J_i \Omega_i}_{\text{Quadrotors}} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} m_b \|\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E r_b + R_p E \dot{r}_b\|^2}_{\text{Ball}} \\ \mathcal{U} &= \underbrace{m_p g e_3^T o_p}_{\text{Plate}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^3 m_i g e_3^T (o_p + R_p x_i + l_i q_i)}_{\text{Quadrotors}} \\ &+ \underbrace{m_b g e_3^T (o_p + R_p E r_b)}_{\text{Ball}} \end{aligned}$$

The Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the system is obtained as the difference between the kinetic and potential energies, i.e., $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{T} - \mathcal{U}$. The action integral is given by $\mathcal{A} = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \mathcal{L} dt$. Further, we define the differential operator $\mathbf{D}_u(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T_x^* \mathbf{Q}$ as the partial derivative of the operatee at $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ with respect to the subscripted configuration variable u to yield a vector in the cotangent space $T_x^* \mathbf{Q}$. The variation of the action integral is expressed by the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{A} &= \delta \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \mathcal{L} dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \delta \mathcal{L} dt \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t_f} (\mathbf{D}_{\dot{o}_p} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta \dot{o}_p + \mathbf{D}_{o_p} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta o_p + \mathbf{D}_{r_b} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta r_b \\ &+ \mathbf{D}_{\dot{r}_b} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta \dot{r}_b + \mathbf{D}_{\Omega_p} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta \Omega_p + \mathbf{D}_{R_p} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta R_p \\ &+ \mathbf{D}_{\dot{q}_i} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta \dot{q}_i + \mathbf{D}_{q_i} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta q_i \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbf{D}_{\Omega_i} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta \Omega_i + \mathbf{D}_{R_i} \mathcal{L} \cdot \delta R_i) dt \end{aligned}$$

To derive coordinate-free equations of motion, we use the exponential map to express infinitesimal variations of elements belonging to a Lie group as follows

$$\delta g = \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \exp(\varepsilon\chi)g$$

where g is an element of a Lie group G , χ is an element of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G and $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ is the exponential map([14]).

The rotation matrices belong to the Lie group $SO(3)$ with its Lie algebra being the space of skew-symmetric matrices. The variation of a rotation matrix R can thus be expressed as

$$\delta R = R\hat{\eta}$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is mapped to the Lie algebra element via the $\hat{\cdot}$ map. The variation of a unit vector $q \in S^2$ can be obtained by using the fact that any two unit vectors are uniquely related by a rotation matrix as follows

$$\begin{aligned} q^\varepsilon &= \exp(\varepsilon\hat{\xi})q \\ \Rightarrow \delta q &= \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} q^\varepsilon = \hat{\xi}q = \xi \times q \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is mapped to the Lie algebra element (of $SO(3)$) via the $\hat{\cdot}$ map again.

Using the rotational kinematic equations and the fact that the time derivative and variational operators commute, the variations of \dot{q} and Ω are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \dot{q} &= \hat{\xi} \times q + \xi \times \dot{q} \\ \delta \Omega &= \dot{\eta} + \Omega \times \eta \end{aligned}$$

Let $u_i = f_i R_i e_3$ denote the thrust acting on the i th quadrotor expressed in the spatial frame. Henceforth, we shall refer to our control inputs in terms of u_i s and M_i s. The virtual work done by the external forces (the forces and torques acting on each quadrotor) is given by

$$\delta \mathcal{W} = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \sum_{i=1}^3 (u_i \cdot (\delta o_p + \delta R_p x_i + l_i \delta q_i) + M_i \cdot \eta_i) dt$$

For variations of trajectories with fixed end points, the Lagrange- D'Alembert principle gives us

$$\delta \mathcal{A} = -\delta \mathcal{W} \quad (4)$$

Substituting the expressions of the variations in (4), using integration by parts and the fact that the variations are arbitrary, the following Euler-Lagrange equations are obtained

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{o}_p} \mathcal{L} - \mathbf{D}_{o_p} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i \quad \{\text{Plate translation}\}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{r}_b} \mathcal{L} - \mathbf{D}_{r_b} \mathcal{L} = 0 \quad \{\text{Ball dynamics}\}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{\Omega}_p} \mathcal{L} + \Omega_p \times \mathbf{D}_{\Omega_p} \mathcal{L} - \mathbf{D}_{R_p} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{x}_i R_p^T u_i \quad \{\text{Plate orientation}\}$$

$$\hat{q}_i \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{q}_i} \mathcal{L} - \hat{q}_i \mathbf{D}_{q_i} \mathcal{L} = l_i \hat{q}_i u_i \quad \{\text{ith Tether dynamics}\}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{\Omega}_i} \mathcal{L} + \Omega_i \times \mathbf{D}_{\Omega_i} \mathcal{L} - \mathbf{D}_{R_i} \mathcal{L} = M_i \quad \{\text{ith Quadrotor dynamics}\}$$

The partial derivatives involved in the above computations are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{o}_p} \mathcal{L} &= m_p \dot{o}_p + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i (\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p x_i + l_i \hat{\omega}_i q_i) \\ &\quad + m_b (\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E r_b + R_p E \dot{r}_b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{o_p} \mathcal{L} = -m_p g e_3 - \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i g e_3 - m_b g e_3$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{\dot{r}_b} \mathcal{L} = m_b E^T R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E r_b + R_p E \dot{r}_b)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{r_b} \mathcal{L} = -m_b E^T \hat{\Omega}_p R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E r_b + R_p E \dot{r}_b) - m_b g E^T R_p^T e_3$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{\dot{\Omega}_p} \mathcal{L} &= (J_p - m_b [\widehat{E r_b}]^2 - \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i^2) \Omega_p + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + l_i \hat{q}_i) \\ &\quad + m_p [\widehat{E r_b}] R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + R_p E \dot{r}_b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{R_p} \mathcal{L} &= \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i ([\widehat{\hat{\Omega}_p x_i}] R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + l_i \hat{q}_i) - g \hat{x}_i R_p^T e_3) \\ &\quad + m_b ([\widehat{\hat{\Omega}_p E r_b}] R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + R_p E \dot{r}_b) - g [\widehat{E r_b}] R_p^T e_3) \\ &\quad + m_b [\widehat{E \dot{r}_b}] R_p^T (\dot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E r_b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{\dot{q}_i} \mathcal{L} = m_i (l_i \dot{o}_p + l_i^2 \dot{q}_i + l_i R_p \hat{\Omega}_p x_i)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{q_i} \mathcal{L} = -m_i g l_i e_3$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{\Omega_i} \mathcal{L} = J_i \Omega_i$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{R_i} \mathcal{L} = 0$$

On substituting the above derivatives into the Euler-Lagrange equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (m_p + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i + m_b) \ddot{o}_p + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p - l_i (\hat{q}_i \hat{\omega}_i - \hat{\omega}_i^2 q_i)) \\ + m_b (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - R_p [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + R_p E \ddot{r}_b) \\ + (m_p + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i + m_b) g e_3 = \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$m_b E^T (R_p^T \ddot{o}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + E \ddot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) = 0 \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (J_p - m_b [\widehat{E r_b}]^2 - \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i^2) \hat{\Omega}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p (J_p - m_b [\widehat{E r_b}]^2 - \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i^2) \Omega_p \\ + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i R_p^T (-l_i (\hat{q}_i \hat{\omega}_i - \hat{\omega}_i^2 q_i)) + m_b [\widehat{E r_b}] (R_p^T \ddot{o}_p + 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + E \ddot{r}_b) \\ + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i R_p^T \ddot{o}_p = \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{x}_i R_p^T (u_i - m_i g e_3) - m_b g [\widehat{E r_b}] R_p^T e_3 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$m_i (\hat{q}_i \ddot{o}_p + l_i \hat{\omega}_i + \hat{q}_i R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - \hat{q}_i R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) = \hat{q}_i (u_i - m_i g e_3) \quad (8)$$

$$J_i \dot{\Omega}_i + \hat{\Omega}_i J_i \Omega_i = M_i \quad (9)$$

Note the coupling between the tethers and the plates in the first, third and fourth equation. To eliminate the angular accelerations of the tethers $\hat{\omega}_i$ in the plate dynamics, we replace the expressions for $\hat{\omega}_i$ from equation (8) into (5) and (7), resulting in

$$\begin{aligned}
& (m_p + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i q_i q_i^T) (\ddot{o}_p + g e_3) + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i q_i q_i^T (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) \\
& + m_b (\ddot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - R_p [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + R_p E \ddot{r}_b + g e_3) \\
& - m_i l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 q_i q_i^T u_i \quad \{\text{Plate translation}\} \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
m_b E^T (R_p^T \ddot{o}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + E \ddot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) = 0 \\
\{\text{Ball dynamics}\} \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (J_p - \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i R_p^T q_i q_i^T R_p \hat{x}_i) \hat{\Omega}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p J_p \hat{\Omega}_p \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i \hat{x}_i R_p^T q_i q_i^T (\ddot{o}_p + g e_3 - l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i) \\
& + m_b [\widehat{E r_b}] (R_p^T \ddot{o}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + \\
& E \ddot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{x}_i R_p^T q_i q_i^T (u_i - m_i R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i) \\
& \{\text{Plate orientation}\} \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
m_i (\hat{q}_i \ddot{o}_p + l_i \dot{\omega}_i + \hat{q}_i R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - \hat{q}_i R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) = \hat{q}_i (u_i - m_i g e_3) \\
\{\text{ith Tether dynamics}\} \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

$$J_i \hat{\Omega}_i + \hat{\Omega}_i J_i \hat{\Omega}_i = M_i \quad \{\text{ith Quadrotor dynamics}\} \quad (14)$$

The term $q_i q_i^T(\cdot)$ indicates a projection operator $q_i(q_i, \cdot)$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product on \mathbb{R}^3 . Hence, in the equations above, terms such as

$$\begin{aligned}
& q_i q_i^T (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) \\
& q_i q_i^T u_i \\
& q_i q_i^T R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p \\
& q_i q_i^T (\ddot{o}_p + g e_3 - l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i) \\
& q_i q_i^T (u_i - m_i R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i)
\end{aligned}$$

indicate the projection of a quantity along the direction of the i th tether.

III. CONTROL DESIGN

The first set of inputs $\{f_i, M_i\}$ has been transformed to $\{u_i, M_i\}$. The u_i s were the thrust vectors expressed in the spatial frame. We now introduce another decomposition of the u_i s as, along the tether and perpendicular to the tether. Observe that the inputs controlling the translational dynamics of the plate and rotational dynamics of the plate appear as $q_i q_i^T u_i$ which is essentially the component of force u_i along the i -th tether. For convenience, $q_i q_i^T u_i$ is denoted as u_i^{\parallel} and the orthogonal component u_i^{\perp} is defined such that

$$u_i = u_i^{\parallel} + u_i^{\perp}$$

It can be seen that equations (10) and (12), which describe the rotational and translational dynamics of the plate, are solely affected by the u_i^{\parallel} s whereas equation (13) which describes the dynamics of the tethers is solely affected by the u_i^{\perp} s. Thus, we adopt a procedure similar to that used in [11] where the controls u_i and M_i are designed in two steps—First, the quadrotors are replaced by fully actuated point masses and u_i^{\parallel} s and u_i^{\perp} s are designed independently to meet the

control objectives. Then the M_i s and f_i s are designed for the quadrotors such that the thrust $f_i R_i e_3$ equals $u_i = u_i^{\parallel} + u_i^{\perp}$.

A. Design of Parallel components

Before designing the parallel component of control u_i^{\parallel} , we decouple the ball and plate system from the quadrotors by making the following observation.

We define μ_i to be the tension in the tether and then examine the free body diagram (figure 2) to apply newton's second law for the i th quadrotor along q_i .




Fig. 2: Free body diagram of the i th quadrotor

$$\begin{aligned}
m_i q_i q_i^T \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (o_p + R_p x_i + l_i q_i) &= u_i^{\parallel} - \mu_i - m_i q_i q_i^T g e_3 \\
\Rightarrow m_i q_i q_i^T (\ddot{o}_p + (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) - l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i) &= u_i^{\parallel} - \mu_i - m_i q_i q_i^T g e_3 \\
\Rightarrow \mu_i &= u_i^{\parallel} - q_i q_i^T m_i (\ddot{o}_p + (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) + g e_3 - l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i) \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} (o_p + R_p x_i + l_i q_i) = \ddot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p - l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i$$

is the acceleration of the i th quadrotor, u_i^{\parallel} is the external force being applied parallel to q_i and $-q_i q_i^T m_i g e_3$ is the gravitational force acting along q_i .

Expressing the dynamics of the ball and that of the plate (equations (10), (11) and (12)) in terms of these tensions μ_i s, we obtain the dynamics of the ball and plate system completely decoupled from the quadrotors as

$$\begin{aligned}
m_b E^T (R_p^T \ddot{o}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + E \ddot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) = 0 \\
\quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

$$m_p (\ddot{o}_p + g e_3) +$$

$$\begin{aligned}
m_b (\ddot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - R_p [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p + 2 R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + R_p E \ddot{r}_b + g e_3) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i \\
\quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
J_p \hat{\Omega}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p J_p \hat{\Omega}_p + m_b [\widehat{E r_b}] (R_p^T \ddot{o}_p + \hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b - [\widehat{E r_b}] \hat{\Omega}_p \\
+ 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + E \ddot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{x}_i R_p^T \mu_i \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

We proceed to design μ_i s to stabilize the attitude and position of the plate and simultaneously stabilize the ball at the centre of the plate. Once suitable μ_i s have been chosen, the controls u_i^{\parallel} can be implemented by substituting for the

accelerations from (16), (17) and (18) into (15).

Partial Feedback Linearization

The ball and plate system is described by the configuration manifold $Q_{ball-plate} = \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^2}_{Ball} \times \underbrace{\mathbb{R}^3 \times SO(3)}_{Plate}$. This system

is acted upon by a force $F = \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i$ and a torque $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{x}_i R_p^T \mu_i$. Thus the ball and plate system is underactuated by $2 + 3 + 3 - 6 = 2$ degrees of freedom. We attempt to simplify the procedure to design the μ_i s by employing the technique of Partial Feedback Linearization (PFL) to linearize the translational and rotational dynamics of the plate. PFL is a standard technique for addressing underactuated systems wherein a partially linearizing feedback is implemented to simplify the system dynamics before control design for meeting the desired specifications is considered (15).

- **Step 1:** Recasting the translational and attitude dynamics of the plate, and the ball dynamics, to employ partial feedback linearization. We proceed to rewrite the system dynamics by identifying invertible blocks in the Riemannian metric M_{bp} of the ball and plate system as

$$M_{bp} = \begin{bmatrix} m_b \mathbb{I}_2 & m_b E^T R_p^T & -m_b E^T [\widehat{Er_b}] \\ m_b R_p E & (m_p + m_b) \mathbb{I}_3 & -m_b R_p [\widehat{Er_b}] \\ m_b [\widehat{Er_b}] E & m_b [\widehat{Er_b}] R_p^T & J_p - m_b [\widehat{Er_b}]^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Defining

$$\begin{aligned} M_{11} &= m_b \mathbb{I}_2 \\ M_{12} &= [m_b E^T R_p^T \quad -m_b E^T [\widehat{Er_b}]] \\ M_{22} &= \begin{bmatrix} (m_p + m_b) \mathbb{I}_3 & -m_b R_p [\widehat{Er_b}] \\ m_b [\widehat{Er_b}] R_p^T & J_p - m_b [\widehat{Er_b}]^2 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

we rewrite equations (16), (17) and (18) as

$$M_{11} \ddot{r}_b + M_{12} [\ddot{o}_p^T \quad \dot{\Omega}_p^T]^T + N_1 = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$M_{12}^T \ddot{r}_b + M_{22} [\ddot{o}_p^T \quad \dot{\Omega}_p^T]^T + N_2 = [F^T \quad \tau^T]^T \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= m_b E^T (\hat{\Omega}_p^2 Er_b + 2\hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) \\ N_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} m_p g e_3 + m_b R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 Er_b + 2R_p \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + m_b g e_3 \\ \hat{\Omega}_p J_p \Omega_p + m_b [\widehat{Er_b}] (\hat{\Omega}_p^2 Er_b + 2\hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

- **Step 2:** Expressing the r_b dynamics in terms of the o_p and Ω_p dynamics, and then cancelling the nonlinearities in the o_p and Ω_p equations by defining new inputs U_1 and U_2 : Noting that M_{11} is invertible, \ddot{r}_b is substituted from (19) into (20) and the linearizing feedback given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} F \\ \tau \end{bmatrix} = N_2 - M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} N_1 + (M_{22} - M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} M_{12}) \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where U_1 and U_2 are the new inputs to the system, is substituted into (19) and (20) to obtain the partially linearized equations

$$\ddot{r}_b = -M_{11}^{-1} N_1 - M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} [U_1 \quad U_2]^T$$

$$\ddot{o}_p = U_1$$

$$\dot{\Omega}_p = U_2$$

- **Step 3:** Now our objective is to stabilize the rotational dynamics of the plate, and then the position of the ball on the plate, and lastly, the translational dynamics of the plate. The inputs U_1 and U_2 are coupled into the dynamics of the ball via the matrix $M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} = [E^T R_p^T - E^T \widehat{Er_b}]$. $E^T R_p^T$ has a constant rank of 2, $R_p e_3$ spans its null space and $E^T R_p^T R_p E = \mathbb{I}_2$. Using these facts, U_1 is chosen as

$$U_1 = R_p e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p) + \frac{1}{m_b} R_p E (-N_1 + M_{11} (k_4 r_b + k_3 \dot{r}_b)) \quad (21)$$

To stabilize the attitude of the plate, U_2 is chosen as

$$U_2 = -k_2 \eta - k_1 \Omega_p \quad (22)$$

where η is the gradient of $\Psi(R) = \frac{1}{2} \text{trace}(I_{3 \times 3} - R_p)$ (see [2] for details on exponential attitude stabilization). The closed loop dynamics are described by the following equations

$$\ddot{r}_b = -k_4 r_b - k_3 \dot{r}_b + E^T \widehat{Er_b} U_2 \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{o}_p &= R_p e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m_b} R_p E (-N_1 + M_{11} (k_4 r_b + k_3 \dot{r}_b)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\dot{\Omega}_p = -k_2 \eta - k_1 \Omega_p \quad (25)$$

Examine the first and the third equation. Choosing appropriate gains k_2 and k_1 ensures that the attitude gets stabilized exponentially fast, which in turn ensures that U_2 approaches 0 exponentially fast. This leads to the last term in equation (23) going to zero. An appropriate choice of k_4 and k_3 ensures that r_b asymptotically goes to zero. When both r_b and the attitude have been stabilized, the dynamics of the z coordinate of the CoM of the plate are given by

$$e_3^T \ddot{o}_p = e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p)$$

which, for appropriate choices of k_5 and k_6 , stabilizes the z coordinate of the CoM of the plate as well.

Theorem 1: Consider the closed loop system described by equations (23), (24) and (25). Then there exist positive scalars $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5, k_6$ such that the state $(r_b, \dot{r}_b, e_3^T o_p, e_3^T \dot{o}_p, R_p, \Omega_p) = ([0 \ 0]^T, [0 \ 0]^T, 0, 0, \mathbb{I}_3, [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T)$ is asymptotically stable.

Proof: To prove the stability of the state $(r_b, \dot{r}_b, e_3^T o_p, e_3^T \dot{o}_p, R_p, \Omega_p) = ([0 \ 0]^T, [0 \ 0]^T, 0, 0, \mathbb{I}_3, [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T)$ of the system described by equations (23), (24) and (25),

consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$V = \frac{k_4 + c_1 k_3}{2} \|r_b\|^2 + c_1 r_b^T \dot{r}_b + \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{r}_b\|^2 + (k_2 + c_2 k_1) \Psi + c_2 \eta^T \Omega_p + \frac{1}{2} \|\Omega_p\|^2 + \frac{k_6}{2} \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2$$

which is positive definite for small values of c_1 and c_2 . The time derivative of the candidate function along the system trajectories is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= k_4 r_b^T \dot{r}_b + \dot{r}_b^T \dot{r}_b + c_1 \|\dot{r}_b\|^2 + c_1 r_b^T \ddot{r}_b + k_2 \eta^T \Omega_p + \Omega_p^T \dot{\Omega}_p + \\ & c_2 \dot{\eta}^T \Omega_p + c_2 \eta^T \dot{\Omega}_p + k_6 (\dot{o}_p^T e_3) (\dot{o}_p^T e_3) + (\dot{o}_p^T e_3) (\dot{o}_p^T e_3) \\ & \leq -(k_1 - c_2) \|\Omega_p\|^2 - (k_3 - c_2) \|\dot{r}_b\|^2 - c_1 k_4 \|r_b\|^2 - c_2 k_2 \|\eta\|^2 - \\ & k_5 \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2 + \dot{r}_b^T E^T [\widehat{E} r_b] (-k_2 \eta_E - k_1 \Omega_p) + \\ & \dot{o}_p^T e_3 e_3^T ((R_p - I) e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p) + \\ & \frac{1}{m_b} R_p E (-N_1 + M_{11} (k_4 r_b + k_3 \dot{r}_b))) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The cubic terms in the derivative can be bounded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r}_b^T E^T [\widehat{E} r_b] (-k_2 \eta_E - k_1 \Omega_p) &\leq \|\dot{r}_b\| \|r_b\| (\|k_2\| \|\eta\| + k_1 \|\Omega_p\|) \\ \dot{o}_p^T e_3 e_3^T (R_p - I) e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p) &\leq 2 \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| (k_5 \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| + k_6 \|o_p^T e_3\|) \\ \dot{o}_p^T e_3 e_3^T \frac{1}{m_b} R_p E (-N_1 + M_{11} (k_4 r_b + k_3 \dot{r}_b)) &\leq \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| (\|\Omega_p\|^2 \|r_b\| + \\ & 2 \|\Omega_p\| \|\dot{r}_b\| + k_4 \|r_b\| + k_3 \|\dot{r}_b\|) + g \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| (-1 + \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above bounds into (26), the derivative of the candidate function is bounded above by

$$\dot{V} \leq z^T \mathcal{W} z + \mathcal{O} \quad (27)$$

where

$$z = [\|r_b\| \|\dot{r}_b\| \|\eta\| \|\Omega_p\| \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^T]^T$$

$$\mathcal{W} = \begin{bmatrix} -c_1 k_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{k_4}{2} \\ 0 & -k_3 + c_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{k_3}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & -c_2 k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_1 + c_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2k_6 & k_5 \\ \frac{k_4}{2} & \frac{k_3}{2} & 0 & 0 & k_5 & -k_5 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{O} = \|\dot{r}_b\| \|r_b\| (k_2 \|\eta\| + k_1 \|\Omega_p\|) + \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| (\|\Omega_p\|^2 \|r_b\| + 2 \|\Omega_p\| \|\dot{r}_b\| + g (-1 + \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2))$$

To bound the cubic and quartic terms in \mathcal{O} , we obtain bounds on η and Ω_p as follows.

Consider the differentiable function

$$V_2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\Omega_p\|^2 + c_0 \eta^T \Omega_p + (k_2 + c_0 k_1) \Psi$$

defined on the state space describing the plate's attitude, (R_p, Ω_p) . This function can be shown to be positive definite on this state space if c_0 is small. The time derivative of the function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &= -k_1 \|\Omega_p\|^2 - c_0 k_2 \|\eta\|^2 + c_0 \dot{\eta}^T \Omega_p \\ &\leq (-k_1 + c_0) \|\Omega_p\|^2 - c_0 k_2 \|\eta\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from that fact that $\|\dot{\eta}\| \leq \|\Omega_p\|$. For $k_1 > c_0$, the time derivative of V_2 is bounded above by a negative definite quantity on the state space (R_p, Ω_p) and is thus, negative definite on this space

as well. This implies that V_2 decays to zero exponentially and is bounded above by its initial value $V_2(0)$. Since V_2 is positive definite on the considered space, we have that

$$\|\Omega_p\| \leq C_1 (V_2(0)) \quad \|\eta\| \leq C_2 (V_2(0))$$

where C_1 and C_2 are some constants in terms of $V_2(0)$. These bounds can be used to express the cubic and quartic terms as quadratic terms to bound the derivative of V in (27) as

$$\dot{V} \leq z^T \mathcal{W}' z + \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| g (-1 + \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2) \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}' = \begin{bmatrix} -c_1 k_4 & \frac{k_2 C_2 + k_1 C_1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{k_4}{2} + \frac{C_1^2}{2} \\ \frac{k_2 C_2 + k_1 C_1}{2} & -k_3 + c_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{k_3}{2} + \frac{C_2^2}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & -c_2 k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_1 + c_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2k_6 & k_5 \\ \frac{k_4}{2} + \frac{C_1^2}{2} & \frac{k_3}{2} + \frac{C_2^2}{2} & 0 & 0 & k_5 & -k_5 \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that the constants C_1 and C_2 appear in the matrix \mathcal{W}' . The right hand side of inequality (28) can be shown to be negative definite when c_1, c_2 are small, $k_3 > c_1, k_1 > c_2, k_1, k_2$ are large and $\|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| > \frac{g(-1 + \|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\|^2)}{k_5}$. Note that since V_2 decays to 0 exponentially, we have η decaying to zero exponentially as well. This implies that R_p approaches identity and the condition on $\dot{o}_p^T e_3$ becomes $\|\dot{o}_p^T e_3\| > 0$. Thus, under these conditions we have

$$\dot{V} < 0$$

and the desired state is asymptotically stable using Lyapunov's direct stability theorem ([16]).

□.

The internal dynamics

To investigate the behaviour of the unstabilized states (the internal dynamics), we analyze the translational dynamics of the plate in the x-y plane

$$\ddot{o}_{p1} = e_1^T \ddot{o}_p = e_1^T U_1 \quad (29)$$

$$\ddot{o}_{p2} = e_2^T \ddot{o}_p = e_2^T U_1 \quad (30)$$

When the ball position r_b , the attitude R_p and the z-coordinate (o_{p3}) of the plate get stabilized, we have $U_1 \rightarrow 0$ and thus $\ddot{o}_{p1} \rightarrow 0$ and $\ddot{o}_{p2} \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 1: We seek to establish a result converse to that stated by Barbalat's lemma, i.e., given $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \ddot{o}_{pi} = 0$, we seek to prove $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{o}_{pi} = c_i$ for some constants $c_i, i = 1, 2$.

Claim 1: The translational velocities of the plate in the x and y direction satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{o}_{p1}(t) = c_1 \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{o}_{p2}(t) = c_2$$

where c_1 and c_2 are finite constants.

To prove the above claim, we employ a result from input-to-state stability, which is now reproduced from [17].

Theorem 2: [17] Internally stable linear systems $\dot{x} = Ax + Bu$ are *Input to State Stable (ISS)* and the state satisfies the following ISS estimate

$$|x(t)| \leq \|e^{tA}\| |x(0)| + \|B\| \int_0^t \|e^{sA}\| \|ds\| \|u\|_\infty$$

Proof of claim 1: Since the velocities and accelerations are continuous, we prove this by establishing integrability of the accelerations. It suffices to show that the accelerations are composed of exponentially decaying terms.

From equations (29) and (30), we need to examine how the first and second components of signal

$$U_1 = R_p e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p) + \frac{1}{m_b} R_p E (-N_1 + M_{11} (k_4 r_b + k_3 \dot{r}_b))$$

behaves. We have already shown that the attitude of the plate stabilizes ($R_p \rightarrow I$, $\Omega_p \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$) exponentially. This implies that $e_1^T R_p e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p)$ and $e_2^T R_p e_3 e_3^T (-k_5 \dot{o}_p - k_6 o_p)$, i.e., the first and second components of the first term of U_1 decay exponentially fast. To show the exponential decay of the second term, we observe the dynamics of r_b .

$$\dot{r}_b = -k_4 r_b - k_3 \dot{r}_b + E^T [\widehat{E r_b}] U_2$$

Note that we have $U_2 = [\beta_1 \ \beta_2 \ \beta_3]^T e^{-\gamma t}$ for some $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma > 0$ due to the exponentially decaying attitude dynamics. Then the above dynamics can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r}_{b1} + k_4 r_{b1} + k_3 \dot{r}_{b1} &= \beta_3 e^{-\gamma t} r_{b2} \\ \dot{r}_{b2} + k_4 r_{b2} + k_3 \dot{r}_{b2} &= -\beta_3 e^{-\gamma t} r_{b1} \end{aligned}$$

In state space, the above equations are given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -k_4 & -k_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -k_4 & -k_3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} + \beta_3 e^{-\gamma t} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbf{X} = [r_{b1} \ \dot{r}_{b1} \ r_{b2} \ \dot{r}_{b2}]^T$.

Note that

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -k_4 & -k_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -k_4 & -k_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

is Hurwitz. Let

$$B = \beta_3 e^{-\gamma t} \quad \text{and} \quad u = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}$$

We have shown that $r_b(t) \rightarrow 0$ asymptotically in the proof of theorem 1. Moreover, $r_b(t)$ is a continuous function of t because the inputs U_1 and U_2 are continuous. Thus r_b is bounded and consequently $u \in L^\infty$ in system (31). We now invoke theorem 2 to conclude that system (31) is ISS and the state $X(t)$ satisfies the following inequality

$$|X(t)| \leq \|e^{tA}\| |X(0)| + |\beta_3| e^{-\gamma t} \left(\int_0^\infty \|e^{sA}\| |ds| \right) \|u\|_\infty \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

Thus we have established that

$$\|k_4 r_b + k_3 \dot{r}_b\| \leq \alpha_r e^{-\gamma t} \quad (32)$$

for some $\alpha_r, \gamma_r > 0$. Now we examine

$$N_1 = m_b E^T (\hat{\Omega}_p^2 E r_b + 2 \hat{\Omega}_p E \dot{r}_b + R_p^T g e_3)$$

Observe that since $R_p \rightarrow I$ exponentially, the last term $E^T R_p^T [0 \ 0 \ g]^T \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ exponentially. The first and second terms of N_1 can also be shown to be bounded above by exponentially decaying terms because of the exponentially stabilized attitude dynamics and inequality (32). To consolidate the above arguments, we have successfully shown that $e_1^T U_1$ and $e_2^T U_1$ are bounded above by exponentially decaying terms and thus the accelerations \ddot{o}_{p1} and \ddot{o}_{p2} are integrable. Furthermore, this helps us establish that the velocities \dot{o}_{p1} and \dot{o}_{p2} converge to a limit as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{o}_{pi}(t) - \dot{o}_{pi}(0) &= \int_0^t \ddot{o}_{pi}(s) ds \\ \Rightarrow \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{o}_{pi}(t) &= \dot{o}_{pi}(0) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \ddot{o}_{pi}(s) ds = c_i \end{aligned}$$

Owing to the above result and the continuity of the velocities, we can conclude that $\sup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{o}_{pi}(t)$ $i = 1, 2$ exist and bound the respective velocities from above. \square

Remark 2: Note that the Riemannian metric M_{bp} and potential energy of the ball and plate system, are invariant to flows along the vector fields $\frac{\partial}{\partial o_{p1}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial o_{p2}} \in TQ_{ball-plate}$. These vector fields are in fact infinitesimal symmetries([18])

Remark 3: Traditional approaches to stabilization of underactuated systems after applying PFL involve stabilizing either the actuated subsystem (dynamics of plate) with the unactuated subsystem (dynamics of ball) constituting the internal dynamics or vice-versa. Both of these approaches yield non-minimum phase internal dynamics and present solutions that are not practically as viable as ours.

Procedure to obtain u_i^{\parallel} :

1) The designed U_1 and U_2 are mapped to F and τ (the net force and torque acting on the plate) by the transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} F \\ \tau \end{bmatrix} = N_2 - M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} N_1 + (M_{22} - M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} M_{12}) \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

2) The μ_i s are obtained from F and τ by solving the following set of linear equations

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} I & I & I \\ \hat{x}_1 & \hat{x}_2 & \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix}}_A \begin{bmatrix} R_p^T \mu_1 \\ R_p^T \mu_2 \\ R_p^T \mu_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} R_p^T F \\ \tau \end{bmatrix}$$

3) Matrix A has a full row rank if the vectors x_1 , x_2 and x_3 are coplanar but not collinear. Thus, the minimum norm solution for the μ_i s is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \\ \mu_3 \end{bmatrix} = \text{diag}(R_p, R_p, R_p) A^T (A A^T)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_p^T F \\ \tau \end{bmatrix}$$

4) The u_i^{\parallel} s are obtained from equation (17) (restated here for convenience) by substituting $\ddot{o}_p = U_1$ and $\dot{\Omega}_p = U_2$

$$u_i^{\parallel} - q_i q_i^T m_i (\ddot{o}_p + (R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \dot{x}_i \dot{\Omega}_p) + g e_3 - l_i \|\omega\|_i^2 q_i) = \mu_i$$

B. Design of Perpendicular components

The perpendicular component u_i^\perp is chosen such that the tether is aligned in the direction $q_{id} = \frac{\mu_i}{\|\mu_i\|}$. Equation (13) describes the tether dynamics and is rewritten here for convenience

$$m_i(\hat{q}_i\ddot{o}_p + l_i\dot{\omega}_i + \hat{q}_i R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - \hat{q}_i R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p) = \hat{q}_i(u_i^\perp - m_i g e_3)$$

Grouping the coupled acceleration terms, we define

$$a_i = \ddot{o}_p + R_p \hat{\Omega}_p^2 x_i - R_p \hat{x}_i \hat{\Omega}_p + g e_3$$

and rewrite equation (13) as

$$\frac{1}{l_i} \hat{q}_i a_i + \dot{\omega}_i = \frac{1}{m_i l_i} \hat{q}_i u_i^\perp$$

We refer to [11] to solve the tracking problem by choosing the control

$$u_i^\perp = -m_i \hat{q}_i^T a_i + m_i l_i \hat{q}_i (k_7 e_{q_i} + k_8 e_{\omega_i} + (q_i^T \omega_{id}) \dot{q}_i + \hat{q}_i^T \dot{\omega}_{id}) \quad (33)$$

where $\omega_{id} = \hat{q}_{id} \dot{q}_{id}$, $e_{q_i} = \hat{q}_{id} q_i$ and $e_{\omega_i} = \omega_i + \hat{q}_i \omega_{id}$. Note that the acceleration terms in a_i are substituted in terms of the μ_i s for implementation. The closed loop dynamics is given by

$$\dot{\omega}_i = -k_7 e_{q_i} - k_8 e_{\omega_i} - (q_i^T \omega_{id}) \dot{q}_i - \hat{q}_i^T \dot{\omega}_{id} \quad (34)$$

C. Design of Quadrotor inputs

The total control $f_i R_i e_3 = u_i = u_i^\parallel + u_i^\perp$ is to be generated by the i th quadrotor using the inputs f_i and M_i . Again, this problem has been solved in [11] and we refer to their approach. A backstepping-like controller is used so that M_i orients the yaw axis of the quadrotor along that of u_i , i.e., $R_i e_3$ tracks $\frac{u_i}{\|u_i\|}$. The first two rows of the desired R_i are obtained by considering some smooth $b_{1i}(t) \in S^2$ which is used to form a right handed coordinate system along with $b_{3i} = \frac{u_i}{\|u_i\|}$ by defining the following desired attitude of the quadrotor.

$$R_{id} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-\hat{b}_{3i}^2 b_{1i}}{\|\hat{b}_{3i}^2 b_{1i}\|} & \frac{\hat{b}_{3i} b_{1i}}{\|\hat{b}_{3i} b_{1i}\|} & b_{3i} \end{bmatrix}$$

Tracking errors for the attitude and angular velocity of the i th quadrotor are defined as

$$e_{R_i} = \frac{1}{2} (R_{id}^T R_i - R_i^T R_{id})^\vee, \quad e_{\Omega_i} = \Omega_i - R_i^T R_{id} \Omega_{id} \quad (35)$$

where the map \cdot^\vee is the inverse of the $\hat{\cdot}$ map and the desired angular velocity is obtained from the attitude kinematics as $\Omega_{id} = (R_{id}^T \dot{R}_{id})^\vee$. With this, the thrust and moment of the quadrotor are chosen as

$$f_i = \|u_i\| \quad (36)$$

$$M_i = -\frac{k_R}{\varepsilon^2} e_{R_i} - \frac{k_\Omega}{\varepsilon} e_{\Omega_i} + \Omega_i \times J_i \Omega_i - J_i (\hat{\Omega}_i^T R_i^T R_{id} \Omega_{id} - R_i^T R_{id} \hat{\Omega}_{id}) \quad (37)$$

for some positive constants ε , k_R and k_Ω .

Theorem 3: Consider the full dynamic model given by (10)-(14). For a desired direction of the first body-fixed axes b_{1i} $i = 1, 2, 3$, control inputs (34) and (35), there exists some $\varepsilon^* > 0$, such that for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*$, the

zero equilibrium of the tracking errors of the quadrotors $(e_{R_i}, e_{\Omega_i}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ is exponentially stable and the state $(r_b, \dot{r}_b, e_3^T o_p, e_3^T \dot{o}_p, R_p, \Omega_p) = ([0 \ 0]^T, [0 \ 0]^T, 0, 0, \mathbf{I}_3, [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T)$ is asymptotically stable and the velocities \dot{o}_{p1} and \dot{o}_{p2} remain bounded.

Proof: Let $\bar{e}_{R_i} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} e_{R_i}$. Before deriving the attitude error dynamics of the quadrotors, we make note of the following properties of the $\hat{\cdot}$ map

$$R \hat{x} R^T = \widehat{R x}$$

$$\hat{x} A + A^T \hat{x} = (\{\text{tr}(A)I - A\} x)^\wedge$$

To derive the attitude error dynamics, we differentiate the equations in (33) to obtain the attitude tracking error dynamics as

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \dot{\bar{e}}_{R_i} &= \frac{1}{2} (R_{id}^T R_i (\hat{\Omega}_i - R_i^T R_{id} \hat{\Omega}_{id} R_{id}^T R_i) + (\hat{\Omega}_i - R_i^T R_{id} \hat{\Omega}_{id} R_{id}^T R_i) R_i^T R_{id})^\vee \\ \Rightarrow \varepsilon \dot{\bar{e}}_{R_i} &= \frac{1}{2} (R_{id}^T R_i \hat{e}_{\Omega_i} + \hat{e}_{\Omega_i} R_i^T R_{id})^\vee = \frac{1}{2} (\text{tr}[R_i^T R_{id}] I - R_i^T R_{id}) e_{\Omega_i} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and the dynamics of the tracking error of the angular velocity as

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \dot{e}_{\Omega_i} &= \hat{\Omega}_i + \hat{\Omega}_i R_i^T R_{id} \Omega_{id} - R_i^T R_{id} \hat{\Omega}_{id} \\ \Rightarrow \varepsilon \dot{e}_{\Omega_i} &= J_i^{-1} (-k_R \bar{e}_{R_i} - k_\Omega e_{\Omega_i}) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The system model is described by equations (36) and (37) (called *boundary layer equations*) and equations (10)-(13). As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the error dynamics are described by

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} (\text{tr}[R_i^T R_{id}] I - R_i^T R_{id}) e_{\Omega_i}$$

$$0 = J_i^{-1} (-k_R \bar{e}_{R_i} - k_\Omega e_{\Omega_i})$$

the solution to which is an isolated root $(e_{R_i}, e_{\Omega_i}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$. When $(e_{R_i}, e_{\Omega_i}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$, the force on the i th tether is given by u_i and thus, the system dynamics are described by the equations (23), (24), (25) and (32), which are the desired closed loop dynamics of the ball and plate system. These equations are called the *reduced dynamics*.

The zero equilibrium of the error dynamics described by (35) and (36) has been shown to be exponentially stable in [11].

For the reduced system, it has been shown that the state $(r_b, \dot{r}_b, e_3^T o_p, e_3^T \dot{o}_p, R_p, \Omega_p) = ([0 \ 0]^T, [0 \ 0]^T, 0, 0, \mathbf{I}_3, [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T)$ is asymptotically stable, the velocities \dot{o}_{p1} and \dot{o}_{p2} remain bounded and that $(e_{q_i}, e_{\omega_i}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ is exponentially stable as well.

Then according to Tikhonov's theorem ([16]), there exists some $\varepsilon^* > 0$, such that for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*$, the hypothesis holds true. ■

IV. SIMULATIONS

For simulating the behaviour of the system under the action of the proposed control laws, the following system

parameters are chosen

$$m_p = 0.75 \quad m_b = 0.1$$

$$J_p = \begin{bmatrix} 0.006 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.008 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.012 \end{bmatrix}$$

Furthermore, prior to employing a numerical technique to obtain the trajectories described by equations (10)-(13), the system states are initialised to the following values.

$$r_b(0) = [1 \ 1]^T \quad \dot{r}_b(0) = [0.5 \ 0.5]^T$$

$$q_1(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 1]^T \quad \omega_1(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T$$

$$q_2(0) = [-0.5126 \ 0.0854 \ 0.8544]^T \quad \omega_2(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T$$

$$q_3(0) = [-0.5126 \ 0.0854 \ 0.8544]^T \quad \omega_3(0) = [0 \ 0 \ 0]^T$$

$$R_p(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \Omega_p(0) = [1 \ 1 \ 2]^T$$

All quantities are expressed in their respective SI units.






Fig. 3: Pictorial depiction of the system with the proposed control strategy in effect. The animation is available at: <https://youtu.be/nGNS-eZxbVM>

The system trajectory subject to these simulation conditions, are depicted by the following plots



(a) The plate's attitude quaternion (b) The plate's angular velocity

Fig. 4




(a) The plate's position

(b) The plate's velocity

Fig. 5

Figures 5a and 5b show that the position of the plate in the x-y plane becomes unbounded while the velocity attains a constant value. This behaviour is attributed to the underactuated nature of the system.



(a) The ball's position

(b) The ball's velocity

Fig. 6

REFERENCES

- [1] R. W. Beard and T. W. McLain, *Small unmanned aircraft: Theory and practice*. Princeton university press, 2012.
- [2] T. Lee, M. Leoky, and N. H. McClamroch, "Geometric tracking control of a quadrotor uav on se (3)," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2010 49th IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 5420–5425.
- [3] G. Hoffmann, S. Waslander, and C. Tomlin, "Quadrotor helicopter trajectory tracking control," in *AIAA guidance, navigation and control conference and exhibit*, 2008, p. 7410.
- [4] F. Goodarzi, D. Lee, and T. Lee, "Geometric nonlinear pid control of a quadrotor uav on se (3)," in *European Control Conference (ECC), 2013*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 3845–3850.
- [5] D. Maithripala and J. Berg, "Robust tracking control for underactuated autonomous vehicles using feedback linearization," in *Advanced Intelligent Mechatronics (AIM), 2014 IEEE/ASME International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 446–451.
- [6] M. Turpin, N. Michael, and V. Kumar, "Trajectory design and control for aggressive formation flight with quadrotors," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 33, no. 1-2, pp. 143–156, 2012.
- [7] —, "Decentralized formation control with variable shapes for aerial robots," in *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2012 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 23–30.

- [8] D. S. Maithripala, J. M. Berg, D. Maithripala, and S. Jayasuriya, "A geometric virtual structure approach to decentralized formation control," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2014*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 5736–5741.
- [9] F. A. Goodarzi, D. Lee, and T. Lee, "Geometric stabilization of a quadrotor uav with a payload connected by flexible cable," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2014*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 4925–4930.
- [10] T. Lee, K. Sreenath, and V. Kumar, "Geometric control of cooperating multiple quadrotor uavs with a suspended payload," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2013 IEEE 52nd Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 5510–5515.
- [11] T. Lee, "Geometric control of multiple quadrotor uavs transporting a cable-suspended rigid body," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2014 IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 6155–6160.
- [12] F. A. Goodarzi and T. Lee, "Dynamics and control of quadrotor uavs transporting a rigid body connected via flexible cables," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2015*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 4677–4682.
- [13] A. A. Rubio, A. Seuret, Y. Ariba, and A. Mannisi, "Optimal control strategies for load carrying drones," in *Delays and Networked Control Systems*. Springer, 2016, pp. 183–197.
- [14] F. Bullo and A. D. Lewis, "Geometric control of mechanical systems," 2005.
- [15] M. W. Spong, "Partial feedback linearization of underactuated mechanical systems," in *Intelligent Robots and Systems '94. Advanced Robotic Systems and the Real World', IROS'94. Proceedings of the IEEE/RSJ/GI International Conference on*, vol. 1. IEEE, 1994, pp. 314–321.
- [16] H. K. Khalil, "Nonlinear systems," 1996.
- [17] E. D. Sontag, "Input to state stability: Basic concepts and results," in *Nonlinear and optimal control theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 163–220.
- [18] F. Bullo, "Stabilization of relative equilibria for underactuated systems on riemannian manifolds," *Automatica*, vol. 36, no. 12, pp. 1819–1834, 2000.