

Adaptive Gains to Super-Twisting Technique for Sliding Mode Design

Xiaogang Xiong^{a,b}, Shyam Kamal^c, Shanhai Jin^d

^aHarbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, P.R.China

^bShenzhen Key Lab of Mechanisms and Control in Aerospace, Shenzhen, P.R.China

^cDepartment of Electrical Engineering Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi
Uttar Pradesh-221005, India

^dSchool of Engineering, Yanbian University, Yanji 133002, China

Abstract

This paper studies the super-twisting algorithm (STA) for adaptive sliding mode design. The proposed method tunes the two gains of STA on line simultaneously such that a second order sliding mode can take place with small rectifying gains. The perturbation magnitude is obtained exactly by employing a third-order sliding mode observer in opposition to the conventional approximations by using a first order low pass filter. While driving the sliding variable to the sliding mode surface, one gain of the STA automatically converges to an adjacent area of the perturbation magnitude in finite time. The other gain is adjusted by the above gain to guarantee the robustness of the STA. This method requires only one parameter to be adjusted. The adjustment is straightforward because it just keeps increasing until it fulfills the convergence constraints. For large values of the parameter, chattering in the update law of the two gains is avoided by employing a geometry based backward Euler integration method. The usefulness is illustrated by an example of designing an equivalent control based sliding mode control (ECBC-SMC) with the proposed adaptive STA for a perturbed LTI system.

Keywords: Second Order Sliding Mode Control, Adaptive Gain, Super-Twisting

1. Introduction

Sliding mode control (SMC) has been recognized as one of potentially useful control schemes due to its finite-time convergence, tracking accuracy and robustness against uncertainty [1, 2, 3, 4]. In practice, the main drawback of SMC is numerical chattering which could cause damages to the actuators of systems. Several solutions have been proposed to alleviate the numerical chattering, such as backward Euler methods [5, 6], higher order sliding mode (HOSM) [4, 7] and adaptive sliding mode designs [8, 9].

Implicit Euler methods can totally remove the chattering and attenuate disturbances to the level of the sampling time to power level of the highest order of sliding mode, which is comparable to the conventional explicit Euler methods. However, implicit Euler methods currently are limited on only simple structures of SMC, such as the first order sliding and second order twisting controller [10, 11]. For more complicated structure of higher sliding mode, comparing with explicit Euler methods, they need additional special solvers to obtain chattering free solutions [5, 6].

Employing higher order sliding mode can efficiently remove the chattering [12, 4, 13]. However, the implementation of higher order sliding mode requires the higher order derivatives of the sliding variables and the upper bounds of the perturbations. In practical applications, it is hard to obtain the knowledge of the bounds. Very large gain magnitudes can be selected to be greater than the actual boundaries of perturbations, satisfying the convergence requirement. However, large gain magnitudes lead to large chattering magnitudes, which is one of the reasons for the development of adaptive gains.

The adaptive sliding mode is to render gains adaptive in the conventional SMC. Since the magnitude of chattering is proportional to the gains, the chattering effect can be reduced if the gains automatically fit themselves to perturbations the SMC needs to counteract. Some adaptive laws for sliding mode control have been proposed for first order and higher order sliding mode control, e.g., [14, 15, 8]. Knowledge of perturbations is not required in such adaptive schemes.

The adaptation is introduced to only one gain, i.e., the gain of highest relative order variable. However, it is worth noticing that the mechanism of second order sliding modes can have two gains corresponding to the two state variables. One of popular second order sliding mode methods is the super-twisting algorithm. Unlike other higher order sliding model, super-twisting algorithm (STA) only needs the measurability of the sliding variable. This characteristic make it widely used in sliding mode control design [4], observer design [1] and differentiators [16].

For the STA, several adaptive laws have been developed based on the concept of equivalent control as well as Lyapunov functions directly [15, 9, 17, 18, 19]. The approach in [15] adapts the two gains to perturbations based on Lyapunov functions. It, however sometimes results in underestimation. Another kinds of adaptation laws in [9, 18, 19] based on the idea of equivalent control has a feature that asymptotically converges an adaptive gain to the minimum possible magnitude to achieve the second order sliding mode in the presence of perturbations. They, however, are based on the assumption that the equivalent control can be approximated by low-pass filtering. The values of parameters in low-pass filters give great influences to the approximation of equivalent control for systems with different noise magnitudes, actuator properties and sensor characteristics.

This paper removes the usage of low-pass filters to approximate the equivalent control. A third-order sliding mode observer is employed to exactly obtain the magnitude of perturbation, which is the minimum level of the two gains in STA. Taking into account the practical advantage of seeking the minimum possible gain, similar mechanism of the adaptive SMC proposed in [9] has been employed. Nevertheless, here, both two gains are rendered to be adaptive by using theorems of guaranteeing robustnesses of STA in [2, 20]. One gain is updated online in accordance with the adaptation of the other gain based on Lyapunov-type analysis that guarantees robustness with respect to perturbations. This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the system and the problem to be tackled. The main results are given in Section 3. An example is provided by designing a conventional equivalent control based sliding mode

controller (ECB-SMC) with the proposed adaptive gains for a LTI system in Section 4, and the effectiveness of the proposed method is illustrated. Finally, Section 5 draws some conclusions.

2. Problem statement

The super-twisting algorithm (STA) introduced in [16] is one of popular second order sliding mode algorithms. It is based on the following second order system¹:

$$\dot{z}_1 = -\alpha|z_1|^{1/2}\text{sgn}(z_1) + z_2 \quad (1a)$$

$$\dot{z}_2 \in -\beta\text{sgn}(z_1) + \rho_0(t) \quad (1b)$$

where $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ is defined as a set-valued inclusion instead of single-valued function [21, 22]:

$$\text{sgn}(z_1) := \begin{cases} z_1/|z_1|, & \text{if } z_1 \neq 0, \\ [-1, 1], & \text{if } z_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Scalars $z_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}, i \in \{1, 2\}$ are variables with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$, and they are packed into the state vector $z(t) = [z_1(t), z_2(t)]^T$. Positive real numbers α and β represent gains. The functions $\rho_0(t)$ denotes a perturbation satisfying

$$|\rho_0(t)| \leq L_1, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^2, t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (3a)$$

$$|\rho_1(t)| \leq L_2, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^2, t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (3b)$$

where $\rho_1(t) := \dot{\rho}_0(t)$ and L_1, L_2 are non-negative finite scalars. Such an assumption of limit-size perturbation is reasonable and similar ones can be found in [9, 19, 20]. By the solution of a differential inclusion with discontinuous right hand side such as (1), it means the Filippov solution here.

¹Here, the conventional differential equations of STA are written as differential inclusion (1) with the symbol “ \in ” because the set-valued essences of signum function (2) will be employed for the implicit Euler integration in the subsequence.

The objective of STA is to drive z to zero in finite time in the presences of $\rho(z, t)$ with appropriately selected the gains α, β , i.e., achieving second order sliding mode control with only the knowledge of $z_1(t)$. The purpose of this paper is to develop an adaptive scheme allowing the gains α and β to be time-varying and updated on-line to set the gains as low as possible. The adaptation aims at the attenuation of chattering and adjustment of parameters, which typical sliding mode algorithms suffer from.

3. Adaptive-gain design

This section proposes an approach to simultaneously adjusting gains α and β in (1) on-line to drive the state vector z to the origin precisely in finite time. The gains are automatically increased when perturbation $\rho_0(t)$ is large. The adaptation also allows the gains α and β to reduce automatically if a bound of the perturbation given a priori is too large. This section starts with an estimation mechanism of $\rho_0(t)$. Then a variable gain algorithm is proposed. At last, the new adaptive mechanism will be introduced later.

3.1. Disturbance $\rho_0(t)$ estimation

To reduce the gains α and β as much as possible with maintaining the robustness of STA, the only way is to make α and β slightly greater than the necessary level such that the disturbance $\rho_0(t)$ is counteracted. This requires the exact estimation of the magnitude of $\rho_0(t)$. In the literature of estimating perturbations [9, 23, 18, 19], a low-pass filter is usually used to approximate the equivalent control of $\rho_0(t)$, i.e., $\beta \text{sgn}(z_1)|_{eq} = \rho_0(t)$:

$$\tau \dot{w} + w \in \beta \text{sgn}(z_1) \tag{4}$$

with a constant $\tau > 0$ and an initial condition $w(0) = w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. The solution w can be considered as the approximation of $\rho_0(t)$, i.e., $w \approx \beta \text{sgn}(z_1)|_{eq} = \rho_0(t)$ when τ is small enough. The problem of such method is that the parameter τ has a very strong influence on the output w and it is difficult to select the value

for different systems with different sampling-time step sizes, noise magnitudes and actuator characteristics.

Here, an observer is proposed to remove the usage of low-pass filter but to estimate $\rho_0(z, t)$ precisely. The observer is [24]

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_1 = -\alpha|z_1|^{1/2}\text{sgn}(z_1) + \hat{z}_2 + k_1|e_1|^{2/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) \quad (5a)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_2 \in -\beta\text{sgn}(z_1) + k_2|e_1|^{1/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) + \hat{z}_3 \quad (5b)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_3 \in k_3\text{sgn}(e_1) \quad (5c)$$

where $e_1 := z_1 - \hat{z}_1$, $e_2 := z_2 - \hat{z}_2$ and k_1, k_2, k_3 are appropriate positive constants. The state \hat{z}_3 is the exact estimation of $\rho_0(t)$ after a finite time $t_e > 0$, i.e., $\forall t \in [t_e, +\infty)$, $\hat{z}_3 = \rho_0(z, t)$ and the explanation is as follows. The corresponding error dynamics of the observer (5) is

$$\dot{e}_1 = e_2 - k_1|e_1|^{2/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) \quad (6a)$$

$$\dot{e}_2 = \rho_0(z, t) - k_2|e_1|^{1/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) - \hat{z}_3 \quad (6b)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_3 \in k_3\text{sgn}(e_1). \quad (6c)$$

By defining $e_3 := \rho_0(z, t) - \hat{z}_3$, equation (6) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{e}_1 = -k_1|e_1|^{2/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) + e_2 \quad (7a)$$

$$\dot{e}_2 = -k_2|e_1|^{1/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) + e_3 \quad (7b)$$

$$\dot{e}_3 \in -k_3\text{sgn}(e_1) + \rho_1(z, t). \quad (7c)$$

According to [12], one can use the homogeneity property of (7) to select the values of k_1, k_2 and k_3 such that the three share one common parameter $L > 0$, and correspondingly the error $e := [e_1, e_2, e_3]^T$ in (7) converges to zero in finite time $t \in [t_e, +\infty)$ if $L > L_2 \geq |\rho_1(z, t)|$. The convergence time t_e is an inverse function of L and proportional function of $e(0)$. For example, in [12], the three parameters are chosen as

$$k_1 = 3L^{1/3}, k_2 = 1.5\sqrt{3}L^{2/3}, k_3 = 1.1L. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, for $t \in [t_e, +\infty)$, \hat{z}_3 is viewed as the equivalence control of the perturbation $\rho_0(z, t)$.

3.2. Selection of α and β

In this section, a variable gain-selection algorithm for STA (1) is introduced to give additional choices for updating α and β without damaging the robustness.

Lemma 1. [20] *Suppose the perturbation term $\rho_0(z, t)$ in the STA (1) globally bounded by (3). Then for every positive $L_1 > 0$, there exists a pair of gains α and β such that $z = 0$ is a robustly and globally finite-time stable equilibrium point. Moreover, there exists a symmetric and positive definite matrix $P = [p_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ such that $V(z) = \zeta^T P \zeta$ with $\zeta := [|z_1|^{1/2} \text{sgn}(z_1), z_2]^T$ is a quadratic, strict and robust Lyapunov function for the perturbed system (1), satisfying*

$$\dot{V} \leq -\frac{1}{|z_1|^{1/2}} \zeta^T Q_R \zeta \quad (9)$$

almost everywhere, for some symmetric and positive definite matrix $Q_R := [q_{Rij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$. Furthermore, a trajectory starting at z_0 will converge to the origin in a finite time smaller than $t_z(z_0)$:

$$t_z(z_0) = \frac{2}{\gamma} V^{1/2}(z_0), \quad \gamma = \frac{\omega_{\min}^{1/2}\{P\} \omega_{\min}^{1/2}\{Q_R\}}{\omega_{\max}\{P\}} \quad (10)$$

where $\omega_{\min}\{P\}$ and $\omega_{\max}\{Q_R\}$ represent the minimum and maximum eigenvalue of P and Q_R , respectively.

The proof of Lemma 1 in [20] derives the following algorithm for the selection rule of α , β , p_{ij} and q_{Rij} :

- (i) Choose positive constants (λ, h) so that $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $h > 1$.
- (ii) Find positive constants (θ_1, θ_2) satisfying the inequality

$$\theta_1 - \frac{2\theta_2}{h} > \frac{1}{4} (1 + \theta_1)^2 - (1 + \theta_1) \theta_2 \lambda + \theta_2^2. \quad (11)$$

The inequality (11) represents the interior of an ellipsoid on the (θ_1, θ_2) -plane parameterized by h and λ . Indeed, it can be transformed into the

following standardized formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}\right)^2 - 2\left(\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}\right)\theta_2\lambda + \theta_2^2 \\ & - 2\left(\frac{1+\theta_1}{2}\right) + \frac{2}{h}\theta_2 + 1 < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This ellipsoid can be utilized to pick θ_1 and θ_2 satisfying (11) as proposed in [20]. The center of the ellipsoid (12) is computed as $((1 + \bar{\theta}_1)/2, \bar{\theta}_2)$, where

$$\bar{\theta}_1 = \frac{h - 2\lambda + h\lambda^2}{h(1 - \lambda^2)}, \quad \bar{\theta}_2 = \frac{\lambda h - 1}{h(1 - \lambda^2)}. \quad (13)$$

If θ_1 and θ_2 are selected as $\bar{\theta}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_2$, respectively, the pair obviously satisfies (11) or (12). Properties $\theta_1 > 0$ and $\theta_2 > 0$ are achieved if the center of the ellipsoid is in the first quadrant of the (θ_1, θ_2) -plane. In fact, the positiveness of $\bar{\theta}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_2$ can be guaranteed by choosing $h\lambda > 1$.

(iii) Given such values of (λ, h) and (θ_1, θ_2) , the gains

$$\beta = \frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}L_1, \quad \alpha = \theta_1 \sqrt{\frac{2h}{(1-\lambda)\theta_2}}L_1^{1/2} \quad (14)$$

assure the robust, finite-time stability of the origin of the STA (1).

After obtaining the constants (h, λ) , (θ_1, θ_2) and gains (α, β) , the value of $t_z(z_0)$ can be calculated by using (10) with the matrices P and Q_R given by:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{11} &= 1, \quad p_{22} = \frac{(1-\lambda)\theta_2}{2L_1}, \quad p_{12} := -\sqrt{\frac{p_{22}}{h}}, \\ q_{R11} &= \alpha + 2p_{12}(\beta + L_1) + 2L_1(1 - \alpha p_{12})\frac{p_{22}}{p_{12}} \\ q_{R12} &= -\frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha p_{12}) + (\beta + L_1)p_{22}, \quad q_{R22} = -p_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

It should be noted that for a constant value of $h > 1$, the size of ellipse (12) is solely determined by the value of λ . If the inequality (12) is satisfied by a given value $\lambda = \lambda_m < 1$, then, for a function $\lambda(t) \geq \lambda_m$ replacing λ_m in (11) and (12), the inequality (11) and (12) is still satisfied. The new center related point $(\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t))$ defined by h and $\lambda(t)$ as in (13) is always located

within the new size-variable ellipse (12). Based on this observation, a modified version of Lemma 1 is provided here to render α and β adaptive without loss the robustness of the perturbed STA (1). Here, $\rho_0(z, t)$ in (3) now is assumed to be exactly observable. The new algorithm is as follow:

(i) Choose positive constants (η, h, p_{22}) so that

$$0 < \eta < 1, \quad h > 1, \quad p > 0 \quad (16)$$

(ii) The gain $\beta(t)$ is assigned here as

$$\beta(t) = \max\left(\beta_m, \frac{|\rho_0(z, t)|}{\eta}\right) \quad (17)$$

with a positive constant $\beta_m > 0$ based on the assumption of the observability of $\rho_0(z, t)$. Then, calculate the positive variable $\lambda(t)$ and the variable center point $(\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t))$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_2(t) &= \beta(t)p \\ \lambda(t) &= -\frac{1}{2\bar{\theta}_2(t)} + \frac{\sqrt{h^2 + 4\bar{\theta}_2(t)h + 4\theta(t)^2h^2}}{2\bar{\theta}_2(t)h} \\ \bar{\theta}_1(t) &= \frac{h - 2\lambda(t) + h\lambda(t)^2}{h(1 - \lambda(t)^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The positiveness of $\bar{\theta}_1(t)$ and $\bar{\theta}_2(t)$ can be guaranteed by choosing $h > 1$. Actually, the variable point $((1 + \bar{\theta}_1(t))/2, \bar{\theta}_2(t))$ is the center of the following size-variable ellipsoid

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1(t) - \frac{2\theta_2(t)}{h} &> \frac{1}{4}(1 + \theta_1(t))^2 + \theta_2(t)^2 \\ &\quad - (1 + \theta_1(t))\theta_2(t)\lambda(t). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

(iii) Given such values of (η, h, p) and functions $\lambda(t)$, $(\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t))$, the gain $\alpha(t)$

$$\alpha(t) = \bar{\theta}_1(t)\sqrt{\frac{h}{p}}. \quad (20)$$

assures the robust, finite-time stability of the origin of the STA (1). Obviously, p is used to adjust the value of $\alpha(t)$.

Theorem 1. : Consider (1) satisfying (3) with gains rendered to be variable, i.e., $\alpha(t) > 0$, $\beta(t) > 0$. Given the perturbation $\rho_0(z, t)$ observable, if $\beta(t)$ and $\alpha(t)$ selected as in (18) and (20) with $\{\eta, \lambda(t), h, \bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t)\}$ satisfying (16)-(18), then $z = 0$ is globally finite time stable and there exists $t_z(z_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $z = 0$ is a robustly and globally finite-time stable equilibrium point. Moreover, the function $V(z) = \zeta^T P \zeta$ with $\zeta := [|z_1|^{1/2} \text{sgn}(z_1), z_2]^T$ and $P = [p_{ij}]$ defined by (41) is a quadratic, strict and robust Lyapunov function for the perturbed system (1) satisfying (3) with observable $\rho_0(z, t)$ and variable gains $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$. It satisfies the inequality:

$$\dot{V} \leq -\frac{1}{|z_1|^{1/2}} \zeta^T Q_R(z, t) \zeta \quad (21)$$

almost everywhere, for $Q_R(z, t) := [q_{Rij}]$ given in (41). Furthermore, a trajectory starting at z_0 will converge to the origin in a finite time smaller than $t_z(z_0)$:

$$z(t) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_z(z_0), \infty) \quad (22)$$

where $t_z(z_0)$ is defined according to (10).

Proof 1. The vector ζ means that $z = 0$ if and only if $\zeta = 0$, because it is a bijective map between $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^2$. As done in [2, 20], define $\rho_z(z, t)$ and $A(z, t)$ by

$$\rho_0(z, t) = \rho_z(z, t) \text{sgn}(z_1) \quad (23)$$

$$A(z, t) = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha(t) & 1 \\ -2\beta(t) + 2\rho_z(z, t) & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Property (3) results in

$$\rho_z(z, t) = \rho_0(z, t) \text{sgn}(z_1), \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{z_1 = 0\}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (25)$$

Let I denote the identity matrix of appropriate dimension. Consider a constant

matrix P written as

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} \\ p_{12} & p_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

and let $Q(z, t)$ be defined with

$$-Q(z, t) = PA(z, t) + A(z, t)^T P. \quad (27)$$

Then the matrix $Q(z, t)$ is computed as

$$Q(z, t) = \begin{bmatrix} 2\alpha p_{11} + 4p_{12}(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t)) & \star \\ \alpha p_{12} + 2p_{22}(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t)) - p_{11} & -2p_{12} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Here, the symbol “ \star ” denotes a symmetric component. The matrices P and Q satisfy

$$P > 0 \quad (29)$$

$$Q(z, t) \geq \omega(t)I, \quad \forall (z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{z_1 = 0\} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (30)$$

for some $\omega(t) > 0$ if the following inequalities are satisfied uniformly in $(z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{z_1 = 0\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$p_{11} = 1, \quad p_{22} > p_{12}^2, \quad p_{12} < 0 \quad (31)$$

$$0 > p_{11}\alpha p_{12} + \frac{1}{4}(p_{11} - \alpha p_{12})^2 + 2p_{12}^2(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t)) - (p_{11} - \alpha p_{12})p_{22}(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t)) + (\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t))^2 p_{22}^2. \quad (32)$$

The inequalities (29) and (30) are satisfied for some $\omega(t) > 0$ if (31)-(32) are met. Due to (17) and (25), the inequality (32) is satisfied uniformly in (z, t) if

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > & \frac{1}{4}(1 - \alpha(t)p_{12})^2 + 2p_{12}^2(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t)) \\ & + \alpha(t)p_{12} - (1 - p_{12}\alpha(t))(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t))p_{22} \\ & + p_{22}^2(\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Defining

$$\begin{aligned} h &:= \frac{p_{22}}{p_{12}^2}, \quad \theta_1(t) := -\alpha(t)p_{12}, \\ \theta_2(t) &:= (\beta(t) - \rho_z(z, t))p_{22} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

leads to

$$\theta_1(t) - 2\frac{\theta_2(t)}{h} > \frac{1}{4}(1 + \theta_1(t))^2 - (1 + \theta_1(t))\theta_2(t) + \theta_2(t)^2. \quad (35)$$

Obviously, (35) is satisfied if

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1(t) - 2\frac{\theta_2(t)}{h} > \frac{1}{4}(1 + \theta_1(t))^2 - (1 + \theta_1(t))\theta_2(t)\lambda(t) \\ + \theta_2(t)^2, \quad 0 < \lambda(t) < 1 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

is met. The inequality (36) is a size-variable ellipse, of which the size is determined by h and $\lambda(t)$. Similar to the algorithm of Lemma 1, the mission is to find suitable functions $\theta_1(t) > 0$ and $\theta_2(t) > 0$ that satisfy (36). Select the center point $(\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t))$, which can be obtained by using the definition (13) with the constant λ replaced by the variable $\lambda(t)$, as the point $(\theta_1(t), \theta_2(t))$ in (36). Let

$$\bar{\theta}_2(t) = \frac{h\lambda(t) - 1}{h(1 - \lambda^2(t))} := \beta(t)p_{22}, \quad (37)$$

which means that the vertical coordinate $\bar{\theta}_2(t)$ of the center $((1 + \bar{\theta}_1(t))/2, \bar{\theta}_2(t))$ of the ellipse (36) is forced to change according to the changes of $\beta(t)$. The equivalence (37) leads to the expression of $\lambda(t)$ in (18), as the input of $\bar{\theta}_1(t)$ in (18). As a result, the center point $((1 + \bar{\theta}_1(t))/2, \bar{\theta}_2(t))$ of the ellipse (36) changes according to the changes of $\beta(t)$. The equivalence $\bar{\theta}_1(t) = -p_{12}\alpha(t)$, $h = p_{22}/p_{12}^2$ and (37) lead to the expression (20). The positiveness of $(\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t))$ requires $h\lambda(t) > 1$, which is always satisfied if $h > 1$.

It should be noted that the size of the ellipse (36) is consistent with the value of $\beta(t)$ and $\alpha(t)$. For a given constant h , the size of the ellipse (36) is determined by $\lambda(t)$, which is forced to be as in (37). Then, the change in size of the ellipse (36) is driven by the magnitude of $\beta(t)$. The size of ellipse (36) increases as $\beta(t)$ increases, making the inequality (36) always satisfied. If $\beta(t)$ changes according to the magnitude of $\rho_0(z, t)$, one can note that the size of the ellipse (36) is finally driven by the magnitude of $\rho_0(z, t)$.

Choose $V(\zeta) = \zeta^T P \zeta$ with P defined in (26), which is a constant positive definite symmetric matrix with elements p_{11} , p_{12} and p_{22} given by (31) and (34). By using the facts $\frac{d}{dt}|z_1|^{1/2} \text{sgn}(z_1) = \frac{1}{2|z_1|^{1/2}} \frac{d}{dt} z_1$, $z_1 \neq 0$, $\dot{\zeta} = \frac{1}{2|z_1|^{1/2}} A(z, t) \zeta$ and (27), the time derivative \dot{V} along the solutions to (1) and (23) is computed as: $z_1 \neq 0$,

$$\dot{V} = -\frac{1}{|z_1|^{1/2}} \zeta^T Q(z, t) \zeta \leq -\frac{\omega(t)}{2|z_1|^{1/2}} \zeta^T \zeta, \quad (38)$$

where $\omega(t) > 0$ is smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $Q_R(z, t) > 0$ given by

$$Q_R(z, t) := \begin{bmatrix} 2\alpha(t) + 4\bar{\theta}_2(t) \frac{p_{12}}{p_{22}} + \xi(t) & \star \\ 2\bar{\theta}_2(t) - (1 + \bar{\theta}_1(t)) & -2p_{12} \end{bmatrix} \quad (39)$$

$$\xi(t) = 2(1 + \bar{\theta}_1(t)) \bar{\theta}_2(t) \frac{1 - \lambda(t)}{p_{12}}.$$

The matrix $Q_R(z, t)$ is constructed by using the inequality (36) with $(\theta_1(t), \theta_2(t))$ replaced by $(\bar{\theta}_1(t), \bar{\theta}_2(t))$. It is a positive definite matrix if (36) is satisfied and

$$2\alpha(t) + 4\bar{\theta}_2(t) \frac{p_{12}}{p_{22}} + 2(1 + \bar{\theta}_1(t)) \bar{\theta}_2(t) \frac{1 - \lambda(t)}{p_{12}} > 0, \quad (40)$$

which is automatically satisfied if (36) holds. Note that the function $V(\zeta(t))$ is proved to be absolutely continuous in t [20], so that $V(\zeta(t))$ is strictly decreasing in t if and only if \dot{V} is negative definite almost everywhere. Then the time derivative \dot{V} along the solutions to (1) is obtained as (38). From (38), one arrive at (22) with $t_z = 4\lambda_P^{1/2} \sqrt{V(\zeta(0))} / \omega(t)$ where λ_P is the smallest eigenvalue of P with elements p_{11} , p_{12} and p_{22} are give as follow:

$$p_{11} = 1, p_{22} = p, p_{12} = -\sqrt{\frac{p_{22}}{h}}. \quad (41)$$

□

Another selection law for $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ can be found in [1], which was proven by employing the method of majorant curve. The difference is that here, instead of showing an inequality condition and constant gains, a selecting law for variable gains $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ is given.




Figure 1: Illustration of the enumeration method for (49).

Theorem 1 is a modified version of selecting α and β for the STA (1) in [20]. The new added parameter $0 < \eta < 1$ determines how close β is to the perturbation magnitude limitation $|\rho_0(z, t)|$ and it should be as large as possible to reduce the value of β as much as possible, making the chattering magnitude greatly attenuated. Comparing to the original one, with the same value of β , the values of α selected according to Theorem 1 can be much smaller, reducing the chattering magnitude further.

3.3. Update law for α and β

This section introduces the approach to simultaneously adjust α and β according to the perturbation $\rho_0(z, t)$, driving the state vector z to the origin precisely in finite time. Let the following adaptive mechanism be introduced to (1):

$$\dot{\beta}(t) \in -L \text{sgn}(\eta\beta(t) - |\hat{z}_3|) - \frac{L}{\eta} \mathbf{H}(\beta(t) - \beta_m) \quad (42a)$$

$$\alpha(t) = \bar{\theta}_1(t) \sqrt{\frac{h}{p}}, \quad \beta(0) = \beta_0 \geq \beta_m \quad (42b)$$

where $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ are scalar variables, $\beta_m > 0$ is a constant defined as the minimum gain magnitude of $\beta(t)$ to prevent the loss of robustness, positive constants h and p satisfy (16). The function $\bar{\theta}_1(t)$ is calculated with (18) and \hat{z}_3 is obtained from (5). The map $\mathbf{H} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an inclusion modified from the

Heaviside step function:

$$\mathbf{H}(z) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z > 0, \\ [-1, 0], & \text{if } z = 0, \\ -1, & \text{if } z < 0. \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

Theorem 2. Consider (1) with (5), (8), and (42). Assume that $\rho_0(z, t)$ is differentiable and satisfying (3) with a given variable $L_2(t) > 0$. Let

$$L > \frac{L_2(t)}{\eta}, \quad (44)$$

then, the solutions $z(t)$, $\hat{z}(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ are bounded for all $(z_0, \hat{z}_0, \beta_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\beta_m, +\infty)$, and the following three statements hold true:

1. There exists $t_e \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\forall t \in [t_e, \infty)$, $\hat{z}_3 = \rho_0(z, t)$.
2. There also exists $t_\delta \in [t_e, \infty)$ such that

$$\beta(t) = \max\left(\frac{|\rho(z, t)|}{\eta}, \beta_m\right). \quad (45)$$

3. Furthermore, there exists $t_z \in [t_\delta, +\infty)$

$$z(t) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_z, \infty) \quad (46)$$

holds for each $(z_0, \hat{z}_0, \beta_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times [\beta_m, +\infty)$.

Proof 2. First, equation (5)(6)(7) ensure $|\hat{z}_3(t)| < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ due to the finite perturbation $|\rho_0(z, t)| \leq L_1(t)$, $|\rho_1(z, t)| \leq L_2(t)$ and conditions (44). The differential inclusions in (42) also guarantees $|\beta(t)| < \infty$ and $|\alpha(t)| < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ due to $|\hat{z}_3(t)| < \infty$. Moreover, the differential equations (42) result in $\beta_m \leq \beta(t) < +\infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\beta(0) = \beta_0 \geq \beta_m$.

To see this, first consider $|\hat{z}_3| > \eta\beta_m$. In the case of $\eta\beta > |\hat{z}_3|$, $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) = 1$ and $\mathbf{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = 0$ gives $\dot{\beta} = -L$, due to (42a). Then, $\eta\beta$ approaches to $|\hat{z}_3|$ in finite time due the negative derivative. In the case of $\eta\beta < |\hat{z}_3|$, the definition (42a) gives $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) = -1$ and $\mathbf{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = 0$ leading to $\dot{\beta} = L$. Due to $|\hat{z}_3| < +\infty$, $\dot{\beta} = L$ makes $\eta\beta > |\hat{z}_3|$ satisfied in finite time. In the case of $\eta\beta = |\hat{z}_3|$, $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) \in [-1, 1]$ and $\mathbf{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = 0$ may lead to the decrease

of β due to the possibility of $\dot{\beta} < 0$. However, as soon as $\beta < \beta_m$ is satisfied, one has $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) \in [-1, 1]$, $\text{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = -1$, and $\dot{\beta} \in [-1, 1]L + L/\eta > 0$, which leads to $\beta \geq \beta_m$ in a short time. Therefore, in case of $|\hat{z}_3| > \eta\beta_m$, β is kept in the set $\beta_m \leq \beta(t) \leq +\infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Now consider the case of $|\hat{z}_3| < \eta\beta_m$. In the case of $\beta > \beta_m$, $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) = 1$ and $\text{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = 0$ gives $\dot{\beta} = -L$, due to (42a). Then, β approaches to β_m in finite time due to the negative derivative. In the case of $|\hat{z}_3| < \eta\beta < \eta\beta_m$, $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) = 1$ and $\text{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = -1$ gives $\dot{\beta} = -L + L/\eta > 0$, making β to approach to β_m in finite time due to the positive derivative. In the case of $\eta\beta < |\hat{z}_3| < \eta\beta_m$, $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) = -1$ and $\text{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = -1$ gives $\dot{\beta} = L + L/\eta$. Therefore, in a finite time, $\beta \geq \beta_m$ is achieved.

For the case of $|\hat{z}_3| = \eta\beta_m$, the analysis is the same as the above.

Next, consider $\beta = \beta_m$. In the case of $\eta\beta > |\hat{z}_3|$, the definition (42a) gives $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3|) = 1$ and $\text{H}(\beta - \beta_m) \in [-1, 0]$, leading to $\dot{\beta} \in -L - [-1, 0]L/\eta$. This means that β may decrease due to the possibility of $\dot{\beta} < 0$. However, as soon as β decreases, $\beta < \beta_m$ achieves and this results in $\text{H}(\beta - \beta_m) = -1$ and $\dot{\beta} = -L + L/\eta$, according to (42a). This implies that β stop decreasing because of hitting the bottom value β_m . It also may increase due to the possibility of $\dot{\beta} > 0$. As soon as β increase to $\beta > \beta_m$, one has $\dot{\beta} = -L$. Therefore, $\beta = \beta_m$ is kept for $\eta\beta > |\hat{z}_3|$. In the case of $\eta\beta < |\hat{z}_3|$, the definition (42a) gives $\text{sgn}(\eta\beta - \hat{z}_3) = -1$, $\text{H}(\eta\beta - \eta\beta_m) \in [-1, 0]$ and $\dot{\beta} = L - [-1, 0]L/\eta$. This means that β increases to approach $|\hat{z}_3|$, leading to $\beta > \beta_m$. Therefore, $\beta = |\hat{z}_3|$ is kept for $\eta\beta < |\hat{z}_3|$. Therefore, the positive invariance of the set $[\beta_m, +\infty)$ is proved for $\beta(t)$ governed by (42).

The rest of the claims can be proved by employing the argument separating the dynamics into three phases. In the first phase, the sliding $e = 0$, i.e., $\hat{z}_3 = \rho_0(z, t)$ is achieved regardless of $z \neq 0$. Notice that property (44) gives $L > L_2 \geq |\rho_1(z, t)|$, which, in turn, implies $e = 0$ is achieved in finite time [12]. Let t_e be a real number defined as the finite time of convergence in the first phase. The second phase of achieving the sliding mode $\delta := \eta\beta - |\hat{z}_3| = 0$ can be verified for the time interval $[t_e, \infty)$ as follows.

$$\beta_i = \begin{cases} \beta_{i-1} + \frac{1+\eta}{\eta}TL, & \text{if } \eta\beta_{i-1} < |\hat{z}_{3,i}| - (1+\eta)TL, \\ \frac{|\hat{z}_{3,i}|}{\eta}, & \text{if } |\hat{z}_{3,i}| - (1+\eta)TL \leq \eta\beta_{i-1} < |\hat{z}_{3,i}| - (1-\eta)TL, \\ \beta_{i-1} + \frac{1-\eta}{\eta}TL, & \text{if } |\hat{z}_{3,i}| - (1-\eta)TL \leq \eta\beta_{i-1} < \eta\beta_m - (1-\eta)TL \\ \beta_m, & \text{if } \eta\beta_m - (1-\eta)TL \leq \eta\beta_{i-1} < \eta\beta_m + \eta TL \\ \beta_{i-1} - TL & \text{if } \eta\beta_{i-1} \geq \eta\beta_m + \eta TL \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

Let $V(\delta) = \delta^2/2$. From the above explanations and analysis, $\beta \in [\beta_m, +\infty]$ is a invariant set for almost all the time. Then one has $\dot{\beta} = -L\text{sgn}(\delta)$ and its derivative yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \delta\dot{\delta} = \delta(-\eta L\text{sgn}(\delta) - |\dot{\hat{z}}_3|) \\ &= -|\delta|(\eta L + |\dot{\hat{z}}_3|\text{sgn}(\delta)) \\ &\leq -|\delta|(\eta L - L_2) \\ &< -\sqrt{2V(\delta)}(\eta L - L_2) < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Therefore, $\delta = 0$ is for $t \in [t_\delta, \infty)$, where

$$t_\delta = \frac{\sqrt{2V(\delta(0))}}{\eta L - L_2} \in [t_e, +\infty). \quad (48)$$

For $t \in [t_\delta, \infty)$, one has $\delta = 0$, i.e., $\eta\beta = |\hat{z}_3| = |\rho_0(z, t)|$ for $\beta > \beta_m$. Combining with the previous analysis, one can conclude that for $t \in [t_\delta, +\infty]$, (45) is achieved, which is independent from the state $z = 0$.

In the third phase, from (45) and Theorem 1, one can conclude that there exist a $t_z \in [t_\delta, +\infty)$ such that $z = 0$ is achieved in finite time $t \in [t_z, +\infty)$. \square

Remark 1. Forward Euler integrations of (42) can cause chattering on β , specially, for large value of L and large time step sizes. With implicit Euler discretization, one can achieve a chattering free integration of β [11]. For simplicity, here only the first two terms in (42a) is considered. The implicit Euler

methods for the three terms in (42a) can be attained by similar methods shown here. By multiplying η on both sides of (42a) and discretization (42a) with the implicit Euler method:

$$\eta\beta_i \in \eta\beta_{i-1} - \eta TL \text{sgn}(\eta\beta_i - |\hat{z}_{3,i}|) - TLH(\eta\beta_i - \eta\beta_m) \quad (49)$$

where $T > 0$ is the time step size, $\beta_i := \beta(t_i)$, $\hat{z}_{3,i} := \hat{z}_3(t_i)$, and $t_i := t_0 + iT, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_+, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. One should note that $\hat{z}_{3,i}$ is a known scalar and can be explicitly obtained by integrating (5). The formulas like (49) is a form of multiple cascaded set-valued inclusions such as $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{H}(\cdot)$ defined as (2) and (43), respectively, [25]. Such structure of differential inclusions always have solutions [11]. It can be also transformed into many other standard forms like mixed linear complementarity problem (MLCP) [25] and affine variational inequality (AVI) [11], which can be solved by many well-researched algorithms, solvers and even enumeration methods. Here, a geometry based enumeration method is illustrated as Fig. 1. The solution of β_i is the vertical value of the cross point of two functions $y = \eta\beta_i - \eta\beta_{i-1}$ and $y \in -\eta TL \text{sgn}(\eta\beta_i - \hat{z}_{3,i}) - TLH(\eta\beta_i - \eta\beta_m)$, depending on the known value of β_{i-1} . Here, only the solution for the case $|\hat{z}_{3,i}| \leq \eta\beta_m \leq +\infty$ is given as (50). For the case of $\eta\beta_m < |\hat{z}_{3,i}|$, the solution can be obtained by exchanging $\eta\beta_m$ with $|\hat{z}_{3,i}|$ and $(1 - \eta)TL$ with ηTL , respectively.

The idea of $\alpha(t)$ in (42) can be seen by comparing with (14). The gain $\alpha(t)$ is updated in accordance with the magnitude of $\beta(t)$ needed to drive z to the origin. Due to the predefined minimum value of β_m , correspondingly, there is a minimum value α_m according to (42). The minimum values are very applicable to real situations. The differentiability of the perturbation $\rho_0(z, t)$ in (3) is not always satisfied in practical applications, but it can be always divided into a differentiable partition and a non-differentiable partition. The minimum values of β_m and α_m are required to deal with the non-differentiable partition, guaranteeing the robustness during the adaptation of STA. While the updated law (42) is used for the differentiable partition. When the differentiable partition




Figure 2: Adaptive equivalent control based sliding mode control (ECB-SMC) for the perturbed LTI system (51) by applying the adaptive-gain law (42) to the super-twisting algorithms (STA) (1). Only the first line of gain updated law (42) is integrated by the implicit Euler method (50) while (51), (54b), and (56) are integrated by the conventional forward Euler method with same time step size $T = 0.0001s$ (The time step size $T = 0.0001s$ is set to avoid the stiff problem in simulations due to the great value differences of matrix elements in (51)). The derivative of the differentiable perturbation φ in (51) is selected as $GD\dot{\varphi} = \rho_0(x, t) = 10 \sin(2\pi t) + 5 \cos(5\pi t)$. The parameters are chosen as $\beta_m = 1$, $\eta = 0.99$, $L = 200$, $h = 1.01$, and $p = 0.01$. The initial state of x is $x(0) = [1, 1, 1, 1]^T$.

is small, the magnitudes of $\beta(t)$ and $\alpha(t)$ are also decreased for preventing unnecessary chattering. When large perturbations require large $\beta(t)$ and $\alpha(t)$, they are increased for enhancing the robustness.

4. Example

Consider an industrial electromechanical emulator provided by Educational Control Products (ECP), representing the important classes of systems such as

conveyors, machine tools, spindle drives, and automated assembly machines [7].

It is consisted of a drive disk and a payload disk and modeled as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \\ \dot{x}_3 \\ \dot{x}_4 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -209.6 & -2 & 838.4 & 1.7 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 77.9 & 0.15 & -311.8 & -2.47 \end{bmatrix}}_A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2306 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_B u + D\varphi \quad (51)$$

where $x := [x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]^T$ is defied as the state, x_1 and x_3 are the angular position of the drive disk and load disk, respectively, and x_2 and x_4 are the angular velocity of the drive disk and load disk, respectively. For simplicity, it is assumed that x is fully measurable and this assumption is reasonable because x_1 and x_3 can be obtained by using encoders while x_2 and x_4 can be estimated by designing two separated velocity observers [1]. The control input u is to drive $x := [x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]^T$ to zero in the presence of twice differentiable perturbation $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ with a constant perturbation matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 1}$.

Here, a simple sliding surface

$$s = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/2306 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}}_G x \quad (52)$$

is designed and its derivative is

$$\dot{s} = G\dot{x} = G[Ax + Bu + D\varphi]. \quad (53)$$

Similar to the conventional equivalent control based sliding mode control(ESB-SMC) [6], the control input u is divided into the continuous control u_c and sliding mode control u_s , i.e., $u = u_c + u_s$. Here, the proposed adaptive STA is employed as the sliding mode control instead of the first order sliding mode

control. Comparing to the conventional first order sliding mode control, the adaptive STA can achieve a second order accuracy, i.e., $s = \dot{s} = 0$, with the chattering being greatly attenuated due to the absolute continuity of STA and adaptively attenuated gains. The equivalent control and sliding mode control are

$$u_c = -(GB)^{-1}GAx \quad (54a)$$

$$u_s = (GB)^{-1}[-\alpha(t)|s|^{1/2}\text{sgn}(s) + \sigma] \quad (54b)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} \in -\beta(t)\text{sgn}(s). \quad (54c)$$

By substituting u in (53) with (54a) and (54b), defining $s := s_1$, $s_2 := \sigma + GD\varphi$ and assuming that the perturbation $|\rho_0(x, t)| := |GD\dot{\varphi}| \leq L_1$, $|\rho_1(x, t)| := |GD\ddot{\varphi}| \leq L_2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, one can obtain

$$\dot{s}_1 = s_2 - \alpha(t)|s_1|^{1/2}\text{sgn}(s_1) \quad (55a)$$

$$\dot{s}_2 \in -\beta(t)\text{sgn}(s_1) + \rho_0(x, t) \quad (55b)$$

in the form of (1). According to the perturbation observer (5), the perturbation $\rho_0(x, t)$ can be estimated by employing the following dynamics:

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_1 = \hat{z}_2 - \alpha(t)|s_1|^{1/2}\text{sgn}(s_1) + k_1|e_1|^{2/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) \quad (56a)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_2 = -\beta(t)\text{sgn}(s_1) + k_2|e_1|^{1/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) + \hat{z}_3 \quad (56b)$$

$$\dot{\hat{z}}_3 \in k_3\text{sgn}(e_1) \quad (56c)$$

where $e_1 := s_1 - \hat{z}_1$. By selecting the gains k_1, k_2 and k_3 as in (8), and defining $e_2 := s_2 - \hat{z}_2$ and $e_3 := \rho_0(x, t) - \hat{z}_3$, one has the error dynamics of perturbation observer:

$$\dot{e}_1 = -3L^{1/3}|e_1|^{2/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) + e_2 \quad (57a)$$

$$\dot{e}_2 = -1.5\sqrt{3}L^{2/3}|e_1|^{1/3}\text{sgn}(e_1) + e_3 \quad (57b)$$

$$\dot{e}_3 \in -1.1L\text{sgn}(e_1) + \rho_1(x, t) \quad (57c)$$

in the form of (7). For large enough value of $L > L_2 \geq |\rho_1(x, t)|$, the error $e := [e_1, e_2, e_3]^T$ will disappear in finite time. Then one has $\hat{z}_3 = \rho_0(x, t)$, of

which the magnitude is used as the tracking target of β in (55) by the update law (42).

One can obtain as small as possible control input u by integrating the controller (54a) and (54b) with the conventional forward Euler method and by integrating (42) with the backward Euler method (50). The gains α and β will be self-adjusted by the law (42) to as small as possible but large enough to counteract the perturbation $\rho_0(x, t)$. The chattering caused by the very large value of L in (42) is removed by the geometry based backward Euler integration method (50).

Fig. 2 shows the simulation results of designing an equivalent control based sliding mode control (ECB-SMC) with the proposed adaptive super-twisting algorithm (STA) (1) for the perturbed LTI system (51). Fig. 2(a) shows that the state x asymptotically converges to zero while Fig. 2(b) shows that the sliding variable s_1 converges to zero in finite time in the presence of perturbation φ . The sliding variable s_1 is a polynomial composition of $x_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, which is a very common design for a higher order system like (51) controlled by a relatively lower sliding mode control such as STA (1). Fig. 2(c) shows that in a finite time, the observer error (57) converges to zero, which is earlier than the convergence of the state x (less than 1 second). This implies that the adaption of the gains α and β is independent from the convergence of the STA (56). This property is different from conventional adaption laws based on low-pass filters, which begin to adjust the gains only after the convergence of STA.

Due to $s_1 = 0$ before the convergence of e in (57) to zero, the small magnitude $\eta\beta = |\rho_0(x, t)|$ or $\beta = \beta_m$, does not affect the convergence time t_z for $s_1 = 0$. This phenomena can be observed by comparing Fig. 2(b),(d), and (f). This is important property because the quicker convergence of $\eta\beta = |\rho_0(x, t)|$ or $\beta = \beta_m$, which is a small magnitude to counteract the perturbation φ , can result in a long convergence of $s_1 = 0$. The reason is that with the same initial state $s(0)$, the convergence of (55) is inverse proportional to β . To achieve a quicker convergence for $s = 0$ in (55), one can increase L and decrease η , leading to a larger gain $\beta = |\rho_0(x, t)|/\eta$.

In Fig. 2(e)(f), it is observed that the adaptation (42) adjusts $\beta(t)$ to the level of perturbation $\rho_0(x, t)$ and changes $\alpha(t)$ proportionally to $\beta(t)$. The two gains $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ adjusted by (42) reduce as the magnitude of $\rho_0(x, t)$ decreases. When $\rho_0(x, t)$ is small, i.e., $|\rho_0(x, t)| < \eta\beta_m$ is satisfied in Theorem 2, $\beta(t)$ converges to β_m . Staying at the predefined minimum value to guarantee the robustness. When $|\rho_0(x, t)| > \eta\beta_m$, a magnitude $\beta = |\rho_0(x, t)|/\eta$, as small as possible but large enough to grantee the robustness, is achieved.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, an adaption methodology of super-twisting algorithm is developed based on third-order observer and Lyapunov function approaches. It can realize the possibly minimum level of gains while keeping the robustness of sliding mode control without using low-pass filters to estimate the boundary of perturbations. The efficacy of the proposed adaptive super-twisting algorithm is confirmed by designing an equivalent control based sliding mode control (ECB-SMC) with the proposed adaptive super-twisting algorithm for a benchmark system in the literature.

The same mechanism can be applied to adapt the gains of higher order sliding mode (HOSM). Further study may focus on various applications of adaptive HOSM, such as adaptive differentiators, adaptive sliding mode controllers, adaptive observers, and adaptive filters.

6. Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11702073), Shenzhen Key Lab Fund of Mechanisms and Control in Aerospace (Grant No. ZDSYS201703031002066), and by the Basic Research Plan of Shenzhen (JCYJ20170413112645981).

References

- [1] J. Davila, L. Fridman, A. Levant, Second-order sliding-mode observer for mechanical systems, *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* 50 (11) (2005) 1785–1789.
- [2] J. Moreno, M. Osorio, A Lyapunov approach to second-order sliding mode controllers and observers, in: *Proceedings of the 47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Cancun, Mexico, 2008, pp. 2856–2861.
- [3] A. Levant, Sliding order and sliding accuracy in sliding mode control, *International Journal of Control* 58 (6) (1993) 1247–1263.
- [4] A. Levant, Principles of 2-sliding mode design, *Automatica* 43 (4) (2007) 576–586.
- [5] V. Acary, B. Brogliato, Y. V. Orlov, Chattering-free digital sliding-mode control with state observer and disturbance rejection, *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* 57 (5) (2012) 1087–1101.
- [6] V. Acary, B. Brogliato, Implicit Euler numerical scheme and chattering-free implementation sliding model systems, *Systems & Control Letters* 59 (5) (2010) 284–293.
- [7] A. Chalanga, S. Kamal, B. Bandyopadhyay, A new algorithm for continuous sliding mode control with implementation to industrial emulator setup, *IEEE/ASME Transaction on mechatronics* 20 (5) (2015) 2194–2204.
- [8] M. Taleb, F. Plestan, B. Bououlid, An adaptive solution for robust control based on integral high-order sliding mode concept, *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 25 (8) (2015) 12011213.
- [9] V. I. Utkin, A. S. Poznyak, Adaptive sliding mode control with application to super-twist algorithm: Equivalent control method, *Automatica* 49 (1) (2013) 39–47.

- [10] B. Wang, B. Brogliato, V. Acary, A. Boubakir, F. Plestan, Experimental comparisons between implicit and explicit implementations of discrete-time sliding mode controllers: Toward input and output chattering suppression, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technologys* 23 (5) (2015) 2071–2075.
- [11] O. Huber, V. Acary, B. Brogliato, F. Plestan, Discrete-time twisting controller without numerical chattering: analysis and experimental results with an implicit method, in: *The 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2014.
- [12] A. Levant, Higher-order sliding modes, differentiation and output-feedback control, *International Journal of Control* 76 (9-10) (2003) 924–941.
- [13] S. Laghrouche, F. Plestan, A. Glumineau, Higher order sliding mode control based on integral sliding mode, *Automatica* 43 (3) (2007) 531–537.
- [14] F. Plestan, Y. Shtessel, V. Bregeault, A. Poznyak, New methodologies for adaptive sliding mode control, *International Journal of Control* 83 (9) (2010) 1907–1919.
- [15] Y. Shtessel, M. Taleb, F. Plestan, A novel adaptive-gain supertwisting sliding mode controller: Methodology and application, *Automatica* 48 (5) (2012) 759–769.
- [16] A. Levant, Robust exact differentiation via sliding mode technique, *Automatica* 34 (3) (1998) 379–384.
- [17] H. Lee, V. I. Utkin, Chattering suppression methods in sliding mode control systems, *Annual Reviews in Control* 31 (2) (2007) 179–188.
- [18] C. Edwards, Y. Shtessel, Adaptive continuous higher order sliding mode control, in: *The 19th World Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC 2014)*, Cape Town, South Africa, 2014.

- [19] C. Edwards, Y. Shtessel, Adaptive dual layer second-order sliding mode control and observation, in: The 2015 American Control Conference (ACC), Chicago, IL, USA, 2015.
- [20] J. A. Moreno, M. Osorio, Strict Lyapunov function for the super-twisting algorithm, *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control* 57 (4) (2012) 1035–1040.
- [21] V. Acary, B. Brogliato, Numerical Methods for Nonsmooth Dynamical Systems, Lecture Notes in Applied and Computational Mechanics, Vol. 35. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2008).
- [22] R. Kikuuwe, K. Kanaoka, T. Kumon, M. Yamamoto, Phase-lead stabilization of force-projecting master-slave systems with a new sliding mode filter, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 23 (6) (2015) 2182–2194.
- [23] X. Xiong, H. Ito, An additional adaptive-gain to super-twisting technique for sliding mode design, in: The 57th Japan Joint Automatic Control Conference, Gunma, Japan, 2014.
- [24] A. Chalanga, S. Kamal, J. A. Moreno, L. Fridman, B. Bandyopadhyay, How to implement super-twisting controller based on sliding mode observer?, in: The 13th International Workshop on Variable Structure Systems, Nantes, France, 2014.
- [25] X. Xiong, R. Kikuuwe, M. Yamamoto, Implicit euler simulation of one dimensional burridge-knopoff model of earthquakes with set-valued friction laws, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* DOI: 10.1007/s10444-014-9398-4.