

Distributed Leader-Follower Formation Tracking Control of Multiple Quad-rotors

Lixia Yan* and Baoli Ma

*The Seventh Research Division, School of Automation Science and
Electrical Engineering, Beihang University, 100191, Beijing, China*

(Dated: March 3, 2020)

The leader-follower formation control analysis for multiple quad-rotor systems is investigated in this paper. To achieve predefined formation in the three-dimensional air space (x, y and z), a novel local tracking control law and a distributed observer are obtained. The local tracking control law starts with finding a bounded continuous yet greater-than-zero control in z , based on which following a feedback linearization (FL) controls derived for errors associated with x and y . By this design method, we obtain less states to be regulated than the traditional extension FL methodology. Then, the proposed distributed observer solves the problems that only a subset of followers can know the leaders states and only neighboring communication is available. Simulation results validate the proposed formation scheme.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

A quad-rotor is a multi-rotor helicopter that is lifted and propelled by four symmetrically mounted rotors [3, 6–8]. It has experienced a great boom in recent years due to potential applications such as aerial photography, geological exploration and disaster relief. To enhance the reliability and safety of these applications, researchers have developed many cooperative strategies of quad-rotor systems, one of which is the leader-follower formation scheme that allows for steering multiple quad-rotors to form a geometric pattern while tracking a leader/reference. For this sake, three classical approaches can be applied, that is, linearization [11, 15, 23, 24, 26, 29], inner-outer loop method [18, 19, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31] and feedback linearization approach [4, 5, 8, 20].

A direct approach for quad-rotor formation consists in linearizing quad-rotor model around maneuvering point. Due to easy implementation of linearized quad-rotor model, the control scheme reported in [11] elaborates the potential functions with its formation control law, achieving the formation pattern with collision avoidance behavior. The control design reported in [15] realizes cooperative formation of multiple heterogeneous agents, including many quad-rotors and linearized differentiable mobile robots moving on the ground. Given the possible interaction fault between adjacent quad-rotors during their formation tracking, two H_∞ -formation schemes are proposed in [23] and [26] respectively, presenting fault-tolerant capacity during flights of multiple quad-rotors. In [24], the result developed for high-order linear integrators is adapted to solve the formation problem of multiple quad-rotors with external disturbances. A finite-time formation tracking controller can be found in [29]. Some other literature, such as [16, 17, 21, 30], extend the results

developed for linear double integrators to achieve formation tracking of multiple quad-rotors directly. These formation tracking control laws, developed by either linearized quad-rotor model or linear double integrators, however, can only solve the formation rendezvous problem or formation tracking problem with a slowly-moving leader. They are incapable of steering quad-rotors to perform agile motions with large roll/pitch angles due to the loss of model nonlinearities in their designs.

As for the inner-outer loop approach, the longitudinal and latitudinal position errors therein are viewed as an outer loop, and the attitude errors in roll and pitch are called inner loop [13]. This approach becomes popular out of two facts. First, the altitude and yaw can be steered independently. Second, the roll and pitch angles can be viewed as virtual control inputs for the dynamics of longitudinal and latitudinal position. Some associated results can be found in [18, 19, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31]. In [18], a discontinuous observer for the formation trajectory is proposed based on neighboring connections and graph theory, which, together with the inner attitude algorithm, makes the formation errors converge to zero asymptotically. A discontinuous formation tracking controller reported in [22] obtains finite-time convergence of the quad-rotor formation errors. The centroid formation, steering the average position of all quad-rotors to track the leader's position, can be achieved by the control laws proposed in both [18] and [22]. In consideration of inefficiency of GPS during indoor flying, the works [19, 27] propose two vision-based formation control laws. The invertibility of the Laplacian matrix associated with an undirected connected interaction graph is made full use by [25], in which the quad-rotor formation error is proven to be convergent, and this convergent rate is proportional to the smallest eigenvalue of the interaction graph. The non-smooth consensus formation tracking scheme shown in [31] achieves the formation pattern with a constant speed. For agile coordination, a virtual structure approach utilized in [28] views each quad-rotor in the group

*yanlixia@buaa.edu.cn;mabaoli@buaa.edu.cn

as a rigid body, achieving swarm with over 200 quadrotors. However, the inner-outer loop formation schemes of multiple quadrotors generally lead to difficulties in obtaining the desired attitude derivatives for the inner-loop control. This is because the desired attitude (roll and pitch angles) includes the coordination position and velocities, and the direct calculation of desired attitude derivatives will contain unavailable information of unconnected quad-rotor. To obtain the desired attitude derivatives, the velocity observer approach [18], first derivative method [22] or direct differentiation [19] can be applied. As a result, the overall stability analysis becomes incomplete.

The feedback linearization approach involves coming up with system state transformations into an equivalent linear system through variable changes, state extensions and suitable control input. Although it is proved that the normal twelve-dimensional system of a quad-rotor is not feedback linearizable in [4], an extended system with fourteen system states is feedback linearizable with triple fourth-order position states and a second-order yaw state. This kind of dynamic extension is built upon the flat property of the quad-rotor and viewing the second-order state of thrust force as the control input to be designed. Classical results associated with this approach can be found in [5, 8]. The main inefficiency of feedback linearization based on dynamic extension lies in that the greater-than-zero total thrust control cannot be always ensured, which might obstruct the flight because the quad-rotor needs an upward thrust to hover in the air. To solve the problem for the dynamic-extension-based feedback linearization method associated with quad-rotor formation, a recent literature [20] proposes a control design based on Euler-Poincaré equations, by whose result the obtained thrust force control is kept being greater than zero all the time.

Motivated by the facts and challenges stated above, this paper makes further endeavors to consider the leader-follower formation issue for a team of quadrotors. To deal with this formation problem, we first establish a local tracking control law via non-regular feedback linearization method, given any reference signal with bounded derivatives and a reference altitude acceleration no more than gravitational acceleration. Then, a distributed observer is investigated by the reduced-order and linear time-varying techniques, solving the problem that only neighboring connection is available and only partial followers can know the leaders states. The combination of the local tracking control law and the distributed reduced-order observer leads to the formation tracking scheme. Compared with previous research, the main innovation points of proposed formation scheme are as follows:

- the safe maneuvering can be ensured as the total thrust of each quad-rotor is kept being greater than zero all the time, and simultaneously, the roll and

pitch are strictly limited in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$;

- the local tracking controller derived from non-regular feedback linearization method allows quadrotors for admissible agile motions with large roll and pitch angles;
- the fully distributed coordination without global interaction will not cause large communication burden when adding cooperative quadrotors to achieve complex formation pattern.

The rest is organized as follows. Section 2 contains quadrotor modeling, basic graph theory and problem formulation. Section 3 presents the main results. Section 4 considers the numerical simulation. Section 5 concludes the work briefly.

Notations: The norm $\|\cdot\|$ refers to Euclidean norm, the letter 'e' without subscript/superscript denotes exponent, 'diag(\cdot)' means diagonalization and I_n denotes a n -dimensional identity matrix.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Model Description




FIG. 1: The illustration of a quad-rotor.

The quad-rotor model used for control formulation and validation displays a symmetrical configuration, see an example in Figure 1, where $F^I(O_I x_I y_I z_I)$ denotes the inertial frame and $F^B(x_B y_B z_B)$ denotes the body-fixed frame. Suppose that there are n quadrotors with index belonging to $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For $i \in \mathcal{N}$, let $p_i = [x_i, y_i, z_i]^T$ be the position of the i -th quadrotor in inertial frame, and $\eta_i = [\phi_i, \theta_i, \psi_i]^T$ denote the roll angle ϕ_i , pitch angle θ_i and yaw angle ψ_i , respectively. The common assumption below can be used to simplify the quad-rotor modeling.

Assumption 1 *The quad-rotor body is rigid and with an invariant structure and aerodynamic parameters, and the thrust and drag are proportional to the square of the propeller speed.*

Based on Assumption 1, the quad-rotor dynamics can be described by [3, 29]

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{p}_i = R_i^T T_{iB}/m_i + G \\ M_i(\eta_i) \ddot{\eta}_i + C_i(\eta_i, \dot{\eta}_i) \dot{\eta}_i = \tau_{ic} \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

where $T_{iB} = [0, 0, F_i]^T$ is the thrust with respect to the body-fixed frame with F_i the total lift, m_i is the mass, $G = [0, 0, -g]^T$ denotes the gravity vector with respect to the inertial frame and $\tau_{ic} = [\tau_{i,\phi}, \tau_{i,\theta}, \tau_{i,\psi}]^T$ is the control torque. Moreover, the specific definitions of $M_i(\eta_i)$ and $C_i(\eta_i, \dot{\eta}_i)$ can be found in [3, 29].

To present the main idea concisely, define virtual control inputs by $u_{i,1} = F_i/m_i$ and $\tau_i = [u_{i,2}, u_{i,3}, u_{i,4}]^T$, where $\tau_i = M_i^{-1}(\eta_i)(\tau_{ic} - C_i(\eta_i, \dot{\eta}_i)\dot{\eta}_i)$. Then, rewrite the quad-rotor dynamics as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{x}_i = u_{i,1} (\cos \psi_i \sin \theta_i \cos \phi_i + \sin \psi_i \sin \phi_i) \\ \ddot{y}_i = u_{i,1} (\sin \psi_i \sin \theta_i \cos \phi_i - \cos \psi_i \sin \phi_i) \\ \ddot{z}_i = u_{i,1} \cos \theta_i \cos \phi_i - g \\ \ddot{\phi}_i = u_{i,2} \\ \ddot{\theta}_i = u_{i,3} \\ \ddot{\psi}_i = u_{i,4} \end{cases}. \quad (2)$$

Suppose that the leader agent with index 0 is time-parameterized and defined by

$$p_0(t) = [x_0(t), y_0(t), z_0(t)]^T, \quad (3)$$

where (x_0, y_0) denotes the coordinate of latitude and longitude and z_0 is the altitude. Steering multiple quad-rotors to form a pattern while tracking a leader is related to many potential applications such as cooperative patrolling and geometrical prospecting, it is therefore very important to maintain quad-rotors moving with fixed altitude in regards of safety and airspace limitations, which motivates the assumption below.

Assumption 2 *The latitudinal and longitudinal positions of the leader, x_0 and y_0 , are fourth-order differentiable with bounded derivatives; and the altitude z_0 is a constant.*

B. Graph Theory

A graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A}\}$ is used to describe the interaction among multiple quad-rotors, where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ denotes the node set, $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ is the edge set and \mathcal{A} is adjacent matrix [35]. Each node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ represents one quad-rotor, and an edge $\{(i, j) : i \neq j\} \in \mathcal{E}$ denotes that the quad-rotor j can send information to quad-rotor i via wireless module. The adjacent matrix is defined by $\mathcal{A} = \{a_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, otherwise $a_{ij} = 0$. Self connection is

forbidden by setting $a_{ii} = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$. For an undirected graph, $a_{ij} = 1 \Leftrightarrow a_{ji} = 1$ holds, denoting that the quad-rotor i and quad-rotor j can transmit information to each other. A path of graph \mathcal{G} is an edge sequence $\{(i, j_1), (j_2, j_3), \dots, (j_*, j)\}$. The in-degree matrix of graph \mathcal{G} is given by $\mathcal{D} = \text{diag}\{[l_{11}, l_{22}, \dots, l_{nn}]\}$, $l_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, and the Laplacian matrix can then be obtained as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{A}. \quad (4)$$

As reported in [14], the matrix \mathcal{L} is semi-positive definite and has only one zero eigenvalue and $n - 1$ positive eigenvalues provided that \mathcal{G} is undirected and connected. Define $a_{i0} = 1$ if there is a valid information flow from the leader to the i -th quad-rotor, otherwise $a_{i0} = 0$, which then leads to the matrix given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{B}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{B} = \text{diag}\{[a_{10}, \dots, a_{n0}]\}$. It has been shown in [14] that \mathcal{H} is positive definite if \mathcal{G} is connected and the matrix \mathcal{B} is non-trivial. Moreover, \mathcal{H} is symmetric if \mathcal{G} is undirected. For a basic formation setup, the assumption below is needed.

Assumption 3 *The graph \mathcal{G} is undirected and connected, and $\mathcal{B} \neq 0_{n \times n}$.*

Remark 1 $\mathcal{B} \neq 0$ means that there at least one quad-rotor can know the leader's position and derivatives up to appropriate orders.

C. Problem Formulation

In this note, the focus is set on achieving a fixed formation pattern. Define a constant vector by

$$\Delta_i = [d_{i,x}, d_{i,y}, d_{i,z}]^T, \quad (6)$$

and formation error by

$$\eta_i = \begin{bmatrix} x_i - x_0 - d_{i,x} \\ y_i - y_0 - d_{i,y} \\ z_i - z_0 - d_{i,z} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The control objective can then be stated as: *Based on the quad-rotor model (2) and Assumptions 1-3, find control laws $(u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, u_{i,3}, u_{i,4})$ so that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta_i = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$.*

III. THE MAIN RESULTS

The formation scheme includes a local controller and a distributed observer. Given any smooth reference trajectory with bounded derivatives and a less-than- g altitude

acceleration, the local controller is proposed firstly with the help of non-regular feedback linearization technique, steering the tracking errors converge to zero asymptotically. The distributed observer is then investigated via interaction between connected agents and is viewed as virtual reference trajectory. The leader-follower formation can be realized via applying the local control law on each follower quad-rotor to track its reference signal, see Figure 2 for an illustration.




FIG. 2: The illustration of formation control scheme.

A. Local Tracking Control Design

A lemma is needed to formulate the control design.

Lemma 1 [9] *The system*

$$\ddot{\xi} = -a_1 \tanh(\dot{\xi} + a_2 \xi) - a_3 \tanh(\dot{\xi}) \quad (8)$$

is globally asymptotically stable with respect to $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\dot{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, provided that $a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0$.

Let $p_{id} = [x_{id}, y_{id}, z_{id}]^T$ be the reference trajectory of the i -th quad-rotor and suppose that p_{id} is fourth-order differentiable with bounded derivatives and $|\ddot{z}_{id}(t)| < g, \forall t \geq 0$. The assumption $\ddot{z}_{id}(t) < g$ is made here due to concern that the altitude coordinations between quad-rotors will be addressed and z_{id} can be time-varying. Define errors

$$\begin{cases} e_{i,x} = x_i - x_{id} - d_{i,x} \\ e_{i,y} = y_i - y_{id} - d_{i,y} \\ e_{i,z} = z_i - z_{id} - d_{i,z} \end{cases}, \quad (9)$$

and calculate the second-order derivative of (9) as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{e}_{i,x} = u_{i,1} (\cos \psi_i \sin \theta_i \cos \phi_i + \sin \psi_i \sin \phi_i) - \ddot{x}_{id} \\ \ddot{e}_{i,y} = u_{i,1} (\sin \psi_i \sin \theta_i \cos \phi_i - \cos \psi_i \sin \phi_i) - \ddot{y}_{id} \\ \ddot{e}_{i,z} = u_{i,1} \cos \theta_i \cos \phi_i - g - \ddot{z}_{id} \end{cases}. \quad (10)$$

In view of (10), the non-regular feedback linearization method can be applied. The specific steps are:

1. Determine $u_{i,1}$ and $u_{i,4}$;

2. Basing on the designed $u_{i,1}$ and the closed-loop $e_{i,z}$ -dynamics, compute and obtain the feedback linearizable form of $[e_{i,x}, e_{i,y}]$, in which the control inputs $(u_{i,2}, u_{i,3})$ will be obviously contained;
3. Find a suitable feedback linearized control law for $(e_{i,x}, e_{i,y})$ -dynamics;

It is admissible to steer the yaw angle ψ_i to zero for formation purpose [22, 25] and determine $u_{i,4}$ in a PD-form by

$$u_{i,4} = -k_{1,\psi} \psi_i - k_{2,\psi} \dot{\psi}_i, \quad (11)$$

where $k_{1,\psi}, k_{2,\psi} > 0$. Suppose that $\theta_i, \phi_i \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and design $u_{i,1}$ by

$$u_{i,1} = \frac{1}{\cos \theta_i \cos \phi_i} \bar{u}_{i,1},$$

$$\bar{u}_{i,1} := g + \ddot{z}_{id} - k_{1,z} \tanh(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z}) - k_{3,z} \tanh \dot{e}_{i,z}, \quad (12)$$

where $k_{z,1}, k_{z,2}, k_{z,3} > 0$ and $k_{z,1} + k_{z,3} < g - |\ddot{z}_{id}|$. The term $\bar{u}_{i,1}$ is an intermediate variable for calculation convenience. Via substituting (12) into (10), $\ddot{e}_{i,z}$ becomes

$$\ddot{e}_{i,z} = -k_{1,z} \tanh(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z}) - k_{3,z} \tanh(\dot{e}_{i,z}), \quad (13)$$

which shows that, according to Lemma 1, $e_{i,z}$ is asymptotically stable. Additionally, it can be seen that $\bar{u}_{i,1} > 0, \forall t \geq 0$, which helps to formulate the control inputs $[u_{i,2}, u_{i,3}]^T$. By (12), organize the column $[\ddot{e}_{i,x}, \ddot{e}_{i,y}]^T$ by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \ddot{e}_{i,x} \\ \ddot{e}_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} = \bar{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S \begin{bmatrix} \tan \theta_i \\ \frac{\tan \phi_i}{\cos \theta_i} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{x}_{id} \\ \ddot{y}_{id} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$R_2(\psi_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi_i & -\sin \psi_i \\ \sin \psi_i & \cos \psi_i \end{bmatrix}, S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Differentiating (14) results

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{e}_{i,x}^{(3)} \\ \dot{e}_{i,y}^{(3)} \end{bmatrix} &= \underbrace{\left[\dot{\bar{u}}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) + \bar{u}_{i,1} \frac{dR_2(\psi_i)}{dt} \right]}_{\Xi_{i,1}} S \begin{bmatrix} \tan \theta_i \\ \frac{\tan \phi_i}{\cos \theta_i} \end{bmatrix} + \bar{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S M_i \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\phi}_i \\ \dot{\theta}_i \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \Xi_{i,1} + \bar{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S M_i \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\phi}_i \\ \dot{\theta}_i \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_{id}^{(3)} \\ \dot{y}_{id}^{(3)} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{u}}_{i,1} &= \dot{z}_{id}^{(3)} - k_{3,z} (1 - \tanh^2 \dot{e}_{i,z}) \ddot{e}_{i,z} \\ &\quad - k_{1,z} [1 - \tanh^2(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z})] (\ddot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} \dot{e}_{i,z}), \\ \frac{dR_2(\psi_i)}{dt} &= \dot{\psi}_i R_2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) R_2(\psi_i), \\ M_i &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sec^2 \theta_i \\ \sec^2 \phi_i \sec \theta_i & \tan \phi_i \tan \theta_i \sec \theta_i \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Via some direct computations, $[e_{i,x}^{(4)}, e_{i,y}^{(4)}]^T$ can be given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} e_{i,x}^{(4)} \\ e_{i,y}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix} = \Xi_{i,2} + \bar{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S M_i \begin{bmatrix} u_{i,2} \\ u_{i,3} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} x_{id}^{(4)} \\ y_{id}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

with derivations shown in (19) next page.

Then, the error states (18) motivates

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{i,2} \\ u_{i,3} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{M_i^{-1} S^{-1} R_2^{-1}(\psi_i)}{\bar{u}_{i,1}} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x_{id}^{(4)} \\ y_{id}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix} - \Xi_{i,2} + \begin{bmatrix} u_{i,x} \\ u_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \quad (20)$$

where $[u_{i,x}, u_{i,y}]^T$ is viewed as new control input, $S^{-1} = S$, $R_2(\psi_i) = R_2^T(\psi_i)$ and

$$M_i^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.25 \sin 2\phi_i \sin 2\theta_i & \cos^2 \phi_i \cos \theta_i \\ \cos^2 \theta_i & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Via substituting (20) into (18), we obtain the linearized form of $[e_{i,x}, e_{i,y}]^T$ -dynamics by

$$\begin{cases} e_{i,x}^{(4)} = u_{i,x} \\ e_{i,y}^{(4)} = u_{i,y} \end{cases}. \quad (22)$$

Concerning the linear form of (22), there are various strategies to formulate $[u_{i,x}, u_{i,y}]^T$, such as nested linear technique and nested saturation function method [33, 34]. For brief, we propose a linear control law by

$$\begin{cases} u_{i,x} = -k_{1,x} e_{i,x} - k_{2,x} \dot{e}_{i,x} - k_{3,x} \ddot{e}_{i,x} - k_{4,x} e_{i,x}^{(3)} \\ u_{i,y} = -k_{1,y} e_{i,y} - k_{2,y} \dot{e}_{i,y} - k_{3,y} \ddot{e}_{i,y} - k_{4,y} e_{i,y}^{(3)} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where the control gains $k_{1,x}, k_{2,x}, k_{3,x}, k_{4,x}, k_{1,y}, k_{2,y}, k_{3,y}, k_{4,y}$ should be selected so that the linearized system (22) is exponentially stable. Till now, the design of local tracking control law is completed. The following theorem validates the local control law.

Theorem 1 *Given any fourth-order differentiable reference trajectory $p_{id} = [x_{id}, y_{id}, z_{id}]^T$ with bounded derivatives and $|\ddot{z}_{id}(t)| < g$, the application of control laws (11)(12)(20)(23) on the quad-rotor model (2) ensures that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \begin{bmatrix} x_i - x_{id} \\ y_i - y_{id} \\ z_i - z_{id} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{i,x} \\ d_{i,y} \\ d_{i,z} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \psi_i = 0. \quad (24)$$

Proof. By the proposed control laws (11)(12)(20)(23), the $[e_{i,x}, e_{i,y}, e_{i,z}]$ -dynamics and the ψ_i -dynamics can be written as follows,

$$\begin{cases} e_{i,x}^{(4)} = -k_{1,x} e_{i,x} - k_{2,x} \dot{e}_{i,x} - k_{3,x} \ddot{e}_{i,x} - k_{4,x} e_{i,x}^{(3)} \\ e_{i,y}^{(4)} = -k_{1,y} e_{i,y} - k_{2,y} \dot{e}_{i,y} - k_{3,y} \ddot{e}_{i,y} - k_{4,y} e_{i,y}^{(3)} \\ \ddot{e}_{i,z} = -k_{1,z} \tanh(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z}) - k_{3,z} \tanh \dot{e}_{i,z} \\ \ddot{\psi}_i = -k_{1,\psi} \psi_i - k_{2,\psi} \dot{\psi}_i \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Based on (25) and Lemma 1 as well as classical linear stability theorem, it is direct to obtain (24). Moreover, the latitudinal and longitudinal states $e_{i,x}, \dot{e}_{i,x}, \ddot{e}_{i,x}, e_{i,y}, \dot{e}_{i,y}, \ddot{e}_{i,y}$ and $e_{i,y}^{(3)}$ globally uniformly exponentially converge to zero. The altitude errors $e_{i,z}, \dot{e}_{i,z}$ and $\ddot{e}_{i,z}$ are globally uniformly asymptotically convergent. \square

Observing equations (12)–(20), one may find out that it is essential to bound ϕ_i and θ_i in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ regarding the designs of (12) and (20). To demonstrate the condition under which $\phi_i, \theta_i \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ establishes, the proposition below is introduced.

Proposition 1 *Given any virtual reference trajectory $p_{id} = [x_{id}, y_{id}, z_{id}]^T$ with bounded derivatives and satisfying $|\ddot{z}_{id}(t)| < g$, applying any control law $[u_{i,x}, u_{i,y}]^T$ capable of achieving $(\ddot{e}_{i,x}, \ddot{e}_{i,y}) \in L_\infty$, and $u_{i,1}$ defined in (11) and any $u_{i,4} \in L_\infty$ on the quad-rotor (2) ensures that $\phi_i(t), \theta_i(t) \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2), \forall t \geq 0$.*

Proof. By (14), one has

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tan \theta_i \\ \tan \phi_i \\ \cos \theta_i \end{bmatrix} = \frac{R_2^{-1}(\psi_i) S^{-1}}{\bar{u}_{i,1}} \left[\begin{bmatrix} \ddot{e}_{i,x} \\ \ddot{e}_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{x}_{id} \\ \ddot{y}_{id} \end{bmatrix} \right], \quad (26)$$

which, together with $\ddot{e}_{i,x}, \ddot{e}_{i,y} \in L_\infty$ drawn from Theorem 1 and $\bar{u}_{i,1} > 0$ due to $k_{1,z} + k_{3,z} < g - |\ddot{z}_{id}|$, shows that $\tan \theta_i \in L_\infty$ and $\tan \phi_i \in L_\infty$. Hence, $\phi_i(t), \theta_i(t) \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2), \forall t \geq 0$. \square

The proposition 1 illustrates the sufficient condition to avoid singularity when calculating the control laws (12)(20)(23), that is, basically, ensuring $\ddot{e}_{i,x}, \ddot{e}_{i,y} \in L_\infty$.

Remark 2 *By (26), further computation can obtain the roll and pitch angles of steady state, with trivial tracking errors, as follows,*

$$\begin{cases} \phi_i = \arctan\left(-\frac{\ddot{y}_{id}}{\sqrt{\ddot{x}_{id}^2 + (g + \ddot{z}_{id})^2}}\right) \\ \theta_i = \arctan \frac{\ddot{x}_{id}}{g + \ddot{z}_{id}} \end{cases}. \quad (27)$$

Remark 3 *Note that the control inputs $(u_{i,2}, u_{i,3})$ are directly designed with position error states rather than steering the roll and pitch to track their reference signals as traditional inner-outer loop methods do. One of such reference signals refers to the virtual roll and pitch angles (ϕ_{id}, θ_{id}) solved according to*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tan \theta_{id} \\ \tan \phi_{id} \\ \cos \theta_{id} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{R_2^{-1}(\psi_i) S^{-1}}{\bar{u}_{i,1}} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{e}_{i,x} \\ \ddot{e}_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{x}_{id} \\ \ddot{y}_{id} \end{bmatrix} + b_1 \begin{bmatrix} e_{i,x} \\ e_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} + b_2 \begin{bmatrix} \dot{e}_{i,x} \\ \dot{e}_{i,y} \end{bmatrix} \right\} \quad (28)$$

with suitable $b_1, b_2 > 0$. Steering (ϕ_i, θ_i) to (ϕ_{id}, θ_{id}) can then lead to $[\ddot{e}_{i,x}, \ddot{e}_{i,y}]^T = -b_1 [e_{i,x}, e_{i,y}]^T - b_2 [\dot{e}_{i,x}, \dot{e}_{i,y}]^T$ and the position error $[e_{i,x}, e_{i,y}]^T$ would converge to zero.

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} e_{i,x}^{(4)} \\ e_{i,y}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix} &= \underbrace{\dot{\Xi}_{i,1} + \left[\ddot{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S M_i + \bar{u}_{i,1} \frac{dR_2(\psi_i)}{dt} S M_i + \bar{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S \frac{dM_i}{dt} \right]}_{\Xi_{i,2}} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\phi}_i \\ \dot{\theta}_i \end{bmatrix} + \bar{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) S M_i \begin{bmatrix} u_{i,2} \\ u_{i,3} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} x_{id}^{(4)} \\ y_{id}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix}, \\
\dot{\Xi}_{i,1} &= \left[\ddot{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) + 2\dot{u}_{i,1} \frac{dR_2(\psi_i)}{dt} + \bar{u}_{i,1} \frac{d^2 R_2(\psi_i)}{dt^2} \right] S \begin{bmatrix} \tan \theta_i \\ \frac{\tan \phi_i}{\cos \theta_i} \end{bmatrix} + \left(\dot{u}_{i,1} R_2(\psi_i) + \bar{u}_{i,1} \frac{dR_2(\psi_i)}{dt} \right) S M_i \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\phi}_i \\ \dot{\theta}_i \end{bmatrix}, \\
\ddot{u}_{i,1} &= z_{id}^{(4)} + 2k_{1,z} [1 - \tanh^2(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z})] (\ddot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} \dot{e}_{i,z})^2 \tanh(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z}) \\
&\quad - k_{1,z} [1 - \tanh^2(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z})] (e_{i,z}^{(3)} + k_{2,z} \ddot{e}_{i,z}) + 2k_{3,z} (1 - \tanh^2 \dot{e}_{i,z}) \ddot{e}_{i,z}^2 \tanh \dot{e}_{i,z} - k_{3,z} (1 - \tanh^2 \dot{e}_{i,z}) e_{i,z}^{(3)}, \\
e_{i,z}^{(3)} &= -k_{1,z} [1 - \tanh^2(\dot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} e_{i,z})] (\ddot{e}_{i,z} + k_{2,z} \dot{e}_{i,z}) - k_{3,z} (1 - \tanh^2 \dot{e}_{i,z}) \ddot{e}_{i,z}, \\
\frac{dR_2^2(\psi_i)}{dt^2} &= \ddot{\psi}_i R_2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) R_2(\psi_i) + \dot{\psi}_i^2 R_2^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) R_2(\psi_i), \\
\frac{dM_i}{dt} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2\dot{\theta}_i \sec^2 \theta_i \tan \theta_i \\ 2\dot{\phi}_i \sec^2 \phi_i \tan \phi_i \sec \phi_i + \dot{\theta}_i \sec^2 \phi_i \tan \theta_i \sec \theta_i & \dot{\phi}_i \sec^2 \phi_i \tan \theta_i \sec \theta_i + \dot{\theta}_i \tan \phi_i (\sec^3 \theta_i + \tan \theta_i \sec \theta_i) \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Remark 4 Different from traditional feedback linearization results having fourteen states to be regulated [18, 19, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31], there are only twelve control states to be regulated in our design.

Remark 5 By (22), the latitudinal and longitudinal position errors are converted into two fourth-order integrators via viewing $(u_{i,x}, u_{i,y})$ as control inputs. It is therefore able to design $(u_{i,x}, u_{i,y})$ with the help of classical linear techniques, such as saturated method [33, 34].

Remark 6 The application of control law (11)(12)(20)(23) on a real quad-rotor should consider more practical scenarios such as available thrust, mass and reference acceleration as well as other requirements. This note does not take these factors into account to make the main idea be presented in a concise manner.

B. Distributed Observer (Virtual Reference Trajectory)

To achieve formation via a local tracking control law, as stated above, the virtual reference trajectory $p_{id} = [x_{id}, y_{id}, z_{id}]^T$ should have bounded derivatives and satisfy $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} [x_{id}, y_{id}, z_{id}]^T = [x_0, y_0, z_0]^T$ and $|\ddot{z}_{id}(t)| < g$. Two problems obstruct the design of such reference trajectory, that is, only partial quad-rotors can know the leader's states and only neighboring interaction is available. Concerning these problems and the fact that z_{id} needs an acceleration less than g while there is no such restriction about $[x_{id}, y_{id}]^T$, the designs of (x_{id}, y_{id}) and z_{id} are separately presented in two lemmas below. Let $\zeta_{id} = [x_{id}, y_{id}]^T$ and $\zeta_0 = [x_0, y_0]^T$ and extend the second-order observer reported in our previous work [32], propose the following lemma.

Lemma 2 Given Assumptions 2-3, the fourth-order dynamics described by

$$\zeta_{id}^{(4)} = -g_3 \zeta_{id}^{(3)} - g_2 \ddot{\zeta}_{id} - g_1 \dot{\zeta}_{id} - g_4 c_i - Q_i c_i \tag{29}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
c_i &= [c_{i,x}, c_{i,y}]^T \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (\zeta_{id}^{(3)} - \zeta_{jd}^{(3)}) + a_{i0} (\zeta_{id}^{(3)} - \zeta_0^{(3)}) \\
&\quad + g_3 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (\ddot{\zeta}_{id} - \ddot{\zeta}_{jd}) + g_3 a_{i0} (\ddot{\zeta}_{id} - \ddot{\zeta}_0) \\
&\quad + g_2 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (\dot{\zeta}_{id} - \dot{\zeta}_{jd}) + g_2 a_{i0} (\dot{\zeta}_{id} - \dot{\zeta}_0) \\
&\quad + g_1 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (\zeta_{id} - \zeta_{jd}) + g_2 a_{i0} (\zeta_{id} - \zeta_0) \\
Q_i &= \text{diag} \left\{ \left[\frac{g_{5,x}}{|c_{i,x}| + \gamma e^{-\lambda t}}, \frac{g_{5,y}}{|c_{i,y}| + \gamma e^{-\lambda t}} \right] \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

and gain selections

$$\begin{aligned}
g_2 &> 0, g_3 > 0, g_2 g_3 > g_1 > 0, g_4 > 0, \gamma > 0, \lambda > 0, \\
g_{5,x} &\geq \sigma_{0,x} := \sup_{t \geq 0} \left| x_0^{(4)} + g_3 x_0^{(3)} + g_2 \ddot{x}_0 + g_1 \dot{x}_0 \right|, \\
g_{5,y} &\geq \sigma_{0,y} := \sup_{t \geq 0} \left| y_0^{(4)} + g_3 y_0^{(3)} + g_2 \ddot{y}_0 + g_1 \dot{y}_0 \right|,
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

ensures that $\zeta_{id}, \dot{\zeta}_{id}, \ddot{\zeta}_{id}$ and $\zeta_{id}^{(3)}$ are bounded, and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{id} = \zeta_0, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\zeta}_{id} = \dot{\zeta}_0, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \ddot{\zeta}_{id} = \ddot{\zeta}_0, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{id}^{(3)} = \zeta_0^{(3)}. \tag{32}$$

Proof. See Appendix A. \square

For z_{id} , we propose the following lemma,

Lemma 3 *The second-order dynamics*

$$\ddot{z}_{id} = -h_1 \tanh(\dot{z}_{id} + h_2(z_{id} - z_{ia})) - h_3 \tanh \dot{z}_{id} \quad (33)$$

driven by

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{z}_{ia} = -h_4(z_{ia} - z_{ib}) - h_5 \dot{z}_{ia} \\ \ddot{z}_{ib} = -h_6 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(z_{ib} - z_{jb}) - h_6 a_{i0}(z_{ib} - z_0) \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

with $h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4, h_5, h_6 > 0$ and $h_1 + h_3 < g$, ensures that

1. $|\ddot{z}_{id}(t)| < g$;
2. $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} z_{id} = z_0$.

Proof. The first claim can be verified directly by selecting gains so that $h_1 + h_3 < g$. To prove the second claim, we prove $z_{ib} \rightarrow z_0, z_{ia} \rightarrow z_0$ and $z_{id} \rightarrow z_0$ sequentially. As reported in many classical literatures, see [35] for example, it is direct to conclude that $z_{ib} - z_0$ and \dot{z}_{ib} are GES with decaying rate being much related to the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix \mathcal{H} [25]. Therefore, by $\ddot{z}_{ia} = -h_4(z_{ia} - z_0) - h_5 \dot{z}_{ia} + h_4(z_{ib} - z_0)$ derived from (34), $z_{ia} - z_0$ converges to zero globally exponentially. For the second-order dynamics (33), define errors $\varepsilon_{i,1} = z_{id} - z_0, \varepsilon_{i,2} = \dot{\varepsilon}_{i,1}$ with time-derivatives given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\varepsilon}_{i,1} = \varepsilon_{i,2} \\ \dot{\varepsilon}_{i,2} = -h_1 \tanh(\varepsilon_{i,2} + h_2 \varepsilon_{i,1}) - h_3 \tanh \varepsilon_{i,2} + \Delta_i \end{cases}, \quad (35)$$

where $\Delta_i = -h_1(\tanh(\varepsilon_{i,2} + h_2(z_{id} - z_{ia})) - \tanh(\varepsilon_{i,2} + h_2(z_{id} - z_0)))$. By the mean value theorem, we have $|\Delta_i| < h_1|z_{ia} - z_0|$. Hence, Δ_i globally exponentially converges to zero. For the nominal part $\dot{\varepsilon}_{i,1} = \varepsilon_{i,2}, \dot{\varepsilon}_{i,2} = -h_1 \tanh(\varepsilon_{i,2} + h_2 \varepsilon_{i,1}) - h_3 \tanh(\varepsilon_{i,2})$, one can choose a positive definite function by $V = h_1 \ln \cosh(\varepsilon_{i,2} + h_2 \varepsilon_{i,1}) + h_3 \ln \cosh \varepsilon_{i,2} + \frac{1}{2} h_2 \varepsilon_{i,2}^2$ [9], whose derivative is $\dot{V} = -[h_1 \tanh(\varepsilon_{i,2} + h_2 \varepsilon_{i,1}) + h_3 \tanh \varepsilon_{i,2}]^2 - h_2 h_3 \varepsilon_{i,2} \tanh \varepsilon_{i,2} < 0$. Therefore, the nominal system associated with (35) is globally asymptotically stable, which, together with the cascade theory [36, 37] and the fact that Δ_i is GES, shows that $[\varepsilon_{i,1}, \varepsilon_{i,2}]^T$ globally asymptotically converges to zero. The claim $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} z_{id} = z_0$ follows. \square

The observers proposed in Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 solve the problem that the leader's states are not available to all quad-rotors. They act as interactions among quad-rotors, and can be generated by on-board computer and transmitted by wireless modules. Moreover, the derivatives of the proposed observer are bounded up to the

fourth order and satisfy $\ddot{z}_{id} < g$. It is therefore admissible to view the observers (29)(33) as virtual reference trajectory for each quad-rotor and apply the local control law stated in previous subsection.

C. Brief discussion

The theorem below concludes the formation scheme briefly.

Theorem 2 *Given Assumptions 1-3, applying the local tracking control laws (11)(12)(20)(23) and distributed observers (29)(33) on a team of quad-rotors described by (2) achieves*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \begin{bmatrix} x_i - x_0 \\ y_i - y_0 \\ z_i - z_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{i,x} \\ d_{i,y} \\ d_{i,z} \end{bmatrix}, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (36)$$

Proof. The actual formation error $p_i - p_0 - \Delta_i$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_i - p_0 - \Delta_i\| &= \|p_i - p_{id} - \Delta_i + p_{id} - p_0\| \\ &\leq \|p_i - p_{id} - \Delta_i\| + \|p_{id} - p_0\|, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

which, together with Theorem 1, Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, shows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} p_i - p_0 - \Delta_i = [0, 0, 0]^T$. The claim (36) follows. \square

Remark 7 *Inspired by the analysis above, one can solve other cooperative problems of quad-rotor systems (such as time-varying formation and communication delay) via modifying associated control protocols developed for linear integrators into virtual reference trajectories meeting the requirements of our local controller.*

Remark 8 *The formation scheme is distributed since only neighboring communication is available. It is therefore direct to add cooperative quad-rotors as required.*

IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

To validate the proposed distributed formation control algorithm we employ a scenario for simulation, concerning four quad-rotors tracking a leader while performing a fixed square pattern. Without loss of generality, the undirected interaction network is described by the figure below.




FIG. 3: The interaction network.

To form a fixed square pattern, define four constant vectors by $\Delta_1 = [20, 20, 0]^T, \Delta_2 = [-20, 20, 0]^T, \Delta_3 = [-20, -20, 0]^T, \Delta_4 = [20, -20, 0]^T$. Two cases are considered as follows,

• **Case1:** $p_0(t) = [100 \sin 0.1t, -100 \cos 0.1t, 100]^T$,


• **Case2:** $p_0(t) = [0, 0, 50]^T$.

For convenience, we select the identical initial states by $x_1(0) = -10, y_1(0) = 12, z_1(0) = 0, \phi_1(0) = 0, \theta_1(0) = 0, \psi_1(0) = \pi/8, x_2(0) = 40, y_2(0) = -12, z_2(0) = 5, \phi_2(0) = 0, \theta_2(0) = 0, \psi_2(0) = \pi/2, x_3(0) = 20, y_3(0) = 10, z_3(0) = 6, \phi_3(0) = 0, \theta_3(0) = 0, \psi_3(0) = \pi, x_4(0) = -20, y_4(0) = 45, z_4(0) = 7, \phi_4(0) = 0, \theta_4(0) = 0, \psi_4(0) = \pi/5$. The control gains are also selected to be identically for two cases as $k_{1,z} = 1, k_{2,z} = 0.5, k_{3,z} = 0.5, k_{1,x} = 0.2, k_{2,x} = 1.6, k_{3,x} = 3.6, k_{4,x} = 3.2, k_{1,y} = 0.2, k_{2,y} = 1.6, k_{3,y} = 3.6, k_{4,y} = 3.2, k_{1,\psi} = 0.5, k_{2,\psi} = 0.5, g_1 = 0.125, g_2 = 0.75, g_3 = 0.85, g_4 = 0.1, g_{5,x} = 2.1, g_{5,y} = 2.1, \gamma = 15, \lambda = 0.1, h_1 = 0.5, h_2 = 0.5, h_3 = 0.5, h_4 = 0.5, h_5 = 0.5, h_6 = 1$. To start the simulation, the initial values of the virtual trajectory is chosen as $\zeta_{id} = [x_{id}(0), y_{id}(0)]^T = [x_i(0), y_i(0)]^T$ and $z_{id}(0) = z_i(0)$ with $i = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and their derivatives are supposed to be zero.


Three sub-figures are depicted for each case with sub-figure (a) being the geometric position paths of quadrotors, sub-figure (b) being the norm of formation error $p_i - p_0 - \Delta_i$ and sub-figure (c) being the attitude angles. The simulation results of these two cases are shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5 respectively. It can be seen from sub-figure (a) of both two cases that the follower quadrotors form the square pattern while tracking the leader with the predefined position displacements. The sub-figure (b) shows that the formation error norm is asymptotically convergent. The attitudes of all followers are kept in reasonable ranges that can be demonstrated by sub-figure (c). All of the simulation results illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed formation algorithm.

V. CONCLUSION


This note solves the leader-follower formation problem for multiple quadrotors. The whole formation control scheme involves two parts, namely, a local tracking control law and a distributed observer. Given a smooth reference trajectory with bounded derivatives, a novel local tracking control law is proposed with the help of non-regular feedback linearization approach. In view of the fact that the leader's states are not available to all followers, we propose a distributed observer and feed it into the local tracking control law via viewing it as virtual reference trajectory. As for future research, we will take into account more practical problem associated quad-rotor formation such as communication failure, wind turbulence and inter-agent collision avoidance.



(a) Geometric position paths(*:Start point).




(b) The norm of formation errors.




(c) The attitude angles of each quad-rotor(Unit:degree).

FIG. 4: The simulation results of **Case 1**.


Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 2



(a) Geometric position paths(*:Start point).



(b) The norm of formation errors.



(c) The attitude angles of each quad-rotor(Unit:degree).

FIG. 5: The simulation results of **Case 2**.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61573034 and Grant 61327807.

Proof. Define

$$\xi_i = \zeta_{id} - \zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, s_i = \xi_i^{(3)} + g_3 \ddot{\xi}_i + g_2 \dot{\xi}_i + g_1 \xi_i \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (38)$$

and note that $s_i = 0$ leads to $\xi_i^{(3)} = -g_3 \ddot{\xi}_i - g_2 \dot{\xi}_i - g_1 \xi_i$. As a result, by gains $g_2 > 0, g_3 > 0, g_2 g_3 > g_1 > 0$, the objective (32) can be realized. Hence, let us prove $s_i \rightarrow 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$ and define some helpful $2n$ -dimensional vectors by

$$c = [c_1^T, c_2^T, \dots, c_n^T]^T, \xi = [\xi_1^T, \xi_2^T, \dots, \xi_n^T]^T, s = [s_1^T, s_2^T, \dots, s_n^T]^T. \quad (39)$$

Direct computations result with

$$\begin{aligned} c &= (\mathcal{H} \otimes I_2) s, \\ s &= \xi^{(3)} + g_3 \ddot{\xi} + g_2 \dot{\xi} + g_1 \xi, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where ' \otimes ' denotes Kronecker product. By Assumption 3, the matrix \mathcal{H} is symmetric, invertible and positive definite [14], and hence, so is $\mathcal{H} \otimes I_2$. The convergence $c \rightarrow 0_{2n}$ is equivalent with $s \rightarrow 0_{2n}$. Choose a positive definite function

$$W = 0.5c^T (\mathcal{H} \otimes I_2)^{-1} c, \quad (41)$$

whose derivative can be obtained as $\dot{W} = c^T (\mathcal{H} \otimes I_2) \dot{c} = c^T \dot{s}$. By the fact

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s} &= \zeta_{id}^{(4)} - 1_n \otimes \zeta_0^{(4)} + g_3 (\zeta_{id}^{(3)} - 1_n \otimes \zeta_0^{(3)}) + g_2 (\ddot{\zeta}_{id} - 1_n \otimes \ddot{\zeta}_0) \\ &\quad + g_1 (\dot{\zeta}_{id} - 1_n \otimes \dot{\zeta}_0) \\ &= -g_4 c - Qc - 1_n \otimes (\zeta_0^{(4)} + g_3 \zeta_0^{(3)} + g_2 \ddot{\zeta}_0 + g_1 \dot{\zeta}_0), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

with $Q = \text{diag}\{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$, rewrite \dot{W} by,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W} &= -g_4 c^T c - c^T Qc - c^T 1_n \otimes (\zeta_0^{(4)} + g_3 \zeta_0^{(3)} + g_2 \ddot{\zeta}_0 + g_1 \dot{\zeta}_0) \\ &= -g_4 \|c\|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_{5,x} c_{i,x}^2}{|c_{i,x}| + \gamma e^{-\lambda t}} - \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,x} (x_0^{(4)} + g_3 x_0^{(3)} + g_2 \ddot{x}_0 + g_1 \dot{x}_0) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g_{5,y} c_{i,y}^2}{|c_{i,y}| + \gamma e^{-\lambda t}} - \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,y} (y_0^{(4)} + g_3 y_0^{(3)} + g_2 \ddot{y}_0 + g_1 \dot{y}_0) \\ &\leq -g_4 \|c\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{g_{5,x} c_{i,x}^2}{|c_{i,x}| + \gamma e^{-\lambda t}} - |c_{i,x}| \sigma_{0,x} \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{g_{5,y} c_{i,y}^2}{|c_{i,y}| + \gamma e^{-\lambda t}} - |c_{i,y}| \sigma_{0,y} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

which, combined with the fact $W \geq \frac{\|c\|^2}{2\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{H})}$, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W} &\leq -2g_4\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{H})W + \gamma n(\sigma_{0,x} + \sigma_{0,y})e^{-\lambda t} \\ &= -qW + \sigma_0 e^{-\lambda t}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $q := 2g_4\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{H})$, $\sigma_0 := \gamma n(\sigma_{0,x} + \sigma_{0,y})$ and inequality $\frac{a_1 x^2}{|x| + a_2} - a_3|x| \geq -a_2 a_3$, with real numbers $a_1 \geq a_3 \geq 0$ and $a_2 > 0$, is applied. By comparison principle [10], integrating both sides of (44) results

$$W(t) \leq \begin{cases} W_1(t) = e^{-qt}W(0) + \sigma_0 \frac{e^{-qt} - e^{-\lambda t}}{\lambda - q}, & \text{if } q \neq \lambda; \\ W_2(t) = e^{-qt}W(0) + \sigma_0 t e^{-qt}, & \text{if } q = \lambda. \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

For $W_1(t)$, it satisfies

$$W_1(t) \leq e^{-qt}W(0) + \frac{2\sigma_0}{|\lambda - q|} e^{-\min\{q,\lambda\}t}. \quad (46)$$

For $W_2(t)$, by the fact $te^{-at} \leq \frac{1}{ae}$, $\forall t \geq 0, a = 0.5\lambda$, it satisfies

$$W_2(t) \leq e^{-qt}W(0) + \frac{2\sigma_0}{\lambda e} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}t} \quad (47)$$

Hence, both W_1 and W_2 converge to zero globally exponentially, which means that c and s are globally exponentially stable (GES). By (40), one has $\xi^{(3)} = -g_3\dot{\xi} - g_2\ddot{\xi} - g_1\xi + s$. The vectors $\xi, \dot{\xi}, \ddot{\xi}$ and $\xi^{(3)}$ are GES due to fact that both $\xi^{(3)} = -g_3\dot{\xi} - g_2\ddot{\xi} - g_1\xi$ and s -dynamics are GES[36, 37]. Therefore, the claims (32) follow. \square

-
- [1] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(9)(2004) 1520–1533.
 - [2] Z. Sun and X. Xia, On Nonregular Feedback Linearization, *Automatica*, 33(7)(1997)1339-1344.
 - [3] S. Bouabdallah and R. Siegwart, Backstepping and sliding-mode techniques applied to an indoor micro quadrotor, *Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Conference in Robotics and Automation*, (2005)2247–2252.
 - [4] A. Benallegue, A. Mokhtari, and L. Fridman, Feedback linearization and high order sliding mode observer for a quad-rotor UAV, *International Workshop in Variable Structure Systems*, (2006)365–372.
 - [5] A. Mokhtari, N. K. M'Sirdi, K. Meghriche, and A. Belaidi, Feedback linearization and linear observer for a quad-rotor unmanned aerial vehicle, *Advanced Robotics*, 20(1)(2006)71–91.
 - [6] A. Tayebi and S. McGilvray, Attitude stabilization of a VTOL quad-rotor aircraft, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 14(3)(2006)562–571.
 - [7] S. Bouabdallah and R. Siegwart, Full control of a quadrotor, *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, (2007)153–158.
 - [8] D. Lee, H. Jin Kim, and S. Sastry, Feedback linearization vs. adaptive sliding mode control for a quad-rotor helicopter, *International Journal of control, Automation and systems*, 7(3)(2009)419–428.
 - [9] A. Ailon, Simple Tracking Controllers for Autonomous VTOL Aircraft With Bounded Inputs, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(3)(2010)737–743.
 - [10] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear control system*, Prentice Hall, 2011.
 - [11] L. Garcia-Delgado, A. Dzul, V. Santibanez, and M. Llama, Quad-rotors formation based on potential functions with obstacle avoidance, *IET Control Theory & Applications*, 6(12)(2012)1787–1802.
 - [12] Z. T. Dydek, A. M. Annaswamy, and E. Lavretsky, Adaptive configuration control of multiple UAVs, *Control Engineering Practice*, 21(8)(2013)1043–1052.
 - [13] B. and B. Fidan, Distributed Cohesive Motion Control of Flight Vehicle Formations, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 60(12)(2013) 5763–5772.
 - [14] Z. Meng, Z. Lin, and W. Ren, Robust cooperative tracking for multiple non-identical second-order nonlinear systems, *Automatica*, 49(8)(2013)2363–2372.
 - [15] R. Rahimi, F. Abdollahi, and K. Naqshi, Time-varying formation control of a collaborative heterogeneous multi agent system, *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 62(12)(2014) 1799–1805.
 - [16] X. Dong, B. Yu, Z. Shi, and Y. Zhong, Time-Varying Formation Control for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Theories and Applications, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 23(1)(2015)340–348.
 - [17] X. Dong, Y. Zhou, Z. Ren, and Y. Zhong, Time-varying formation control for unmanned aerial vehicles with switching interaction topologies, *Control Engineering Practice*, 46(2016)26–36.
 - [18] J. Ghommam, L. F. Luque-Vega, B. Castillo-Toledo, and M. Saad, Three-dimensional distributed tracking control for multiple quad-rotor helicopters, *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 353(10)(2016)2344–2372.
 - [19] E. Montijano, E. Cristofalo, D. Zhou, M. Schwager, and C. Sags, Vision-Based Distributed Formation Control Without an External Positioning System, *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 32(2)(2016)339–351.
 - [20] D. E. Chang and Y. Eun, Global Chartwise Feedback Linearization of the Quadcopter With a Thrust Positivity Preserving Dynamic Extension, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(9)(2017)4747–4752.
 - [21] X. Dong, Y. Zhou, Z. Ren, and Y. Zhong, Time-Varying Formation Tracking for Second-Order Multi-Agent Systems Subjected to Switching Topologies With Application to Quadrotor Formation Flying, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 64(6)(2017)5014–5024.
 - [22] H. Du, W. Zhu, G. Wen, and D. Wu, Finite-time formation control for a group of quad-rotor aircraft, *Aerospace Science and Technology*, 69(2017)609–616.

- [23] J. Shi, Y. Yang, J. Sun, X. He, D. Zhou, and Y. Zhong, Fault-tolerant formation control of non-linear multi-vehicle systems with application to quad-rotors, *IET Control Theory & Applications*, 11(17)(2017)3179–3190.
- [24] K. Fathian, T. H. Summers, and N. R. Gans, Robust Distributed Formation Control of Agents With Higher-Order Dynamics, *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(3)(2018)495–500.
- [25] Z. Hou and I. Fantoni, Interactive LeaderFollower Consensus of Multiple Quadrotors Based on Composite Non-linear Feedback Control, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 26(5)(2018)1732–1743.
- [26] R. T. Y. Thien and Y. Kim, Decentralized formation flight via PID and integral sliding mode control, *Aerospace Science and Technology*, 81(2018)322–332.
- [27] A. Weinstein, A. Cho, G. Loianno, and V. Kumar, Visual Inertial Odometry Swarm: An Autonomous Swarm of Vision-Based Quadrotors, *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 3(3)(2018)1801–1807.
- [28] D. Zhou, Z. Wang, and M. Schwager, Agile Coordination and Assistive Collision Avoidance for Quadrotor Swarms Using Virtual Structures, *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 34(4)(2018)916–923.
- [29] X. Ai and J. Yu, Flatness-based finite-time leader-follower formation control of multiple quad-rotors with external disturbances, *Aerospace Science and Technology*, 92(2019) 20–33.
- [30] X. Dong, Y. Hua, Y. Zhou, Z. Ren, and Y. Zhong, Theory and Experiment on Formation-Containment Control of Multiple Multirotor Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 16(1)(2019) 229–240.
- [31] H. Du, W. Zhu, G. Wen, Z. Duan, and L. J., Distributed Formation Control of Multiple Quadrotor Aircraft Based on Nonsmooth Consensus Algorithms, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 49(1)(2019)342–353.
- [32] L. Yan , B. Ma, Practical formation tracking control of multiple unicycle robots, *IEEE Access*, 7(2019)113417 - 113426.
- [33] S. Amini, B. Ahi, and M. Haeri, Control of high order integrator chain systems subjected to disturbance and saturated control: A new adaptive scheme, *Automatica*, 100(2019)108–113.
- [34] Y. Xie and Z. Lin, Global optimal consensus for higher-order multi-agent systems with bounded controls, *Automatica*, 99(2019)301–307.
- [35] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(9)(2004)1520–1533.
- [36] E. Panteley and A. Loria, On global uniform asymptotic stability of nonlinear time-varying systems in cascade, *Systems & Control Letters*, 33(2)(1998)131–138.
- [37] E. Panteley and A. Lora, Growth rate conditions for uniform asymptotic stability of cascaded time-varying systems, *Automatica*, 37(3)(2001)453–460.