

# Attitude Tracking for Rigid Bodies Using Vector and Biased Gyro Measurements\*

Eduardo Espíndola and Yu Tang

**Abstract**—The rigid-body attitude tracking using vector and biased gyro measurements with unknown inertia matrix is studied in this note. First, a gyro-bias observer with global exponential stability is designed. Then, an attitude tracking controller based on this observer is devised, ensuring almost global asymptotic stability and almost semiglobal exponential stability. A separation property of the combined observer-controller is proved. Lastly, an adaptive attitude tracking controller relying on a modified gyro-bias observer and with no over-parametrization is developed to deal with the unknown inertia matrix. The proposed control schemes require neither an explicit attitude representation nor any attitude estimation, but only the measurement of at least two non-collinear known inertial reference vectors and biased gyro rate, which can be obtained by common low-cost IMU sensors. Simulations are included to illustrate the proposed adaptive controller under noisy measurements.

**Index Terms**—Adaptive control, attitude tracking, gyro bias estimation, vector measurements.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE attitude control for rigid bodies has been studied for decades under the assumption that attitude measurements are available [1], [2], [3]. In practice, the attitude is commonly estimated from vector measurements provided by inertial measurement units (IMUs) (see, e.g., [4], [5], [6], [7]). However, use of attitude estimation in closed loop with a controller must be analyzed to ensure overall stability. Several approaches have been proposed to address attitude control using vector measurements since the pioneering work [8], which can be categorized as direct and indirect. In the direct approach, no representation of the attitude and therefore no estimation of the attitude is needed, thus, inertial vector measurements are used directly in the control synthesis [8], [9], [10]. In the indirect approach, on the other hand, the attitude is estimated for control purposes [11], [12], [13], [14]. A combined approach is presented in [15]. The direct approach has advantages that it simplifies the stability analysis, and most importantly reduces the undesired equilibria introduced by the attitude observer in the closed loop. For the attitude stabilization problem, vector measurements are sufficient [8], [13]. When the attitude tracking is considered, gyro-rate measurements are also needed [9], [15], and the gyro bias must be corrected [12], [14]. The problem becomes even more complicated if in addition the inertia matrix is unknown, thus the gyro bias and the inertia

matrix must be estimated simultaneously, arising a nonlinear parameterization issue. To overcome the nonlinear parameterization, over-parameterization is often employed (see, e.g., [12], [14] and the references cited therein).

The rigid-body attitude tracking using vector and biased gyro measurements with unknown inertia matrix is studied in this note. The organization and contributions are stated as follows. A globally exponentially stable gyro-bias observer is designed in Section III. In Section IV, two attitude tracking controllers, nonadaptive and adaptive, using vector and biased gyro measurements, are designed using the direct approach. The attitude tracking problem is formulated as an alignment problem between the vector measurements and their desired values, with the alignment errors defined by the inner product and the cross-product between them. The closed-loop system contains, in addition to a set of undesired equilibria, the desired attitude as its equilibrium. By exploiting the relationship between these error variables near the undesired equilibria, a strict Lyapunov function is proposed, which allows achieving almost global asymptotic stability (AGAS) and almost semiglobal exponential stability (ASGES) of the desired equilibrium in contrast to only AGAS in [8], [12], [13], [9]. Moreover, the proposed gyro-bias observer allows to prove a separation property in the combined observer and the nonadaptive controller. When the inertia matrix is unknown, a modified version of the gyro-bias observer avoids over-parameterization in the adaptive controller, in contrast with those adaptive controllers in [12], [14]. In Section V, the proposed adaptive controller is simulated under noisy measurements. Finally, Section VI draws the conclusions. Appendix A gives the proof of some technical results.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Notations

The vector norm is denoted by  $\|x\| = (x^T x)^{1/2}$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , while for a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , its norm is  $\|A\| = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(A^T A)$ . If in addition  $A$  is symmetric, then  $A = A^T > 0$  indicates a positive definite matrix with  $A^T$  denoting its transpose, and  $\lambda_{\max}(A)$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(A)$  are its maximum and minimum eigenvalues, respectively.  $I_n$  denotes the identity matrix of  $n \times n$ ,  $0_{n \times m}$  a zero matrix of  $n \times m$ .  $S(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$  is the cross-product operator  $S(u)v = u \times v$ , which satisfies  $S(u)v = -S(v)u$ ,  $S(u)S(v) - S(v)S(u) = S(S(u)v)$ , and  $\|S(u)v\| \leq \|u\|\|v\|$ ,  $\forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . A unit sphere of dimension  $n - 1$  embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x^T x = 1\}$ . A closed unit ball is expressed as  $\mathcal{B}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x^T x \leq 1\}$ .

\* This work was supported in part by CONACyT under grant 253677 and PAPIIT-UNAM IN112421, and carried out in the National Laboratory of Automotive and Aerospace Engineering LN-INGEA.

E. Espíndola (e-mail: eespindola@comunidad.unam.mx) and Y. Tang (corresponding author, e-mail: tang@unam.mx) are with the Faculty of Engineering, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, 04510 México.

### B. Rotational Kinematics and Dynamics

The attitude of a rigid body is represented by a rotation matrix  $R \in SO(3)$  that transforms the body-fixed frame into an inertial frame. Commonly, unit quaternions  $q = [q_0, q_v^T]^T \in \mathcal{S}^3$  are employed to represent the attitude, where  $q_0 \in [-1, 1]$  and  $q_v \in \mathcal{B}^2$  are the scalar part and vector part of the quaternion, respectively, and  $\mathcal{S}^3$  denotes the quaternion group with  $\hat{1} = [1, 0_{1 \times 3}]^T$  as the identity quaternion. A rotation matrix  $R$  is related to a unit quaternion  $q$  through Rodriguez formula

$$R(q) = I_3 + 2q_0S(q_v) + 2S^2(q_v). \quad (1)$$

The rotational kinematics and dynamics of a rigid body are

$$\dot{R} = RS(\omega), \quad (2)$$

$$M\dot{\omega} = S(M\omega)\omega + \tau, \quad (3)$$

where  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are the angular velocity and the applied torque, respectively.  $M = [m_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^{3,3} = M^T > 0$  is the inertia matrix with lower and upper bands  $\underline{m}I_3 \leq M \leq \bar{m}I_3$ , where  $\bar{m} := \lambda_{\max}(M)$ , and  $\underline{m} := \lambda_{\min}(M)$ . All are expressed in the body frame.

### C. Measurements

It is assumed that  $n \geq 2$  reference vectors in the inertia frame  $r_i \in \mathcal{S}^2$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  are known and their measurements in the body frame  $v_i \in \mathcal{S}^2$ , are accessible for all  $t \geq 0$ . These unit vectors are related through

$$v_i = R^T r_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, a biased gyro-rate measurement  $\omega_g$

$$\omega_g = \omega + b, \quad (5)$$

is available, where  $b \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is the constant gyro bias.

The following assumptions are made.

- Assumption A1: Among the  $n$  inertial reference vectors  $r_i$ , there are at least two noncollinear vectors.
- Assumption A2: Gyro bias is a constant unknown vector with a known bound, i.e.,  $\|b\| \leq \theta_b$ , with  $\theta_b$  known.

Note that, for each pair of noncollinear vector measurements  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{S}^2$ , a third virtual vector measurement  $v_3 = S(v_1)v_2/\|S(v_1)v_2\|$  can be obtained, which satisfies (4) with  $r_3 = S(r_1)r_2/\|S(r_1)r_2\|$ .

## III. GYRO BIAS OBSERVER

The estimated angular velocity  $\hat{\omega} := \omega_g - \hat{b}$  can be obtained by the gyro-rate measurement  $\omega_g$  and the gyro-bias estimate  $\hat{b}$ , which is given by the following observer

$$\dot{\hat{b}} = K_f \hat{\omega} + \gamma_f \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S(\Lambda_i v_i)(v_i - v_{f_i}), \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{\hat{b}} = \bar{b} - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i}) \Lambda_i v_i, \quad (7)$$

where  $0 < \Lambda_i = \Lambda_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$  is a constant matrix gain,  $k_i > 0$  is the weight assigned to each vector measurement according

to its confidence level,  $K_f := \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i}) \Lambda_i S(v_i)$ , and  $v_{f_i}$  is the filtered  $v_i$

$$\dot{v}_{f_i} = \gamma_f (v_i - v_{f_i}), \quad v_{f_i}(0) = v_i(0), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (8)$$

with  $\gamma_f > 0$  the filter gain.

The following technical lemma [16] is needed for the design of the bias observer.

**Lemma 3.1: (Linear filter):** Consider the linear filter (8). Then,  $\forall \epsilon_f > 0$ , there exists a  $\underline{\gamma}_f := \omega_{\max}/\epsilon_f$ , being  $\omega_{\max} < \infty$  the bandwidth of the overall system, such that  $\|v_i - v_{f_i}\| < \epsilon_f$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $t \geq 0$  provided that  $\gamma_f > \underline{\gamma}_f$ .

**Theorem 3.2: (Globally exponentially stable gyro-bias observer):** Let  $\Lambda_i = \Lambda_i^T > 0$ ,  $k_i > 0$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and  $\gamma_f > 0$  be chosen according to Lemma 3.1 such that  $\lambda_o := \lambda_{\min}(K_o) - \epsilon_f \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_i) > 0$ , where  $K_o := \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_i) \Lambda_i S(v_i)$ . Then, the gyro-bias observer (6)-(7) drives  $\hat{b} \rightarrow b$  exponentially  $\forall \hat{b}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ .

*Proof:* It follows from (4) and (2) that  $\dot{v}_i = S(v_i)\omega$ . Let the bias-estimation error be defined as  $\tilde{b} := \hat{b} - b$ . Its time derivative, by using (6), (7), (8) and  $K_f$  is

$$\dot{\tilde{b}} = \dot{\hat{b}} - \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i}) \Lambda_i v_i = K_f (\hat{\omega} - \omega) = -K_f \tilde{b},$$

which can be expressed by adding  $\pm K_o$  as

$$\dot{\tilde{b}} = -K_f \tilde{b} = -K_o \tilde{b} - \left( \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i} - v_i) \Lambda_i S(v_i) \right) \tilde{b}. \quad (9)$$

Note that  $K_o = K_o^T > 0$  under Assumption A1 (Lemma 2, [13]).

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate  $V_1 = \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{b}\|^2$ . Its time evolution along (9) is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 &= -\tilde{b}^T K_o \tilde{b} - \tilde{b}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i} - v_i) \Lambda_i S(v_i) \right) \tilde{b} \\ &\leq -\lambda_{\min}(K_o) \|\tilde{b}\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i} - v_i) \Lambda_i S(v_i) \right\| \|\tilde{b}\|^2 \\ &\leq -\lambda_{\min}(K_o) \|\tilde{b}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \|v_{f_i} - v_i\| \|\Lambda_i\| \|\tilde{b}\|^2 \\ &\leq -\left( \lambda_{\min}(K_o) + \epsilon_f \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_i) \right) \|\tilde{b}\|^2 \\ &= -\lambda_o \|\tilde{b}\|^2 = -2\lambda_o V_1. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Therefore,  $\tilde{b} \rightarrow 0_{3 \times 1}$  exponentially for any initial condition  $\tilde{b}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with decaying rate  $\lambda_o$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.3 (Gyro-bias observer):** The gain condition on  $\lambda_o$  stated in Theorem 3.2 is different from the high-gain conditions in observer designs (Sec. 14.5, [17]), since  $\epsilon_f$  can be arbitrarily small by a sufficiently large filter gain  $\gamma_f$  according to Lemma 3.1. Note that a sufficiently large  $\gamma_f$  also implies that the knowledge of the bandwidth of the overall system  $\omega_{\max_i}$  is not needed. Note that the vector measurement noise may be amplified by the matrix gain  $\Lambda_i$  due to the second right-side term in (7) which depends on the vector measurements. Nonetheless, the weights  $k_i$  can be assigned to reduce this effect.

#### IV. ATTITUDE CONTROL DESIGN

In this section, an attitude tracking controller is first designed based on the bias observer (6)-(7) and assuming known the inertia matrix. The exponential stability, ASGES and AGAS of the desired equilibrium, as well as a separation property of the combined observer and the controller are proved. Then an adaptive control is devised when the inertia matrix is unknown, and AGAS of the adaptive control is ensured. Relying on a modified bias estimator, only six parameters of the inertia matrix are estimated, and thus no over-parameterization is needed. In both controllers, the vector measurements  $v_i$  in (4) and the gyro-rate measurement  $\omega_g$  with bias estimation  $\hat{b}$  are employed directly in the control law without attitude estimation.

##### A. Control objective and error variables

Let  $R_d \in SO(3)$  be a desired attitude related to a differentiable desired angular velocity  $\omega_d \in \mathbb{R}^3$  through  $\dot{R}_d = R_d S(\omega_d)$ . Define the attitude error as  $R_e = R R_d^T$ , which is associated with its quaternion parameterization  $e = [e_0, e_v^T]^T \in \mathcal{S}^3$  by Rodriguez formula  $R_e = R(e)$  in (1). The control objective is to design a control law to achieve asymptotic convergence of the attitude tracking error  $e \rightarrow \pm \hat{1} = [\pm 1, 0_{1 \times 3}]^T$  and the angular velocity error  $\omega - \omega_d \rightarrow 0_{3 \times 1}$ .

To relate the quaternion error  $e = [e_0, e_v^T]^T$  with the vector measurements, two error variables are defined: the weighted inner product between  $v_i$  in (4) and its desired value  $v_{d_i} := R_d^T r_i$

$$e_R = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \|v_i - v_{d_i}\|^2, \quad (11)$$

where  $k_i > 0$  are given in the observer (6)-(7), and the weighted cross product between  $v_i$  and  $v_{d_i}$

$$z = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S(v_i) v_{d_i}. \quad (12)$$

Some useful results for the subsequent analysis are given in the following lemma. Its proof is given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 4.1: (Properties of error variables  $e_R$  and  $z$ ):**

1) The error  $e_R$  in (11) can be expressed as

$$e_R = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (1 - v_i^T v_{d_i}) = 2e_v^T W e_v, \quad (13)$$

where  $W := -\sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^2(r_i) = W^T > 0$  under Assumption A1. Furthermore,  $0 \leq e_R \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$ .  $e_R = 0$  implies  $v_i = v_{d_i}$  and  $e = \pm \hat{1}$ ; while  $e_R = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$  implies  $v_i = -v_{d_i}$ . Besides,  $e_R = 2\lambda_{w,1}$  provided that  $e_v = v_{w,1}$ , where  $v_{w,j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , are the unit eigenvectors of  $W$  associated with the eigenvalues  $\lambda_{w,j}$ , i.e.,  $W v_{w,j} = \lambda_j v_{w,j}$ , ordered as  $\lambda_{w,1} \geq \lambda_{w,2} \geq \lambda_{w,3} > 0$ .

2) The time derivative of  $e_R$  is

$$\dot{e}_R = z^T (\omega - \omega_d). \quad (14)$$

3) The error variable  $z$  in (12) can be expressed as

$$z = 2R_d^T (e_0 I_3 - S(e_v)) W e_v. \quad (15)$$

Furthermore,  $z = 0_{3 \times 1}$  implies that  $e = \pm \hat{1}$ , or  $e = [0, v_{w,j}^T]^T$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

4) The dynamics of  $z$  is described by

$$\dot{z} = J(\omega - \omega_d) + S(z)\omega_d, \quad (16)$$

where  $J = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{d_i}) S(v_i)$ , with  $\|J\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$ .

5) For any  $\alpha_1 > 0$ , there exists  $\beta > 0$ , such that

$$\alpha_1 e_R \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \|z\|^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (17)$$

for all  $e \in \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j$ , where  $\bigcup B_j := B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3$ , and

$$B_j := \left\{ e \in \mathcal{S}^3 \mid e = \left[ -\rho, \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} v_{w,j}^T \right]^T, \rho \in [0, \epsilon] \right\},$$

is a closed ball with center in  $e_j := [0, v_{w,j}^T]^T$ , and (arbitrarily small) radius  $\epsilon > 0$ , for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

##### B. Attitude tracking controller

Define the reference velocity  $\omega_r := -\lambda_c z + \omega_d$  and the composite tracking error  $\sigma := \omega - \omega_r$ , where  $\lambda_c > 0$  is a design parameter. Note that the control objective is achieved if  $z(t)$  and  $\sigma(t) \rightarrow 0_{3 \times 1}$  asymptotically. The following control law is proposed

$$\tau = M \dot{\omega}_r - S(M \hat{\omega}) \omega_r - K_c \hat{\sigma} - (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T) z, \quad (18)$$

where  $\dot{\omega}_r = -\lambda_c J(\hat{\omega} - \omega_d) - \lambda_c S(z)\omega_d + \dot{\omega}_d$ ,  $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\omega} - \omega_r$ ,  $\hat{\omega} = \omega_g - \hat{b}$ , with  $\hat{b}$  given by the gyro-bias observer (7).  $K_c \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ ,  $K_c = K_c^T > 0$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$  are design parameters.

**Theorem 4.2: (Exponential stability):** Let the design parameters be chosen as follows:

- Gyro-bias observer:  $\Lambda_i = \Lambda_i^T > 0$ ,  $k_i > 0$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and  $\gamma_f > 0$  according to Theorem 3.2,
- Controller:  $K_c = K_c^T > 0$ ,  $\lambda_c > 0$ ,  $\alpha_1 > 0$ ,  $\alpha_2 > 0$ ,

such that

$$\lambda_a := \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n k_i > 0, \quad (19)$$

$$\lambda_o := \lambda_{\min}(K_o) - \epsilon_f \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_i) > \frac{\|G\|^2}{4\lambda_{\min}(K_c)}, \quad (20)$$

where  $G := K_c - S(\omega_r)M + \lambda_c M J$ , which is bounded in light of the boundedness of  $z$  and  $\omega_d$ . Then the attitude controller (18) and the gyro-bias observer (6)-(7), in closed loop with the system (2)-(3), have the following properties: for  $j = 1, 2, 3$

- The set of equilibria for  $(e, \sigma, \hat{b}) \in \mathcal{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$  is  $\left\{ (\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1}), (e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1}) \right\}$ .
- The equilibrium  $(\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  is exponentially stable  $\forall (e(0), \sigma(0), \hat{b}(0)) \in \mathcal{X} := \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus B_e \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ , where  $B_e := \{e \in \mathcal{S}^3 \mid e_R < 2\lambda_{w,3}\}$ .
- The three undesired equilibria  $(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  are unstable.

*Proof:* The proof starts with calculating the dynamics of the error state  $x_1 := [z^T \ \sigma^T \ \hat{b}^T]^T$  in closed loop with the control law (18). By (16), the dynamics of  $z$  is rewritten as

$$\dot{z} = J\sigma - \lambda_c Jz + S(z)\omega_d. \quad (21)$$

The dynamics of  $\sigma$  can be calculated by the definition of  $\omega_r$  and its time derivative  $\dot{\omega}_r = -\lambda_c J(\omega - \omega_d) - \lambda_c S(z)\omega_d + \dot{\omega}_d$ , the definition of  $\dot{\omega}_r$ , the fact  $\hat{\omega} - \omega = -\tilde{b}$ , the property of the skew-symmetric matrix, and the control law (18) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} M\dot{\sigma} &= M(\dot{\omega} - \dot{\omega}_r) = S(M\omega)\omega + \tau - M\dot{\omega}_r \\ &= S(M\omega)\sigma + \tau - M\dot{\omega}_r + S(M\omega)\omega_r \\ &= S(M\omega)\sigma - K_c\sigma + G\tilde{b} - (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T)z. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The error dynamics of the closed-loop system is completed by the dynamics of the bias-estimation error in (9). Note that  $x_1 = 0_{9 \times 1}$  is the only equilibrium of the closed loop system (21), (22), and (9). Therefore, according to item (3) of Lemma 4.1, the set of equilibria for  $(e, \sigma, \tilde{b}) \in \mathcal{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$  is given in item (i).

To prove item (ii), consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_2(x_1, t) = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^T M\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{b}\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}\|z\|^2 + \alpha_1 e_R, \quad (23)$$

$\forall x_1 = [z^T, \sigma^T, \tilde{b}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ . Note that in the region  $\mathcal{X}$  the equilibrium  $x_1 = 0_{9 \times 1} \implies e = \pm \hat{1}$  because  $2\lambda_{w,3}\|e_v\|^2 \leq 2e_v^T W e_v = e_R < 2\lambda_{w,3}$  implies  $\|e_v\| < 1$ , and therefore the undesired equilibria are excluded from the region  $\mathcal{X}$ .  $V_2$  is bounded by

$$\gamma_1 \|x_1\|^2 \leq V_2(x_1, t) \leq \gamma_2 \|x_1\|^2, \quad (24)$$

with  $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2} \min\{\lambda_{\min}(M), 1, \alpha_2\}$ , and  $\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2} \max\{\lambda_{\max}(M), 1, \alpha_2 + \beta\}$  for some  $\beta > 0$  according to item (5) of Lemma 4.1.

The time derivative of (23) along the error dynamics (21), (22), and (9), and the time derivative of  $e_R$  in (14) written as  $\dot{e}_R = z^T(\omega - \omega_d) = z^T\sigma - \lambda_c z^T z$ , is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &= \sigma^T M\dot{\sigma} + \tilde{b}^T \dot{\tilde{b}} + \alpha_2 z^T \dot{z} + \alpha_1 \dot{e}_R \\ &= -\sigma^T K_c \sigma + \sigma^T G\tilde{b} - \tilde{b}^T K_f \tilde{b} - \lambda_c z^T (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J) z \\ &= -x_1^T Q_1 x_1 \leq -\lambda_{\min}(Q_1) \|x_1\|^2 \leq -\frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q_1)}{\gamma_2} V_2, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where

$$Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_c(\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & K_c & -\frac{1}{2}G \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2}G & K_f \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

is positive definite under conditions (19) and (20). Therefore, by Theorem 4.10 of [17] it follows that

$$\|x_1(t)\| \leq \left(\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1}\right)^{1/2} \|x_1(t_0)\| e^{-\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q_1)}{2\gamma_2}\right)(t-t_0)}.$$

Then the equilibrium  $x_1 = 0_{9 \times 1}$  is globally exponentially stable  $\forall x_1(0) = [z^T(0), \sigma^T(0), \tilde{b}^T(0)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ . This implies that  $(e, \sigma, \tilde{b}) = (\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  is (locally) exponentially stable for  $(e(0), \sigma(0), \tilde{b}(0)) \in \mathcal{X}$ .

To prove item (iii), that is, the instability of the undesired equilibria  $e = e_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , the Lyapunov function  $V_2$  near the equilibrium  $e = e_j$  is analyzed. With little notation abuse, denote  $V_2(x_1, t)$  by  $V_2(e, \omega_e, \tilde{b})$ . It is sufficient to show, by Chetaev's Theorem (Theorem 4.3, [17]), that if

$V_2(e_j^*, \sigma^*, \tilde{b}^*) < V_2(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$ , for some  $(e_j^*, \sigma^*, \tilde{b}^*)$  arbitrarily close to the undesired equilibrium  $(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$ , then the equilibrium  $(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  is unstable since  $V_2$  is a non-increasing function.

Following (43) in Appendix A, a small rotation on  $e_j$  is given by

$$e_j^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ v_{w,j} \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-\epsilon^2} \\ \epsilon v_{w,j} \end{bmatrix}^T = \begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon \\ (\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2})v_{w,j} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

for an arbitrarily small  $1 > \epsilon > 0$ , where  $\otimes$  denotes the quaternion product.

Define  $\Delta V := V_2(e_j^*, \sigma^*, \tilde{b}^*) - V_2(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$ . By (23), (27), and (44)-(45) in Appendix A, it has

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*T} M\sigma^* + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{b}^{*T}\tilde{b}^* + 2\alpha_2\epsilon^2\lambda_j^2(1-\epsilon^2) \\ &\quad + 2\alpha_1(1-\epsilon^2)\lambda_j - 2\alpha_1\lambda_j \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*T} M\sigma^* + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{b}^{*T}\tilde{b}^* + 2\alpha_2\epsilon^2\lambda_j^2(1-\epsilon^2) - 2\alpha_1\lambda_j\epsilon^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{*T} M\sigma^* + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{b}^{*T}\tilde{b}^* - 2\lambda_j(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\lambda_j(1-\epsilon^2))\epsilon^2 < 0, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\frac{1}{4\lambda_j(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\lambda_j(1-\epsilon^2))}(\sigma^{*T} M\sigma^* + \tilde{b}^{*T}\tilde{b}^*) < \epsilon^2$ . Therefore, under the condition (19) and  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ , there always exists  $(e_j^*, \sigma^*, \tilde{b}^*)$  arbitrarily close to the undesired equilibrium  $(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$ , such that  $V_2(e_j^*, \sigma^*, \tilde{b}^*) < V_2(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$ . This shows the instability of the three undesired equilibria.  $\square$

Note that the attraction region in item (ii) of Theorem 4.2 may be enlarged to cover almost the entire space of  $\mathcal{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ , as the following corollary states.

**Definition 4.3** (Almost global asymptotic stability (AGAS) and almost semi-global exponential stability (ASGES)) [15]: Let the origin be an equilibrium of a dynamic system. The equilibrium is of:

- i) AGAS, if it is asymptotically stable and the set of initial states that do not converge to the origin has zero Lebesgue measure.
- ii) ASGES, if it is asymptotically stable and for almost all initial states, there exist finite controller parameters such that the corresponding trajectory exponentially converges to the origin.

**Corollary 4.4: (ASGES and AGAS):** The equilibrium  $(\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  is of AGAS  $\forall (e(0), \sigma(0), \tilde{b}(0)) \in \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \{e_j\} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ , and ASGES  $\forall (e(0), \sigma(0), \tilde{b}(0)) \in \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ , where  $e_j$  and  $B_j$  are defined in item 5) of Lemma 3.1.

**Proof:** For  $e \in \mathcal{S}^3$ , the inequality (17) is no longer held, nor the upper bound on the Lyapunov function  $V_2$  in (23). It follows from the proof of Theorem 4.2 that  $\dot{V}_2 < 0$ , which shows the asymptotic stability of  $x_1 = 0_{9 \times 1}$ . Since the Lebesgue measure of the unstable set  $\{(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})\}$  is zero, the equilibrium  $(\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  is AGAS. On the other hand,  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ , the proof of item (ii) in Theorem 4.2 holds for  $e \in \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j$ . Note that the set  $\mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j$  can be arbitrarily enlarged for a given  $\alpha_1$  and any arbitrarily small  $\epsilon > 0$  by a

sufficiently large  $\beta$  in item (5) of Lemma 3.1 to cover almost entire  $\mathcal{S}^3$ , the equilibrium  $(\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  is thus ASGES.  $\square$

*Remark 4.5 (Comparison with some reported controllers):* By exploiting the relationship between the error variables  $z$  and  $e_R$  near the equilibria characterized by item (i) of Theorem 4.2 as established in item 5) of Lemma 3.1, it allows one to propose a strict Lyapunov function (23) for the desired equilibrium. This in turn enables the controller (18) to achieve AGAS and ASGES under the conditions stated in Theorem 4.2, contrasting with only AGAS in [8], [12], [13], [9].

*Remark 4.6 (A separation property):* Note that the bias observer (6)-(7) is used in the control loop without modifications. This implies that the bias observer (6)-(7) and controller (18) may be designed separately provided that the convergence rate  $\lambda_o$  in (20) of the observer is sufficiently large. This condition may also be obtained through finite-time convergence, e.g., [7].

*Remark 4.7 (Controller tuning):* The controller and the observer can be tuned as follows to satisfy the conditions in Theorem 4.2: 1) assign the weights  $k_i$  to the observer (6)-(7) according to the confidence level of each sensor, 2) choose the controller gains  $K_c = K_c^T > 0$ ,  $\lambda_c > 0$ ,  $\alpha_1 > 0$ ,  $\alpha_2 > 0$  such that the condition (19) holds, 3) choose the filter gain  $\gamma_f$  as in Lemmas 3.1 and the matrix gain  $\Lambda_i$  in (6)-(7) such that the condition (20) holds.

### C. Adaptive Attitude Tracking Controller

To deal with the unknown inertia matrix, the first two terms in the control law (18) are replaced by an adaptive compensation in the following proposed adaptive control law:

$$\tau = Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\hat{\theta} - K_c\hat{\sigma} - (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T)z, \quad (28)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\omega} - \omega_r$ , and the controller gains  $K_c$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$  are the same as in the control law (18),  $Y(\hat{\omega}, h)$  is the regressor

$$Y(\hat{\omega}, h) := S(\hat{\omega})F_1(\hat{\omega}) + F_1(h), \quad (29)$$

$$h := -\lambda_c \left( J(\hat{\omega} - \omega_d) + S(z)\omega_d \right) + \dot{\omega}_d + (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T)z,$$

$F_1(u)$ , for a vector  $u = [u_1, u_2, u_3]^T$ , is defined as

$$F_1(u) := \begin{bmatrix} u_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & u_3 & u_2 \\ 0 & u_2 & 0 & u_3 & 0 & u_1 \\ 0 & 0 & u_3 & u_2 & u_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $\hat{\theta}(t)$  is the parameter estimation of the inertia matrix entries  $\theta = [m_{11}, m_{22}, m_{33}, m_{23}, m_{13}, m_{12}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^6$ , which is updated according to

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}} = -\Gamma Y^T(\hat{\omega}, h)\hat{\sigma}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}$ ,  $\Gamma = \Gamma^T > 0$  is the adaptation gain. The estimated gyro bias  $\hat{b}$  used to calculate  $\hat{\omega} = \omega_g - \hat{b}$  is obtained by the following modified observer

$$\dot{\hat{b}} = \mu_b \text{Tanh}(\bar{b}) - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^T(v_{f_i}) \Lambda_i v_i, \quad (31)$$

$$\dot{\hat{b}} = \frac{1}{\mu_b} \text{Cosh}^2(\bar{b}) \left( K_f \hat{\omega} + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S(\Lambda_i v_i) \dot{v}_{f_i} - (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T)z \right), \quad (32)$$

where  $\mu_b \geq \theta_b$  with  $\theta_b$  the bound on  $\|b\|$  in Assumption A2. The hyperbolic functions are defined entry-wise:

$$\text{Tanh}(\bar{b}) := [\tanh(\bar{b}_1), \tanh(\bar{b}_2), \tanh(\bar{b}_3)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

$$\text{Cosh}(\bar{b}) := \text{diag}\{\cosh(\bar{b}_1), \cosh(\bar{b}_2), \cosh(\bar{b}_3)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3},$$

$$\text{Sech}(\bar{b}) := \text{diag}\{\text{sech}(\bar{b}_1), \text{sech}(\bar{b}_2), \text{sech}(\bar{b}_3)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}.$$

Note that  $\hat{b}$  in (31) is bounded by  $\|\hat{b}\| \leq \sqrt{3}\mu_b + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_i)$ . The stability of the proposed adaptive controller is summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.8: (Adaptive controller):** Let the design parameters be chosen as follows:

- Gyro-bias observer:  $\Lambda_i = \Lambda_i^T > 0$ ,  $k_i > 0$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and  $\gamma_f > 0$ ,  $\mu_b \geq \theta_b$ ,
- Adaptive controller:  $K_c = K_c^T > 0$ ,  $\lambda_c > 0$ ,  $\alpha_1 > 0$ ,  $\alpha_2 > 0$ ,  $\Gamma = \Gamma^T > 0$ ,

such that condition (19) is satisfied and

$$\lambda_o = \lambda_{\min}(K_o) - \epsilon_f \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_i) > 0, \quad (33)$$

$$\lambda_{\min}(K_c) > \frac{\|H\|^2}{4\lambda_o} + \|S(\bar{b})M\|, \quad (34)$$

where  $H := M(K_f + \lambda_c J) + S(M\omega_r) - S(\bar{b} + \omega_r)M$ , which is bounded. Then the adaptive controller (28), the gyro-bias observer (31), and the adaptation law (30), in closed loop with the system (2)-(3), have the following properties, for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ :

- All variables are bounded, and  $(e, \hat{\sigma}, \tilde{b}) \rightarrow (\pm \hat{1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  almost globally asymptotically  $\forall (e(0), \hat{\sigma}(0), \tilde{b}(0), \tilde{\theta}(0)) \in \mathcal{X}_a := \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^6$ , where  $\tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta} - \theta$  is the parameter estimation error.
- The three undesired equilibria  $(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{6 \times 1})$  are unstable.

*Proof:* Let  $x_2 := [z^T \hat{\sigma}^T \tilde{b}^T \tilde{\theta}^T]^T$  denote the state of the closed loop system with the control law (28). Its dynamics is calculated as follows.

The dynamics of the bias estimation error by (31) and (32) is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{b}} &= \dot{\hat{b}} - \dot{b} = \mu_b \text{Sech}^2(\bar{b}) \dot{\hat{b}} - K_f \omega - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S(\Lambda_i v_i) \dot{v}_{f_i} \\ &= -K_f \tilde{b} - (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T)z. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The dynamics of  $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\omega} - \omega_r$ , in view of (5) and (35), is now given by

$$\begin{aligned} M\dot{\hat{\sigma}} &= M\dot{\hat{\omega}} - M\dot{\omega}_r = M\dot{\omega} - M\dot{\omega}_r - M\dot{\hat{b}} \\ &= S(M\omega)\omega + \tau - Mh + M(K_f + \lambda_c J)\tilde{b} \\ &= -\left(S(\omega)F_1(\omega) + F_1(h)\right)\Theta + M(K_f + \lambda_c J)\tilde{b} + \tau \\ &= -Y(\omega, h)\Theta + M(K_f + \lambda_c J)\tilde{b} + \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Adding and subtracting  $Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\theta$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 M\dot{\hat{\sigma}} &= -Y(\omega, h)\theta + Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\theta - Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\theta \\
 &\quad + M(K_f + \lambda_c J)\tilde{b} + \tau \\
 &= S(\hat{\omega})M\hat{\omega} - S(\omega)M\omega - Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\theta \\
 &\quad + M(K_f + \lambda_c J)\tilde{b} + \tau \\
 &= \left( S(M\hat{\sigma}) - S(\hat{\sigma})M + S(M\omega_r) - S(\tilde{b} + \omega_r)M \right) \tilde{b} \\
 &\quad - Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\theta + M(K_f + \lambda_c J)\tilde{b} + \tau \\
 &= -S(\tilde{b})M\hat{\sigma} - S(\hat{\sigma})M\tilde{b} - Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\theta + H\tilde{b} + \tau,
 \end{aligned}$$

which in closed loop with the controller (28) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 M\dot{\hat{\sigma}} &= Y(\hat{\omega}, h)\tilde{\theta} - \left( K_c + S(\tilde{b})M \right) \hat{\sigma} - S(\hat{\sigma})M\tilde{b} \\
 &\quad - (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J^T) z + H\tilde{b}.
 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The error state dynamics is completed with the following

$$\dot{z} = J\hat{\sigma} - \lambda_c Jz + S(z)\omega_d + J\tilde{b}, \quad (37)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{\theta}} = -\Gamma Y^T(\hat{\omega}, h)\hat{\sigma}. \quad (38)$$

Note that the state  $x_2$  of the closed-loop system (37), (36), (35), and (38) has the only equilibrium at  $x_2 = 0_{15 \times 1}$ . To determine its stability, consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_3 = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}^T M \hat{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{b}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \|z\|^2 + \alpha_1 e_R, \quad (39)$$

$\forall x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^6$  and  $e \in \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j$ .

The time evolution of (39) along the closed-loop dynamics, by using the fact that  $\dot{e}_R = z^T \hat{\sigma} - \lambda_c z^T z + z^T \tilde{b}$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{V}_3 &= \hat{\sigma}^T M \dot{\hat{\sigma}} + \tilde{b}^T \dot{\tilde{b}} + \tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\theta}} + \alpha_2 z^T \dot{z} + \alpha_1 \dot{e}_R \\
 &= -\hat{\sigma}^T (K_c + S(\tilde{b})M) \hat{\sigma} + \hat{\sigma}^T H \tilde{b} - \tilde{b}^T K_f \tilde{b} \\
 &\quad - \lambda_c z^T (\alpha_1 I_3 + \alpha_2 J) z \\
 &\leq -\bar{x}^T Q_2 \bar{x},
 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where  $\bar{x} := \left[ \|z\|, \|\hat{\sigma}\|, \|\tilde{b}\| \right]^T$ , and

$$Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_c \lambda_a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{\min}(K_c) - \|S(\tilde{b})M\| & -\frac{1}{2} \|H\| \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \|H\| & \lambda_o \end{bmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

which is semipositive definite under conditions (34)-(33), and  $\dot{V}_3 \leq 0$ . This implies that the state  $x_2$  bounded. Next, it is straightforward to verify that  $\dot{V}_3$  is bounded, and then  $(z, \hat{\sigma}, \tilde{b}) \rightarrow (0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  asymptotically by invoking Barbalat's Lemma. Moreover,  $z \rightarrow 0_{3 \times 1}$  implies that  $(e, \hat{\sigma}, \tilde{b}) \rightarrow (\pm 1, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1})$  almost globally asymptotically, and  $\tilde{\theta}$  remains bounded. Furthermore, the three undesired equilibria  $(e_j, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{3 \times 1}, 0_{6 \times 1})$  are unstable by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.2.  $\square$

*Remark 4.9 (The Adaptive Controller):* Compared to some similar adaptive control laws for attitude tracking of rigid bodies, the proposed scheme does not require an attitude estimation procedure, a property leveraged from the nonadaptive design in the previous subsection. Moreover, in the proposed adaptive controller only 6 parameters of the unknown inertia

matrix are estimated compared with the over-parameterization required in [12], [14]. Furthermore, in the adaptation law, neither restrictions on the smoothness of the desired trajectory nor parameter projections are needed as opposed to those used in [14]. Note that when a persistent excitation condition on  $Y(\hat{\omega}, h)$ , the exponential convergence of  $\tilde{\theta} \rightarrow 0_{6 \times 1}$  can be established as in classical adaptive control designs [18].

*Remark 4.10 (Tuning procedure):* The design parameters may be tuned to verify conditions (19) and (33)-(34) as follows: 1) Assign the weight  $k_i$  according to the confidence of each vector measurement  $v_i$ . 2) Choose the observer gains  $\Lambda_i = \Lambda_i^T > 0$ ,  $\gamma_f > 0$  to verify condition (33). Likewise, the observer bound  $\mu_b > 0$  is chosen to be  $\mu_b \geq \theta_b$  according to Assumption A2. 3) The controller gains  $\alpha_1 > 0$  and  $\alpha_2 > 0$  are selected to fulfill the condition (19). 4) Fix a controller gain  $\lambda_c > 0$ , and choose  $K_c = K_c^T > 0$  to verify (34). 5) The design parameter  $\Gamma = \Gamma^T > 0$  in the adaptive law may be set independently of the design parameters of the observer and the controller.

## V. SIMULATIONS

The adaptive controller (28) under noisy measurements was simulated. Three inertial reference vectors  $r_1 = [0, 0, 1]^T$ ,  $r_2 = (1/\sqrt{3}) [1, 1, 1]^T$  and  $r_3 = r_1 \times r_2 / \|r_1 \times r_2\|$  were considered. The desired trajectory was chosen as in [12] given by  $\omega_d = [\cos(t) + 0.5 \cos(0.2t), 0.75 \sin(2t), \sin(5te^{-0.001t}) + \cos(0.5t)]^T$  (rad/s). The initial conditions were  $q(0) = [-1, 0, 0, 0]^T$ ,  $\omega(0) = [0, 0, 0]^T$  (rad/s),  $q_d(0) = [0.8, 0, 0.6, 0]^T$ , and  $\omega_d(0) = [1.5, 0, 1]^T$  (rad/s).

The parameters are as follows. The inertia parameter vector was  $\theta = [0.0360, 0.0869, 0.0935, 0.0004, 0.0015, -0, 0007]^T$  (Kg $m^2$ ). The vector measurement weights were  $k_i = 0.1$ , and the observer gains were  $\Lambda_i = 10I_3$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $\gamma_f = 1000$ ,  $\mu_b = 1$ . The adaptive controller gains were  $K_c = 3I_3$ ,  $\lambda_c = 1$ ,  $\alpha_1 = 0.1$ ,  $\alpha_2 = 0.01$ ,  $\Gamma = I_6$ .

The gyro bias was  $b = [0.2, 0.1, -0.1]^T$  (rad/s). Noise was introduced in the vector measurements and gyro measurements as follows. Vector measurements:  $v_{m,i} = (v_i + m_v \bar{v}_i) / \|v + m_v \bar{v}_i\|$ ,  $\bar{v}_i = \nu_i / \|\nu_i\|$ , where  $\nu_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are zero-mean Gaussian distributions with unitary variance, for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $m_v \in [0, 0.1]$  is a uniform distribution; Gyro rate measurement:  $\omega_m = \omega + m_w \nu_w + b$ , with  $\nu_w \in \mathbb{R}^3$  a zero-mean Gaussian distributions and unit-variance, and  $m_w \in [0, 0.1]$  a uniform distribution.

The tracking error  $e = q \otimes q_d^{-1}$  is shown in Fig. 1(a), where the convergence of  $e_0$  to the set  $[-0.99, -1]$  is observed. The norm of the error variable  $\|z\|$  is displayed in Fig. 1(b), which remains in the set  $[0, 0.02]$  after 20 (s). Besides, the bias estimation error  $\|\tilde{b}\|$  and the estimated composite error  $\|\hat{\sigma}\|$  are depicted in Fig. 1(c)-(d). Note that they converge to the set  $[0, 0.2]$ , corresponding to the sum of the maximum noise levels in the vector and gyro measurements. Fig. 1(e) draws the norm of the estimation error  $\|\tilde{\theta}\|$ , which converges to the set  $[0, 0.02]$  under the excitation provided by the desired trajectory. The control effort is shown in Fig. 1(f), which is maintained in  $[0, 1]$  (Nm).




Fig. 1. Performance of the adaptive controller (28) in the presence of noisy measurements.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this note, attitude tracking using vector and biased gyro measurements was considered. First, a globally exponentially convergent bias observer was designed. Then, an attitude tracking controller based on the bias observer was developed which is almost globally asymptotically stable and almost semiglobal exponentially stable. A separation property of the combined observer-controller was proved. Lastly, an adaptive controller was devised to deal with the unknown inertia matrix, which estimates only the inertia parameters without over-parameterization thanks to a modified bias observer. Almost global asymptotic stability was demonstrated. Numerical simulations were included to illustrate the theoretical results and verify the robustness of the adaptive controller in the presence of measurement noise. In addition, by directly using the vector measurement, the proposed attitude controllers do not require attitude estimation, which avoids both the undesired critical points introduced by an attitude observer and the unwinding phenomenon in quaternion-based designs.

## APPENDIX A

### PROOF OF LEMMA 4.1

- 1) Recall the attitude error  $R_e = RR_d^T$ , which is associated with its quaternion parameterization  $e = [e_0, e_v^T]^T \in S^3$  by Rodriguez formula  $R_e = R(e)$  in (1). Then it follows from (13),  $v_i = R^T r_i$ , and  $v_{d_i} = R_d^T r_i$  that

$$\begin{aligned} e_R &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (1 - v_i^T v_{d_i}) = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (1 - r_i^T R_e r_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (1 - r_i^T (I_3 + 2e_0 S(e_v) + 2S^2(e_v)) r_i) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (r_i^T (2S^2(e_v)) r_i) \\ &= 2e_v^T \left( - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i S^2(r_i) \right) e_v = 2e_v^T W e_v. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,  $0 \leq e_R = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (1 - v_i^T v_{d_i}) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$ . Furthermore,  $e_R = 0 \iff v_i = v_{d_i} \iff e = [\pm 1, 0_{1 \times 3}]^T$ ;  $e_R = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \iff v_i = -v_{d_i}$ . In particular,  $e_R = 2e_v^T W e_v = 2\lambda_{w,1} \iff e_v = v_{w,1}$ , where  $v_{w,j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , are the unit eigenvectors of  $W$  associated with the eigenvalues  $\lambda_{w,j}$ , i.e.,  $W v_{w,j} = \lambda_j v_{w,j}$ , ordered as  $\lambda_{w,1} \geq \lambda_{w,2} \geq \lambda_{w,3} > 0$ .

- 2) By  $\dot{v}_i = S(v_i)\omega$  and  $\dot{v}_{d_i} = S(v_{d_i})\omega_d$ , the time derivative of  $e_R = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (1 - v_i^T v_{d_i})$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e}_R &= - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (v_i^T S(v_{d_i})\omega_d + v_{d_i}^T S(v_i)\omega) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (v_{d_i}^T S(v_i)(\omega - \omega_d)) \\ &= z^T (\omega - \omega_d). \end{aligned}$$

- 3) The proof is given by Lemma 1 and Lemma 3 of [13].
- 4) By the property of the skew-symmetric matrix, the time derivative of the error variable  $z$  in (12) is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (S(v_i)\dot{v}_{d_i} - S(v_{d_i})\dot{v}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (S(v_i)S(v_{d_i})\omega_d - S(v_{d_i})S(v_i)\omega) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i ((S(v_i)S(v_{d_i}) - S(v_{d_i})S(v_i))\omega_d \\ &\quad - (S(v_{d_i})S(v_i))(\omega - \omega_d)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i (S(S(v_i)v_{d_i})\omega_d) + J(\omega - \omega_d) \\ &= S(z)\omega_d + J(\omega - \omega_d). \end{aligned}$$

- 5) By (15) the norm  $\|z\|^2 = z^T z$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\|z\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} (2e_v^T W (e_0 I_3 + S(e_v)) R_d) \\ &\quad (2R_d^T (e_0 I_3 - S(e_v)) W e_v) \\ &= 2e_v^T W^2 e_v - 2(e_v^T W e_v)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It is easy to see that the equality of (17) holds when  $e = [e_0, e_v^T] = [\pm 1, 0_{1 \times 3}]$ , which corresponds to  $R = R_d$ . Now, consider the undesired equilibria  $e_j = [0, v_{w,j}^T]^T$ , being  $v_{w,j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , the  $j$ -th unit-eigenvector of  $W$ . Given any  $1 > \epsilon > 0$ , applying an arbitrarily small rotation  $\delta_j = [(\sqrt{1 - \epsilon^2}), \epsilon v_{w,j}^T]^T$  to  $e_j$  yields

$$e_j^* = [e_{0,j}^*, e_{v,j}^{*T}] = e_j \otimes \delta_j = \left[ -\epsilon, \left( \sqrt{1 - \epsilon^2} \right) v_{w,j}^T \right]^T. \quad (43)$$

Then, the error variable  $z$  in (15) and  $e_R$  in (11) evaluated at  $e_j^*$  and  $e_i^*$  respectively, are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|z^*\|^2 &= 2e_{v,j}^{*T} W^2 e_{v,j}^* - 2(e_{v,j}^{*T} W e_{v,j}^*)^2 \\ &= 2\epsilon^2 \lambda_{w,j}^2 (1 - \epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$e_R^* = 2e_{v,i}^{*T} W e_{v,i}^* = 2(1 - \epsilon^2) \lambda_{w,i}. \quad (45)$$

Therefore,  $\forall i, j = 1, 2, 3$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \beta &\geq 2 \frac{\lambda_{w,1}}{\epsilon^2 \lambda_{w,3}^2} \alpha_1 \\ \implies \frac{\beta}{2} 2\epsilon^2 \lambda_{w,j}^2 (1 - \epsilon^2) &\geq \alpha_1 2(1 - \epsilon^2) \lambda_{w,i}, \\ \implies \frac{\beta}{2} \|z^*\|^2 &\geq \alpha_1 e_R^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is the worst case for the inequality (17) to be held, this inequality fulfills for all  $z \neq 0_{3 \times 1}$ , which is equivalent to  $e \in \mathcal{S}^3 \setminus \bigcup B_j$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] J.-Y. Wen and K. Kreutz-Delgado, "The attitude control problem," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 1148–1162, 1991.
- [2] A. Tayebi, "Unit quaternion-based output feedback for the attitude tracking problem," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 1516–1520, 2008.
- [3] C. G. Mayhew, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel, "Quaternion-based hybrid control for robust global attitude tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 2555–2566, 2011.
- [4] A. Tayebi and S. McGilvray, "Attitude stabilization of a vtol quadrotor aircraft," *IEEE Transactions on control systems technology*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 562–571, 2006.
- [5] R. Mahony, T. Hamel, and J.-M. Pfimlin, "Nonlinear complementary filters on the special orthogonal group," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 1203–1218, 2008.
- [6] X. Tong, M. Chen, and F. Yang, "Passive and explicit attitude and gyro-bias observers using inertial measurements," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 8942–8952, 2020.
- [7] R. Hamrah, R. R. Warier, and A. K. Sanyal, "Finite-time stable estimator for attitude motion in the presence of bias in angular velocity measurements," *Automatica*, vol. 132, p. 109815, 2021.
- [8] P. Pounds, T. Hamel, and R. Mahony, "Attitude control of rigid body dynamics from biased imu measurements," in *2007 46th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 4620–4625.
- [9] J. R. Forbes, "Passivity-based attitude control on the special orthogonal group of rigid-body rotations," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1596–1605, 2013.
- [10] D. Thakur and M. R. Akella, "Gyro-free rigid-body attitude stabilization using only vector measurements," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 811–818, 2015.
- [11] A. Khosravian and M. Namvar, "Rigid body attitude control using a single vector measurement and gyro," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1273–1279, 2011.
- [12] T. H. Mercker and M. R. Akella, "Rigid-body attitude tracking with vector measurements and unknown gyro bias," *Journal of guidance, control, and dynamics*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 1474–1484, 2011.
- [13] A. Tayebi, A. Roberts, and A. Benallegue, "Inertial vector measurements based velocity-free attitude stabilization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 2893–2898, 2013.
- [14] A. Benallegue, Y. Chitour, and A. Tayebi, "Adaptive attitude tracking control of rigid body systems with unknown inertia and gyro-bias," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 3986–3993, 2018.
- [15] T. Lee, "Global exponential attitude tracking controls on so(3)," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 2837–2842, 2015.
- [16] E. Espindola-López and Y. Tang, "Global exponential attitude tracking for spacecraft with gyro bias estimation," *ISA transactions*, 2021.
- [17] H. K. Khalil, "Nonlinear systems third edition," *Patience Hall*, vol. 115, 2002.
- [18] P. A. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust adaptive control*. Courier Corporation, 2012.