

# Composite Learning Backstepping Control With Guaranteed Exponential Stability and Robustness

Tian Shi, *Student Member, IEEE*, Changyun Wen, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Yongping Pan, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Adaptive backstepping control provides a feasible solution to achieve asymptotic tracking for mismatched uncertain nonlinear systems. However, input-to-state stability depends on high-gain feedback generated by nonlinear damping terms, and closed-loop exponential stability with parameter convergence involves a stringent condition named persistent excitation (PE). This paper proposes a composite learning backstepping control (CLBC) strategy based on modular backstepping and high-order tuners to compensate for the transient process of parameter estimation and achieve closed-loop exponential stability without the nonlinear damping terms and the PE condition. A novel composite learning mechanism that maximizes the staged exciting strength is designed for parameter estimation, such that parameter convergence can be achieved under a condition of interval excitation (IE) or even partial IE that is strictly weaker than PE. An extra prediction error is employed in the adaptive law to ensure the transient performance without nonlinear damping terms. The exponential stability of the closed-loop system is proved rigorously under the partial IE or IE condition. Simulations have demonstrated the effectiveness and superiority of the proposed method in both parameter estimation and control compared to state-of-the-art methods.

**Index Terms**—Adaptive control, composite learning, exponential stability, mismatched uncertainty, parameter convergence.

## I. INTRODUCTION

ADAPTIVE control is desirable due to its unique capacity to accommodate uncertain and time-varying properties of nonlinear systems, where recent survey papers can be referred to [1]–[6]. The presence of mismatched uncertainties is a major obstacle to adaptive control of nonlinear systems. Adaptive integral backstepping with overparameterization, which combines integral backstepping and direct adaptive control, is a precursor to relax the above obstacle by designing an adaptive law to adjust a virtual control input at each backstepping step [7]. A tuning function approach is a direct adaptive backstepping approach that avoids overparameterization [8, Ch. 4], where an adaptive law termed as a tuning function is constructed iteratively at each backstepping step, while an actual adaptive law is generated at the last step by all previous tuning functions. It is revealed that adaptive backstepping control driven by tuning functions has a higher-order tracking property [9]. There are two common drawbacks for the above adaptive backstepping

approaches: 1) The “explosion of complexity” exists due to the repeated differentiation of virtual control inputs; 2) the exponential stability of the closed-loop system (implying parameter convergence and robustness) relies on a strict condition termed persistent excitation (PE), which requires system states contain sufficiently rich spectral information all the time.

Adaptive dynamic surface control (DSC) applies a first-order linear filter to estimate the time derivative of each virtual control input at its backstepping step for addressing the complexity problem of the classical backstepping control [10]. The performance and robustness of adaptive DSC have been enhanced by integrating neural network (NN) approximation [11], nonlinear filtering [12], power integration [13], coordinate transformation [14], prescribed performance control [15], etc. An approach similar to DSC named command-filtered backstepping control (CFBC) employs a second-order linear filter to estimate the time derivatives of virtual control inputs and introduces compensation terms for stability guarantees [16]. The performance and robustness of adaptive CFBC have been improved by some techniques, such as NN approximation [17], exact differentiation [18], and immersion and invariance [19]. Nevertheless, the adaptive DSC and CFBC approaches suffer from the explosion of the dynamic order and the loss of global stability and asymptotic tracking due to the employed filtering operations [20].

A modular backstepping approach follows the certainty equivalence principle that separates control and estimation designs [8, Ch. 5]. A key feature of this approach is that the time derivatives of virtual control inputs are replaced by their partial derivatives with respect to system states and reference signals, while the resulting high-order time derivatives of parameter estimates are treated as additive disturbances. Therefore, the modular backstepping approach does not involve tuning functions and overparameterization and has a lower complexity. This approach ensures input-to-state stability with strong robustness owing to introducing a nonlinear damping term in a stabilizing function at each backstepping step [21]. A standard gradient-descent identifier derived from a swapping scheme can be combined with modular backstepping to achieve asymptotic tracking [8, Ch. 6]. Nevertheless, due to the existence of the high-order time derivatives of parameter estimates in the closed-loop system, the modular backstepping approach can degrade the transient tracking performance and prevent exact parameter estimation even in the presence of PE.

A high-order tuner (HOT) approach in [22] can efficiently remove the negative influence caused by the time derivatives of parameter estimates in modular backstepping. The key idea of the HOT is to apply a linear filter with a sufficiently high

This work was supported in part by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Sun Yat-sen University, China, under Grant 23lgzy004 (Corresponding author: Yongping Pan).

Yongping Pan is with the School of Advanced Manufacturing, Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518100, China (e-mail: panyongp@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

Tian Shi is with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China (e-mail: shit23@mail2.sysu.edu.cn)

Changyun Wen is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798 (e-mail: ecywen@ntu.edu.sg)

relative degree to the adaptive law, such that the exact implementation of the high-order time derivatives of parameter estimates becomes feasible. In [23], a direct adaptive control scheme was combined with the HOT to counteract the transient process of parameter estimates caused by their high-order time derivatives, improving the transient and steady-state tracking performance. In [24], a memory regressor extension (MRE) identifier, which utilizes regressor extension with filtering, was combined with the HOT to design an indirect adaptive control law, where the HOT is applied to an extended regression model such that the high-order time derivatives of parameter estimates can be calculated exactly without filtering delay. However, the above two methods still need nonlinear damping terms to ensure closed-loop stability and transient performance and resort to the stringent PE condition for exponential stability guarantees.

From the above discussions, one concludes that the modular backstepping approach has the following limitations:

- 1) The transient and steady-state tracking performances rely on nonlinear damping terms;
- 2) The transient process of parameter estimates due to their high-order time derivatives can destroy the tracking performance and parameter convergence (except [24]);
- 3) The stringent PE condition must be fulfilled to realize the exponential stability of the closed-loop system.

Motivated by the above facts, this paper proposes a composite learning backstepping control (CLBC) strategy that ensures the exponential stability of the closed-loop system under relaxed excitation conditions for a class of strict-feedback uncertain nonlinear systems. The design procedure is as follows: First, the modular backstepping scheme without nonlinear damping terms is given to facilitate the control design; second, a generalized regression equation is constructed by the swapping technique and an interval integration; third, a linear filter is applied to the generalized regression equation to generate a generalized linearly parameterized model; fourth, a generalized prediction error is designed to exploit online data memory; fifth, a general prediction error is introduced to counteract a modeling error term; finally, a composite learning HOT is constructed by mixing the two prediction errors to implement the high-order time derivatives of parameter estimates exactly. The contributions of this study lie in three folds:

- 1) A feasible modular backstepping strategy termed CLBC is proposed to ensure the transient and steady-state tracking performance without nonlinear damping terms;
- 2) An algorithm of staged exciting strength maximization is designed to enhance the online data memory of composite learning in different excitation stages;
- 3) The closed-loop system is proven to achieve exponential stability with guaranteed parameter convergence under the condition of interval excitation (IE) or even partial IE.

*Notations:*  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  denote the spaces of real numbers, positive real numbers, real  $n$ -vectors and real  $m \times n$ -matrices, respectively,  $\min\{\cdot\}$  represents the minimum operator,  $\lambda_{\min}(A)$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(A)$  represent the minimal and maximum eigenvalues of  $A$ , respectively,  $\sigma_{\min}(A)$  is the minimum singular value of  $A$ ,  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  is the Euclidean norm of  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $L_\infty$  is the space

of bounded signals,  $I$  is an identity matrix,  $\mathbf{0}$  is a zero matrix,  $\Omega_c := \{\mathbf{x} \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq c\}$  is the ball of radius  $c$ ,  $\arg \max_{x \in S} f(x) := \{x \in S \mid f(y) \leq f(x), \forall y \in S\}$ , where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $f: \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ , and  $n, m$  are positive integers.

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a class of  $n$ th-order strict-feedback uncertain nonlinear systems as follows [8]:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i = \varphi_i^T(\mathbf{x}_i)\boldsymbol{\theta} + x_{i+1}, \\ \dot{x}_n = \varphi_n^T(\mathbf{x})\boldsymbol{\theta} + \beta(\mathbf{x})u, \\ y = x_1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with  $i = 1$  to  $n - 1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i(t) := [x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_i(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^i$ , where  $\mathbf{x}(t) := [x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denotes a measurable state,  $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is a control input,  $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  is a system output,  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is an unknown parameter,  $\varphi_i: \mathbb{R}^i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  is a known smooth regressor,  $\beta: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a known gain function, and  $N$  is the number of parameter elements. Let  $y_r(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  be a reference signal. The following definitions are introduced for the subsequent analysis<sup>1</sup>.

*Definition 1* [25]: A bounded regressor  $\Phi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$  is of PE if there exist constants  $\sigma$  and  $\tau_d \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$\int_{t-\tau_d}^t \Phi(\tau)\Phi^T(\tau)d\tau \geq \sigma I, \forall t \geq 0.$$

*Definition 2* [26]: A bounded regressor  $\Phi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$  is of IE if there exist constants  $\sigma$ ,  $\tau_d$ , and  $T_e \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$\int_{T_e-\tau_d}^{T_e} \Phi(\tau)\Phi^T(\tau)d\tau \geq \sigma I.$$

*Definition 3:* A bounded regressor  $\Phi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$  is of partial IE, if there exist constants  $\sigma$ ,  $\tau_d$ , and  $T_a \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$\int_{T_a-\tau_d}^{T_a} \Phi_\zeta(\tau)\Phi_\zeta^T(\tau)d\tau \geq \sigma I$$

in which  $\Phi_\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is a sub-regressor constituted by some column vectors of  $\Phi^T$  with  $1 \leq m < N$ .

For convenience, a column  $\phi_j(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  ( $j = 1$  to  $N$ ) of a regressor  $\Phi^T(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$  is named as a channel. Therefore, one has  $\Phi^T(t) = [\phi_1(t), \phi_2(t), \dots, \phi_N(t)]$ . A channel  $\phi_j(t)$  is named as an *active channel* if  $\|\phi_j(t)\| \neq 0$ , conversely termed as an *inactive channel*. Without loss of generality, this study considers the case that the IE condition may not hold,  $\forall t \geq 0$ , but the partial IE condition holds at some moments (including  $t = 0$ ). We aim to design a suitable adaptive control strategy for the system (1) such that closed-loop stability with parameter convergence can be guaranteed without the PE condition.

*Remark 1:* The PE condition in Definition 1 is very stringent since its exciting strength must be not less than the constant  $\sigma$ ,  $\forall t \geq 0$ . The IE condition in Definition 2 is strictly weaker than the PE condition as its excitation strength must be less than  $\sigma$  only for a certain time  $T_e$ , which may be fulfilled during transient processes. However, the PE and IE conditions require all channels  $\phi_j(t)$  ( $j = 1$  to  $N$ ) to be activated simultaneously for all time and at a certain time, respectively, which is too strict

<sup>1</sup>If  $t < \tau_d$  in Definitions 1-3, the integral interval is reset as  $[0, t]$

to satisfy in most practical scenarios. The partial IE condition in Definition 3 relaxes this requirement by ignoring all inactive channels such that it can be satisfied at the beginning and some moments later owing to  $\mathbf{x}(0) \neq \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{x}(t) \neq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\exists t > 0$  for general cases, which implies the impossibility for all channels  $\|\phi_j(t)\| \equiv 0$  ( $j = 1$  to  $N$ ),  $\forall t \geq 0$ .

### III. MODULAR BACKSTEPPING CONTROL DESIGN

The following assumptions are given for the modular backstepping control design of the system (1).

*Assumption 1:* There exist constants  $c_\theta, c_r \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $\theta \in \Omega_{c_\theta} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $y_r, \dot{y}_r, \dots, y_r^{(n-1)} \in \Omega_{c_r} \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

*Assumption 2:* There exist some constants  $c_d, \bar{b}, b_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$  to get  $\mathbf{x}(0)$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_{rn}(t) \in \Omega_{c_d} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $b_0 < |\beta(\mathbf{x})| < \bar{b}$  on  $\Omega_{c_d}$ , and  $\varphi_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \in L_\infty$  ( $k = 1$  to  $n - i$ ) on  $\Omega_{c_d}$  for  $i = 1$  to  $n$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_{rn}(t) := [y_r(t), \dot{y}_r(t), \dots, y_r^{(n-1)}(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

The virtual control inputs  $v_1(t), v_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  in the modular backstepping approach are recursively given by [8]

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(x_1, \hat{\theta}, y_r) &= -k_{c1}e_1 - \psi_1^T \hat{\theta}, \\ v_i(\mathbf{x}_i, \Theta_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{ri}) &= -k_{ci}e_i - e_{i-1} - \psi_i^T \hat{\theta} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \left( \frac{\partial v_{i-1}}{\partial x_k} x_{k+1} + \frac{\partial v_{i-1}}{\partial \hat{\theta}^{(k-1)}} \hat{\theta}^{(k)} + \frac{\partial v_{i-1}}{\partial y_r^{(k-1)}} y_r^{(k)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with  $\Theta_{i-1}(t) := [\hat{\theta}(t), \dot{\hat{\theta}}(t), \dots, \hat{\theta}^{(i-1)}(t)] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times i}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{ri}(t) := [y_r(t), \dot{y}_r(t), \dots, y_r^{(i-1)}(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^i$ , where  $e_1(t) := x_1(t) - y_r(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $e_i(t) := x_i(t) - v_{i-1}(t) - y_r^{(i-1)}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  are tracking errors,  $\psi_1 := \varphi_1$  and  $\psi_i := \varphi_i - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{\partial v_{i-1}}{\partial x_k} \varphi_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$  are regressors,  $k_{c1}, k_{ci} \in \mathbb{R}^+$  are control gain parameters, and  $i = 2, \dots, n$ . The control law  $u$  is derived in the final step of the backstepping procedure as follows:

$$u = \frac{1}{\beta(\mathbf{x})} \left( v_n(\mathbf{x}, \Theta_{n-1}, \mathbf{y}_{rn}) + y_r^{(n)} \right). \quad (3)$$

Applying (2), (3), and  $e_i = x_i - v_{i-1} - y_r^{(i-1)}$  to (1) results in a close-loop tracking error system

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}} = \Lambda \mathbf{e} + \Phi^T(\mathbf{x}, \Theta_{n-1}, \mathbf{y}_{rn}) \tilde{\theta}, \quad (4)$$

in which  $\mathbf{e}(t) := [e_1(t), e_2(t), \dots, e_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a tracking error vector,  $\Phi := [\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$  is a new regressor,  $\tilde{\theta}(t) := \theta - \hat{\theta}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is a parameter estimation error, and

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} -k_{c1} & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -1 & -k_{c2} & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -k_{cn} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}. \quad (5)$$

Consider linear filtering operations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\zeta} = \Lambda \zeta + \Phi^T \hat{\theta} \\ \dot{\Phi}_s^T = \Lambda \Phi_s^T + \Phi^T \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and define an output vector  $\mathbf{p}(t) := \mathbf{e}(t) + \zeta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $\zeta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\Phi_s(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$  are filtered outputs. Following the swapping technique [8, Ch. 6], one can obtain a static linear parametric model from (6) as follows:

$$\mathbf{p}(t) = \Phi_s^T(t) \theta + \epsilon_f(t) \quad (7)$$

where  $\epsilon_f(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is an exponentially decay term that satisfies  $\epsilon_f(t) \equiv \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\forall t \geq 0$  if  $\zeta(0) = -\mathbf{e}(0)$  and  $\Phi_s(0) = \mathbf{0}$ . However, the parameter vector  $\theta$  in (7) can not be estimated by classical adaptation schemes because the regressor  $\Phi_s$  relies on the inaccessible high-order time derivatives  $\hat{\theta}^{(k)}$  ( $k = 1$  to  $n - 1$ ). Even when  $\hat{\theta}^{(k)}$  are available, the parameter convergence of classical adaptation schemes relies on the stringent PE condition, which requires that the reference trajectory  $y_r$  includes sufficiently rich spectral information all the time.

*Remark 2:* In existing modular backstepping control methods, nonlinear damping terms like  $k_{di} \|\psi_i\|^2$  with  $k_{di} \in \mathbb{R}^+$  being damping parameters ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ) must be incorporated into the virtual control inputs  $v_i$  in (2) to counteract the transient process arising from the modeling error term  $\Phi^T \tilde{\theta}$  and the high-order time derivatives  $\hat{\theta}^{(k)}$  ( $k = 1$  to  $n - 1$ ), such that the boundedness stability of the closed-loop system can always be established even in the absence of adaptation [8], [24]. However, the square terms  $\|\psi_i\|^2$  can lead to high-gain control, regardless of whether the estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}$  converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  or not, which results in noise amplification and control saturation in practice. In this study, we aim to establish closed-loop stability without resorting to nonlinear damping terms as detailed in Sec. IV.

### IV. COMPOSITE LEARNING BACKSTEPPING CONTROL

#### A. Composite Learning HOT

Multiplying (7) by  $\Phi_s$  and letting  $\zeta(0) = -\mathbf{e}(0)$  and  $\Phi_s(0) = \mathbf{0}$ , one obtains an extended regression equation

$$\Phi_s(t) \Phi_s^T(t) \theta = \Phi_s(t) \mathbf{p}(t). \quad (8)$$

Integrating (8) yields a generalized regression equation

$$\Psi(t) \theta = \mathbf{q}(t) \quad (9)$$

where  $\Psi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is an excitation matrix given by

$$\Psi(t) := \int_{t-\tau_d}^t \Phi_s(\tau) \Phi_s^T(\tau) d\tau \quad (10)$$

and  $\mathbf{q}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is an auxiliary variable given by

$$\mathbf{q}(t) := \int_{t-\tau_d}^t \Phi_s(\tau) \mathbf{p}(\tau) d\tau. \quad (11)$$

To obtain the high-order time derivatives  $\hat{\theta}^{(k)}$ , one introduces a stable linear filter with  $n - 1$  relative degrees

$$H(s) := \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\alpha_i}{s + \alpha_i} \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ) are filtering constants. Applying  $H(s)$  in (12) to each side of (9), one gets a generalized linearly parameterized model as follows:

$$Q(t) \theta = \mathbf{q}_f(t) \quad (13)$$

with  $Q(t) := H(s)[\Psi(t)]$  and  $\mathbf{q}_f(t) := H(s)[\mathbf{q}(t)]$ .

As the partial IE condition holds at some moments (including  $t = 0$ ), there exist certain constants  $\sigma, \tau_d \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$\Psi_\zeta(t) := \int_{t-\tau_d}^t \Phi_{s,\zeta}(\tau) \Phi_{s,\zeta}^T(\tau) d\tau \geq \sigma I \quad (14)$$

---

**Algorithm 1** Staged exciting strength maximization
 

---

```

1: Initialize:  $\mathcal{I}' \leftarrow \emptyset, T_a = 0, \sigma_c = \sigma, t_e = 0$ 
2: for  $t = 0$  with a step size of  $T_s$  do
3:   if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{I}') < N$  then
4:     Find the indexes  $k_i$  satisfying  $\|\phi_{s,k_i}(t)\| > 0, k_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and set  $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{N_\zeta}\}$ 
5:     if  $\exists k_i \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $k_i \notin \mathcal{I}'$  then
6:       Reconstruct  $\Phi_{s,\zeta}(t)$  and  $\Psi_\zeta(t)$  by  $\mathcal{I}$ 
7:        $\sigma_c \leftarrow \sigma, T_a \leftarrow t, \mathcal{I}' \leftarrow \mathcal{I}$ 
8:     end if
9:     if  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi_\zeta(t)) \geq \sigma_c$  then
10:       $\sigma_c \leftarrow \sigma_{\min}(\Psi_\zeta(t)), t_e \leftarrow t$ 
11:    end if
12:   else
13:     if  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi(t)) \geq \sigma_c$  then
14:       $\sigma_c \leftarrow \sigma_{\min}(\Psi(t)), t_e \leftarrow t$ 
15:    end if
16:   end if
17: end for

```

---

for some moments (including  $t = 0$ ), in which  $\Phi_{s,\zeta}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_\zeta}$  denotes a sub-regressor composed by all active channels  $\phi_{s,k_i}$  of  $\Phi_s^T$ , i.e.,  $\Phi_{s,\zeta}^T := [\phi_{s,k_1}, \phi_{s,k_2}, \dots, \phi_{s,k_{N_\zeta}}]$  with  $\|\phi_{s,k_i}\| > 0, 1 \leq k_i \leq N$  and  $i = 1$  to  $N_\zeta$ , and  $N_\zeta < N$  is the number of active channels. If the IE condition holds, there exists a finite time  $T_e \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $\Psi(T_e) \geq \sigma I$ ; otherwise,  $T_e = \infty$ .

The index  $k_i$  of active channels  $\phi_{s,k_i}$  may be changed under partial IE, which leads to the existence of multiple partial IE stages. To consider the changes of the sub-regressor  $\Phi_{s,\zeta}$  under different partial IE stages, let  $\mathcal{I} := \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{N_\zeta}\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}' := \{k'_1, k'_2, \dots, k'_{N'_\zeta}\}$  denote index sets of active channels in the current and previous partial IE stages, respectively, where  $1 \leq k'_i \leq N$  with  $i = 1$  to  $N'_\zeta$ , and  $N'_\zeta < N$  is the number of previous active channels. Then, a staged exciting strength maximization algorithm for reconstructing the sub-regressor  $\Phi_{s,\zeta}$  and maximizing the exciting strength  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi_\zeta(t))$  in each partial IE stage is given in Algorithm 1, where  $T_s \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is a sampling time,  $T_a \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is the first epoch in each partial IE stage,  $\sigma_c(t) \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is the current maximal exciting strength, and  $t_e \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is the corresponding exciting time. Based on the above argument, a generalized prediction error is defined by

$$\xi(t) := \mathbf{q}_f(t_e) - Q(t_e)\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t). \quad (15)$$

Fig. 1 illustrates the current maximal exciting strength  $\sigma_c(t)$  in Algorithm 1 under a simple case with two partial IE stages. As new active channels  $\phi_{s,k_i}(t)$  exist at  $t = T_a$ , the sub-regressor  $\Phi_{s,\zeta}$  with the excitation matrix  $\Psi_\zeta(t)$  in (14) is reconstructed by all new active channels [see Lines 4-8 in Algorithm 1]. In this partial IE stage, as the exciting strength  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi_\zeta(t))$  can be time-varying [see the green dash line in Fig. 1], the update of the exciting time  $t_e$  is based on strength maximization, i.e.,  $\max_{\tau \in [T_a, t]} \sigma_{\min}(\Psi_\zeta(\tau))$  [see Lines 9-11 in Algorithm 1 and the black solid line in Fig. 1]. This is the same for the IE stage [see Lines 13-15 in Algorithm 1 and the red area in Fig. 1].

To counteract the transient process of the modeling error term  $\Phi^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  in (4) such that closed-loop stability can be ensured




Fig. 1. An illustration of the current maximal exciting strength  $\sigma_c$  in Algorithm 1. Note that the black solid line denotes  $\sigma_c$ , the blue and green dash lines are  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi_\zeta)$  in two partial IE stages, and the red dotted line is  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi)$ .

without resorting to the nonlinear damping terms  $k_{di}\|\psi_i\|^2$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ), we introduce extra prediction error feedback. Applying  $H(s)$  in (12) to (4) results in a filtered regression equation

$$\mathbf{z}(t) = \Phi_f^T(t)\boldsymbol{\theta} \quad (16)$$

with  $\mathbf{z}(t) := sH(s)[e] + H(s)[\Phi^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \Lambda e]$  and  $\Phi_f := H(s)[\Phi]$ . Then, giving a filtered prediction model

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \Phi_f^T(t)\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad (17)$$

with  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  being a predicted value of  $\mathbf{z}(t)$ , define a general filtered prediction error

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(t) := \mathbf{z}(t) - \Phi_f^T(t)\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t). \quad (18)$$

The generalized prediction error  $\xi(t)$  in (15) is combined with the general prediction error  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(t)$  in (18) to design a composite learning-based HOT as follows:

$$\dot{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} = \Gamma(\Phi_f \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(t) + \kappa \xi(t)) \quad (19)$$

in which  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a positive-definite diagonal matrix of learning rates, and  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is a weighting factor. Since  $H(s)$  in (12) owns  $n - 1$  relative degrees, the time derivatives of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  in (19) up to the  $(n - 1)$ th order can be implemented physically by a direct differentiation scheme [27]. More specifically, the high-order time derivatives of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  are calculated by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(k+1)} = \Gamma \left( \sum_{i=0}^k C_k^i s^{k-i} H(s)[\Phi] \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(i)} + \kappa \xi^{(k)}(t) \right) \quad (20)$$

with  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(i)}(0) = \mathbf{0}$  and intermediate time derivatives

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(i)} = \mathbf{z}^{(i)} - \sum_{j=0}^i C_i^j s^{i-j} H(s)[\Phi] \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(j)},$$

$$\xi^{(k)} = \mathbf{q}_f^{(k)}(t_e) - \sum_{i=0}^k C_k^i Q^{(k-i)}(t_e) \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(i)}$$

in which  $C_k^i = k!/(i!(k-i)!)$  are binomial coefficients with  $0 \leq i \leq k$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n - 2$ .

*Remark 3:* In the proposed composite learning HOT (19), the excitation matrix  $\Psi$  in (10) is composed of active and inactive channels. If only the partial IE condition holds, there exists at least one inactive channel  $\phi_{s,j}$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , i.e.,  $\|\phi_{s,j}\| = 0$ , and all elements in the  $j$ th row and the  $j$ th column




Fig. 2. An illustration of the relationship between the channels  $\phi_{s,i}$  and the excitation matrix  $\Psi$  with  $N = 7$ . Note that the blue modules denote active channels, the white modules are inactive channels, and  $p$  is defined in (7).

of  $\Psi(t)$  are 0. Fig. 2 illustrates the relationship between the channels  $\phi_{s,j}(t)$  and the excitation matrix  $\Psi(t)$  with  $N = 7$ . In this case, the full exciting strength  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi(t)) \equiv 0$  [see the red dotted line in Fig. 1], such that online data need to be stored and updated by the excitation matrix  $\Psi_\zeta$ , which removes the effect that the current exciting strength  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi(t))$  is decided by inactive channels. It is worth noting that inactive channels can be determined by  $\|\phi_{s,j}\| < \mu$  with a small threshold  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^+$  instead of  $\|\phi_{s,j}\| = 0$  in practice, as measurement noise may exist in the feedback of  $x$  such that it is impossible to have  $\|\phi_{s,j}\| \neq 0$  even for inactive channels.

*Remark 4:* The previous composite learning methods only consider the IE case and utilize the excitation matrix  $\Psi(t_e)$  in (10) with the auxiliary variable  $q(t_e)$  in (11) to directly compute the generalized prediction error  $\xi(t)$  in (15) [6]. However, the excitation matrix  $\Psi(t_e)$  can be discontinuous at some moments even the excitation strength  $\sigma_c(t)$  is continuous, which makes it impossible to obtain the time derivatives  $\dot{\theta}^{(k+1)}$  directly, and the control law (3) may generate a discontinuous signal. Differently in the proposed composite learning HOT (19), the excitation matrix  $\Psi(t_e)$  in (10) is embedded in the stable filter  $H(s)$  to generate the filtered excitation matrix  $Q(t_e)$  in (13) and to construct the novel generalized prediction error  $\xi(t)$  in (15). In this manner, the time derivatives  $\dot{\theta}^{(k+1)}$  in (20) and the control law (3) can be implemented continuously.

### B. Parameter Convergence Analysis

Let  $\Phi_{f,\zeta}^T := [\phi_{f,k_1}, \phi_{f,k_2}, \dots, \phi_{f,k_{N_\zeta}}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_\zeta}$  be an active sub-regressor of  $\Phi_f^T$  in (17) with  $\phi_{f,k_i}$  being the  $k_i$ th channel of  $\Phi_f^T$ , and  $\tilde{\theta}_\zeta := [\tilde{\theta}_{k_1}, \tilde{\theta}_{k_2}, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_{k_{N_\zeta}}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\zeta}$  be a parameter estimation error corresponding to active channels. The following theorem shows parameter convergence results for the proposed composite learning-based HOT scheme.

*Theorem 1:* Let  $[0, t_f]$  with  $t_f \in \mathbb{R}^+$  be the maximal time interval for the existence of solutions of the system (1). For any given  $\theta \in \Omega_{c_\theta}$  and  $\Gamma = \Gamma^T > 0$ , the composite learning law of  $\theta$  in (19) guarantees the following:

- 1) The parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}(t)$  is of  $L_\infty$ ,  $\forall t \geq 0$ , and  $\epsilon(t)$  is of  $L_2 \cap L_\infty$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, t_f]$ ;
- 2) The partial parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}_\zeta(t)$  exponentially converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  if  $t_f \rightarrow \infty$ , partial IE in Definition 3 exists

for some constants  $\sigma, T_a \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , and the index set  $\mathcal{I}$  no longer changes on  $t \in (T_a, \infty)$ ;

- 3) The parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}(t)$  exponentially converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  if  $t_f \rightarrow \infty$  and IE in Definition 2 exists for some constants  $\sigma, T_e \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .

*Proof.* 1) Since one has  $\xi = Q(t_e)\tilde{\theta}$ ,  $\epsilon = \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta}$ , and  $\dot{\tilde{\theta}} = -\dot{\tilde{\theta}}$ , the composite learning law (19) becomes

$$\dot{\tilde{\theta}} = -\Gamma(\Phi_f \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta} + Q(t_e)\tilde{\theta}). \quad (21)$$

Choose a Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_\theta = \tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta}. \quad (22)$$

Differentiating  $V_\theta$  regarding  $t$  and using (21) yields

$$\dot{V}_\theta \leq -2\kappa \tilde{\theta}^T Q(t_e)\tilde{\theta} - 2\tilde{\theta}^T \Phi_f \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta}.$$

Because  $Q(t_e)$  is positive semidefinite, i.e.,  $Q(t_e) \geq 0$ , one has  $\tilde{\theta}^T Q(t_e)\tilde{\theta} \geq 0$  such that

$$\dot{V}_\theta \leq -2\tilde{\theta}^T \Phi_f \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta}, \forall t \in [0, t_f]. \quad (23)$$

Noting  $V_\theta(t) \geq 0$  and  $\dot{V}_\theta(t) \leq 0$  from (23), one obtains  $0 \leq V_\theta(t) \leq V_\theta(0), \forall t \geq 0$ . Integrating each side of (23) over  $[0, t]$  and using  $\epsilon = \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta}$ , one obtains

$$\int_0^t \epsilon^2(\tau) d\tau \leq (V_\theta(0) - V_\theta(t))/2.$$

Noting  $V_\theta(t) \in L_\infty$  and  $0 \leq V_\theta(t) \leq V_\theta(0)$ , the above result implies  $\epsilon \in L_2, \forall t \in [0, t_f]$ . Using  $V_\theta(t) \leq V_\theta(0)$  yields

$$\tilde{\theta}^T(t) \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta}(t) \leq \tilde{\theta}^T(0) \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta}(0).$$

After some algebraic operations, the above result leads to

$$\|\tilde{\theta}(t)\| \leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Gamma)/\lambda_{\min}(\Gamma)} \|\tilde{\theta}(0)\|$$

implying  $\tilde{\theta}(t) \in L_\infty$ . Since the solutions of (1) only exist on  $t \in [0, t_f]$ , one obtains  $x(t)$  and  $\hat{\theta}^{(k)}(t) \in L_\infty$  with  $k = 1$  to  $n - 1, \forall t \in [0, t_f]$ , implying  $\Phi_f \in L_\infty, \forall t \in [0, t_f]$ . It follows from  $\epsilon = \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta}$  that  $\epsilon \in L_\infty, \forall t \in [0, t_f]$ . In summary, one has  $\tilde{\theta}(t) \in L_\infty, \forall t \geq 0$  and  $\epsilon(t) \in L_2 \cap L_\infty, \forall t \in [0, t_f]$ .

2) Consider the parameter convergence problem under partial IE and  $t_f \rightarrow \infty$ . The composite learning law (19) with respect to active channels is given by

$$\dot{\tilde{\theta}}_\zeta = -\Gamma_\zeta \left( \Phi_{f,\zeta} \Phi_{f,\zeta}^T \tilde{\theta}_\zeta + \kappa Q_\zeta(t_e) \tilde{\theta}_\zeta \right), t \geq T_a \quad (24)$$

with  $Q_\zeta(t_e) := H(s)[\Psi_\zeta(t_e)]$ , in which  $\Gamma_\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\zeta \times N_\zeta}$  is a positive-definite diagonal matrix of learning rates with respect to active channels. Let a Lyapunov function candidate be

$$V_{\theta,\zeta} = \tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T \Gamma_\zeta^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_\zeta. \quad (25)$$

Differentiating  $V_{\theta,\zeta}$  with respect to  $t$  and applying (24) to the resulting expression, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{\theta,\zeta} &\leq -2\tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T \Phi_{f,\zeta} \Phi_{f,\zeta}^T \tilde{\theta}_\zeta - 2\kappa \tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T Q_\zeta(t_e) \tilde{\theta}_\zeta \\ &\leq -2\kappa \tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T Q_\zeta(t_e) \tilde{\theta}_\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

As partial IE exists for the constant  $\sigma$ , one obtains  $\Psi_\zeta(t_e) \geq \sigma_c(T_a)I \geq \sigma I$  from (14). Since  $H(s)$  is stable with unity gain, there exists a constant  $\sigma^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $\sigma^* \leq \sigma$  such that

$$Q_\zeta(t_e) = H(s)[\Psi_\zeta(t_e)] \geq \sigma^* I.$$

It follows from the above two results that

$$\dot{V}_{\theta,\zeta} \leq -2\kappa\sigma^* \tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T \tilde{\theta}_\zeta \leq -2\kappa\sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma_\zeta) \tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T \Gamma_\zeta^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_\zeta.$$

Thus, one immediately obtains

$$\dot{V}_{\theta,\zeta}(t) \leq -k_\zeta V_{\theta,\zeta}(t), t \geq T_a$$

with  $k_\zeta := 2\kappa\sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma_\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Applying [28, Lemma A.3.2] to solve the above inequality, one obtains

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(t) \leq V_{\theta,\zeta}(T_a) e^{-k_\zeta(t-T_a)}.$$

Combining (25) with the above result yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\theta}_\zeta(t)\|^2 &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma_\zeta) \tilde{\theta}_\zeta^T(t) \Gamma_\zeta^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_\zeta(t) = \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma_\zeta) V_{\theta,\zeta}(t) \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma_\zeta) V_{\theta,\zeta}(T_a) e^{-k_\zeta(t-T_a)}, \forall t \geq T_a \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the partial estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}_\zeta(t)$  exponentially converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  on  $t \in [T_a, \infty)$ .

3) The proof of parameter convergence under IE is similar to those under partial IE, so we omit the similar steps to give the proof. Applying the Lyapunov function  $V_\theta$  in (22) and the IE condition  $\Psi(T_e) \geq \sigma I$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\theta}(t)\|^2 &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma) \tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta} = \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma) V_\theta(t) \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\Gamma) V_\theta(T_e) e^{-k_\theta(t-T_e)}, \forall t \geq T_e \end{aligned}$$

where  $k_\theta := 2\kappa\sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma)$ , and  $\sigma^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $\sigma^* \leq \sigma$  satisfies

$$Q(t_e) = H(s)[\Psi(t_e)] \geq H(s)[\Psi(T_e)] \geq \sigma^* I \quad (26)$$

which implies that the parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}(t)$  exponentially converge to  $\mathbf{0}$  on  $t \in [T_e, \infty)$ .  $\square$

### C. Closed-Loop Stability Analysis

We introduce the following lemmas to facilitate the analysis of closed-loop stability, where Lemma 2 can be obtained by a simple extension of [29, Lemma 4].

*Lemma 1 [30] (Local existence of solutions):* Consider the system (1) under Assumptions 1-2 with the control law (3). For any given  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \Omega_{c_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , there exist  $c_x > c_0$  and  $T_a \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , such that  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \Omega_{c_x} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, t_f)$ .

*Lemma 2 [29] (Convergence of stable filters):* Consider  $H(s)$  in (12) on  $t \in [0, t_f)$  and  $\Phi_f$  in (16). For any given small  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , there exists a sufficiently large  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\alpha_i > \alpha$  with  $i = 1$  to  $n-1$ , so that  $\|\Phi - \Phi_f\| \leq \delta$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, t_f)$ .

The following theorem is established to show the stability of the closed-loop system (4) with (19).

*Theorem 2:* For the system (1) under Assumptions 1-2 driven by the CLBC law (3) and (19) with  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \Omega_{c_0}$  and  $\hat{\theta}(0) \in \Omega_{c_\theta}$ . There exist suitably large control parameters  $k_{c1}$  to  $k_{cn}$  in (5) and filtered parameters  $\alpha_1$  to  $\alpha_{n-1}$  in (12), such that the closed-loop system (4) with (19) is stable in the sense that:

- 1) All closed-loop signals are of  $L_\infty$ ,  $\forall t \geq 0$ ;
- 2) The tracking error  $e(t)$  and the partial parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}_\zeta(t)$  exponentially converge to  $\mathbf{0}$  if partial IE in Definition 3 exists for some constants  $T_a, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and the index set  $\mathcal{I}$  no longer changes on  $t \in (T_a, \infty)$ ;
- 3) The tracking error  $e(t)$  and the parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}(t)$  exponentially converge to  $\mathbf{0}$  if IE in Definition 2 exists for some constants  $T_e, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .




Fig. 3. An illustration of the time indices on error convergence in the proof of Theorem 2 under regressor filtering. Note that  $\varepsilon$  is a steady-state bound.

*Proof.* 1) Choose a Lyapunov function candidate

$$V(e, \tilde{\theta}) = (e^T e + \tilde{\theta}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\theta})/2. \quad (27)$$

Differentiating  $V$  with respect to  $t$  yields

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

Applying (4) and (19) to the above formula, one obtains

$$\dot{V} = e^T (-K e + \Phi^T \tilde{\theta}) - \tilde{\theta}^T \Phi_f \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta} - \kappa \tilde{\theta}^T Q(t_e) \tilde{\theta} \quad (28)$$

with  $K := \text{diag}(k_{c1}, k_{c2}, \dots, k_{cn})$ , which can be rewritten into

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} = & -e^T (K - I/4) e - \kappa \tilde{\theta}^T Q(t_e) \tilde{\theta} + e^T (\Phi - \Phi_f) \tilde{\theta} \\ & - e^T e/4 - \tilde{\theta}^T \Phi_f \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta} + e^T \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta} \end{aligned}$$

where the second line of the above formula satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & -e^T e/4 - \tilde{\theta}^T \Phi_f \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta} + e^T \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta} \\ & \leq -\|e/2 - \Phi_f^T \tilde{\theta}\|^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it is straightforward to get

$$\dot{V} \leq -e^T (K - I/4) e - \kappa \tilde{\theta}^T Q(t_e) \tilde{\theta} + e^T (\Phi - \Phi_f) \tilde{\theta}. \quad (29)$$

It follows from Lemma 2 to obtain  $\|\Phi - \Phi_f\| \leq \delta$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, t_f)$ , in which  $t_f \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is the moment that  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  leaves  $\Omega_{c_x}$  for the first time. According to Theorem 1, one gets  $\tilde{\theta}(t) \in L_\infty$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, \infty)$ , such that there exists a constant  $c_\theta \in \mathbb{R}^+$  that satisfies  $\|\tilde{\theta}(t)\| \leq c_\theta$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, \infty)$ . Applying these results to the above inequality and letting  $k_{ci} > 1/4$ , one has

$$\dot{V} \leq -k_c \|e\|^2 + \delta c_\theta \|e\|$$

with  $k_c := \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{k_{ci}\} - 1/4 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Applying Young's inequality  $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$  with  $a = \sqrt{k_c} \|e\|$  and  $b = \delta c_\theta / \sqrt{k_c}$  to the above inequality, one obtains

$$\dot{V} \leq -k_c \|e\|^2/2 + (\delta c_\theta)^2 / (2k_c) \quad (30)$$

which is valid on  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_{c_x}$  for  $t \in [0, t_f)$ . It is observed from (29) and (30) that the filtered prediction error  $\epsilon$  in (18) counteracts the modeling error term  $\Phi^T \tilde{\theta}$ , which leads to (30). Thus,  $e(t)$  converges to a steady-state bound subject to  $\delta$  on  $t \in [0, t_f)$ .

To demonstrate that  $e(t)$  does not leave the steady-state bound on  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , we refer to the proof of [29, Th. 3]. As shown in Fig. 3, let  $\|e(t)\| > \varepsilon$  for  $t \in (t_{s_j}, t_{f_j})$  and

$\|e(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$  for  $t \in [t_{f_j}, t_{s_{j+1}}]$  with  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N_e$ , where  $N_e$  is the number of times for  $\|e(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$  ( $N_e$  can be infinity), and  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is a small constant. Without loss of generality, assume  $\|e(0)\| > \varepsilon$  with  $t_{s_1} = 0$ . Thus, if the choice of  $\alpha_i$  in (12) and  $k_{ci}$  in (5) satisfies  $\varepsilon > \delta c_\theta / k_c$ , it follows from (30) that

$$\dot{V} \leq -\rho, \forall t \in (t_{s_j}, t_{f_j}) \quad (31)$$

with  $\rho := k_c \varepsilon^2 / 2 - (\delta c_\theta)^2 / (2k_c) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , which implies that  $V(t)$  is monotonically decreasing for  $\|e(t)\| > \varepsilon$ . In addition,  $\|e(t_{f_j})\| = \|e(t_{s_{j+1}})\| = \varepsilon$  can be obtained directly, and  $\tilde{\theta}$  is monotonically decreasing from Theorem 1. Then, one gets

$$V(t) \leq V(t_{f_j}), \forall t \in [t_{f_j}, t_{s_{j+1}}]. \quad (32)$$

Combining (31) and (32), one gets  $V(t) \leq V(0)$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, t_f]$ . Let  $\Omega_{c_x} \supset \{\mathbf{x} | V(t) \leq V(0), \boldsymbol{\theta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \Omega_{c_\theta}, y_r, \dot{y}_r, \dots, y_r^{(n-1)} \in \Omega_{c_r}\}$ . Thus, if  $\varepsilon > \delta c_\theta / k_c$  holds,  $\Omega_{c_x}$  is a positively invariant set, which means that  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  started from  $\Omega_{c_0}$  stays inside  $\Omega_{c_x}$  and does not leaves  $\Omega_{c_x}$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, \infty)$ , implying  $t_f = \infty$ .

Integrating (31) at  $(t_{s_j}, t_{f_j})$ , one obtains

$$V(t_{f_j}) \leq V(t_{s_j}) - \rho(t_{f_j} - t_{s_j}).$$

Therefore, it is derived that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq V(t_{f_{N_e}}) \leq V(t_{s_{N_e}}) - \rho(t_{f_{N_e}} - t_{s_{N_e}}) \\ &\leq V(t_{f_{N_e-1}}) - \rho(t_{f_{N_e}} - t_{s_{N_e}}) \\ &\leq V(t_{f_{N_e-2}}) - \rho \sum_{j=N_e-1}^{N_e} (t_{f_j} - t_{s_j}) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\leq V(0) - \rho \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} (t_{f_j} - t_{s_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, one immediately obtains

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_e} (t_{f_j} - t_{s_j}) \leq V(0) / \rho$$

which implies that the total time spent on  $\|e(t)\| > \varepsilon$  is finite so that  $e(t)$  is ultimately bounded by  $\varepsilon$ . As  $V(t_{f_j})$  with  $j = 1$  to  $N_e$  is a positive-decreasing sequence, either the sequence terminates at a finite  $N_e$  with  $t_{f_{N_e}}$  and  $V(t_{f_{N_e}})$  being finite or  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} V(t_{f_j}) = V(\infty)$  exists and is finite [28, Th. 7.2.3]. Applying Assumptions 1-2, Theorem 1, and  $V$  in (27), one gets  $e(t), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t) \in L_\infty, \forall t \geq 0$ , which implies that  $\mathbf{x}(t), v_i(t), \Phi(t) \in L_\infty, \forall t \geq 0$  with  $i = 1$  to  $n$  in (4). Consequently, all closed-loop signals are of  $L_\infty, \forall t \geq 0$ .

2) Consider the control problem under partial IE on  $t \in [T_a, \infty)$ . Choose a Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_\zeta = \frac{1}{2} e^T e + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \Gamma_\zeta^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta.$$

Differentiating  $V_\zeta$  with respect to  $t$  yields

$$\dot{V}_\zeta = (\dot{e}^T e + e^T \dot{e}) / 2 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \Gamma_\zeta^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}_\zeta.$$

Applying (4) and (24) to the above formula, one obtains

$$\dot{V}_\zeta = e^T (-K e + \Phi_\zeta^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \Phi_{f,\zeta} \Phi_{f,\zeta}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta - \kappa \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T Q_\zeta(t_e) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta.$$

Noting the process of the derivation from (28) to (29), we omits the similar steps to directly give

$$\dot{V} \leq -k_c e^T e - \kappa \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T Q_\zeta(t_e) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta + e^T (\Phi_\zeta - \Phi_{f,\zeta}) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta. \quad (33)$$

As there exist the constants  $T_a, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$  to satisfy the partial IE condition, one obtains  $\Psi_\zeta(t_e) \geq \sigma_c(T_a) I \geq \sigma I$  from (14). As  $H(s)$  is a stable filter with unity gain, there exists a constant  $\sigma^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $\sigma^* \leq \sigma$  such that

$$Q_\zeta(t_e) = H(s) [\Psi_\zeta(t_e)] \geq \sigma^* I.$$

It follows from the above result and (33) that

$$\dot{V}_\zeta \leq -k_c e^T e - \kappa \sigma^* \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta + e^T (\Phi_\zeta - \Phi_{f,\zeta}) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta.$$

Noting Lemma 3 and  $\Phi, \Phi_f \in L_\infty$ , one knows  $\|\Phi - \Phi_f\| \leq \delta, \forall t \geq 0$ . As  $\Phi - \Phi_f = \Phi_\zeta - \Phi_{f,\zeta}$  due to the 0 norms of inactive channels, one obtains

$$\dot{V}_\zeta \leq -k_c e^T e - \kappa \sigma^* \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta + \delta \|e\| \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta\|.$$

Applying Young's inequality  $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$  with  $a = \delta \|e\| / \sqrt{\kappa \sigma^*}$  and  $b = \sqrt{\kappa \sigma^*} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta\|$  to the above inequality yields

$$\dot{V}_\zeta \leq -(k_c - \delta^2 / (2\kappa \sigma^*)) e^T e - \kappa \sigma^* \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta / 2.$$

Choosing  $k_c > \delta^2 / (2\kappa \sigma^*)$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_\zeta &\leq -(2k_c - \delta^2 / (\kappa \sigma^*)) e^T e / 2 - \kappa \sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma_\zeta) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta^T \Gamma_\zeta^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta / 2 \\ &\leq -k_p V_\zeta, t \geq T_a \end{aligned}$$

with  $k_p := \min\{2k_c - \delta^2 / (\kappa \sigma^*), \kappa \sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma_\zeta)\} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , which indicates that the tracking error  $e(t)$  and the parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_\zeta(t)$  exponentially converge to  $\mathbf{0}$  on  $t \in [T_a, \infty)$ .

3) The proof of closed-loop exponential stability under IE is similar to that under partial IE, so we omit similar steps to give the proof. Applying the Lyapunov function  $V$  in (27) and the IE condition  $\Psi(T_e) \geq \sigma I$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &\leq -(2k_c - \delta^2 / (\kappa \sigma^*)) e^T e / 2 - \kappa \sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^T \Gamma^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} / 2 \\ &\leq -k_e V, t \geq T_e \end{aligned}$$

with  $k_e := \min\{2k_c - \delta^2 / (\kappa \sigma^*), \kappa \sigma^* \lambda_{\min}(\Gamma)\} \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $k_c > \delta^2 / (2\kappa \sigma^*)$ , where  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^+$  satisfies  $\|\Phi - \Phi_f\| \leq \delta, \forall t \geq 0$ , and  $\sigma^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $\sigma^* \leq \sigma$  satisfies (26), which implies that the tracking error  $e(t)$  and the parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(t)$  exponentially converge to  $\mathbf{0}$  on  $t \in [T_e, \infty)$ .  $\square$

*Remark 6:* In existing modular backstepping control methods, the nonlinear damping terms  $k_{di} \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_i\|^2$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ) can ensure the boundedness of the system (1) in the absence of adaptation. In the proposed CLBC in (3) with (19), the no updating of some elements of the parameter estimate  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  in (19) implies that the corresponding channels are inactive. In this case, the partial IE condition in Definition 3 holds, and the exponential stability of the closed-loop system without resorting to the nonlinear damping terms  $k_{di} \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_i\|^2$  can be established under Algorithm 1. It is worth noting in Theorem 2 that if the condition “the index set  $\mathcal{I}$  no longer changes on  $t \in (T_a, \infty)$ ” is not satisfied, the exponential stability of the closed-loop system can still be established. Actually, the endless changes of some indexes  $k_i$  imply the establishment of the partial PE condition.

*Remark 7:* The proposed CLBC in (3) with (19) has several connections and distinctions compared to the MRE-HOT in [24]. Similarly to the MRE-HOT, the swapping scheme and the stable filter  $H(s)$  in (12) are introduced to generate the high-order time derivatives  $\hat{\theta}^{(k+1)}$  in (20) for counteracting the deteriorating effect due to the transient process of parameter estimation. The distinctions between the two controllers include:

- 1) The proposed CLBC introduces the filtered prediction error  $\epsilon$  in (18) to counteract the transient process caused by the modeling error term  $\Phi^T \tilde{\theta}$  in (4) such that the boundedness stability of the closed-loop system is established without the nonlinear damping terms  $k_{di} \|\psi_i\|^2$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ), whereas the MRE-HOT resorts to  $k_{di} \|\psi_i\|^2$  to counteract  $\Phi^T \tilde{\theta}$  so as to establish the boundedness stability;
- 2) The proposed CLBC integrates the extended regression equation (8) over a time interval to obtain the generalized regression equation (9), applies  $H(s)$  to (9) to construct the novel generalized prediction error  $\xi$  in (15), and combines the two prediction errors  $\xi$  and  $\epsilon$  for the composite learning HOT (19), whereas the MRE-HOT applies  $H(s)$  directly to (8) to design an indirect adaptive law;
- 3) The proposed CLBC stores and forgets online data based on Algorithm 1 to guarantee that the exciting strength  $\sigma_c$  is monotonously non-decreasing in each excitation stage, which enhances the exponential stability and robustness of the closed-loop system under partial IE or IE, whereas the MRE-HOT is hard to ensure monotonously non-decreasing of  $\sigma_c$ , and its exponential stability depends on PE.

*Remark 8:* Composite learning is an innovative methodology that exploits regressor extension and online data memory to achieve the exponential stability of adaptive control systems with guaranteed parameter convergence without the PE condition and has been widely applied to uncertain nonlinear systems with successful applications [6], [31]–[35]. It follows from Theorem 2 that the exponential stability of the closed-loop system (4) with (19) can be achieved under the partial IE or IE condition. Actually, the exponential stability obtained not only implies the rapid convergence of both the tracking error  $e$  and the estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}$  but endows robustness against system perturbations resulting from, e.g., external disturbances, unmodelled dynamics, and measurement noise [36].

*Remark 9:* The parameter selection of the proposed CLBC in (3) with (19) follows the following rules:

- 1) The choice of the control gains  $k_{ci}$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ) in (5) are subject to control saturation and measurement noise;
- 2) The filtering constants  $\alpha_i$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n - 1$ ) in (12) are chosen to be suitably large such that the filtered regressor  $\Phi_f$  can approach the regressor  $\Phi$  while filtering out high-frequency unmodelled dynamics as much as possible;
- 3) Increasing the learning parameters  $\kappa$  and  $\Gamma$  in (19) can speed up the learning process at the cost of increasing the required sampling frequency and noise sensibility;
- 4) Increasing the integral duration  $\tau_d$  in (10) can improve parameter convergence at the cost of increasing memory usage and enlarging low-frequency unmodelled effects.

## V. SIMULATION STUDIES

### A. Stability and Convergence Comparison

This section is devoted to verifying the exponential stability and parameter convergence of the proposed CLBC in (3) with (19) under various excitation conditions. Consider a mass-spring-damping model as follows [37]:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = x_2, \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_3 + \varphi_2^T(x_2)\theta, \\ \dot{x}_3 = u, \\ y = x_1 \end{cases}$$

where  $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes a mass position,  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  is a control input, and  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is a unknown parameter vector. Noting (1), one has  $\varphi_2(x_2) = [-x_2, -x_1, -x_2^3]^T$  and  $\varphi_1(x_1) = \varphi_3(x) = \mathbf{0}$ .

Choose the control parameters  $k_{ci} = 1$  with  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $\Gamma = 3I$ ,  $\kappa = 1$ ,  $\tau_d = 3$ ,  $\hat{\theta}(0) = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $\sigma = 10^{-4}$ , and the stable filter  $H(s) = 25/(s^2 + 10s + 25)$  in (12). Gaussian white noise with 0 mean and 0.001 standard derivation is added to the measurement of the states  $x_i$ . The MRE-HOT in [24] and the composite learning dynamic surface control (CL-DSC) in [10] are selected as baseline controllers, where we set the damping parameters  $k_{di} = 0.1$  for the MRE-HOT, the stable filter  $L(s) := 20/(s + 20)$  for the CL-DSC, and the other shared parameters to be the same values for fair comparisons.

*Case 1: Tracking with PE.* Consider a tracking problem under PE with the reference trajectory  $y_r = 1.5 \sin(0.5t)$ , the desired parameter  $\theta = [0.1, 0.5, 1.5]^T$ , and the initial state  $x(0) = [0.6, 0, 0]^T$ . Performance comparisons of the three controllers are depicted in Figs. 4 and 5. It is observed that the estimation error  $\theta$  by the CL-DSC has a steady-state error since the time derivative of each virtual control input is estimated by the filter  $L(s)$  [see Fig. 4(a)],  $\tilde{\theta}$  by the MRE-HOT converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  after running 30 s [see Fig. 4(b)] as PE is fulfilled in this case, and  $\tilde{\theta}$  by the proposed CLBC exhibits the rapid convergence to  $\mathbf{0}$  [see Fig. 4(c)], which validates its strong learning capability. Besides, the proposed CLBC exhibits much better tracking performance than the CL-DSC and MRE-HOT [see Fig. 5(a)] because the exciting strength  $\sigma_c$  of the CLBC is monotonic non-decreasing and keeps a high level throughout [see Fig. 5(c)]. Moreover, the control inputs  $u$  by the proposed CLBC and the MRE-HOT are not affected by the measurement noise throughout and are comparable after their estimation errors  $\tilde{\theta}$  converge to  $\mathbf{0}$  [see Fig. 5(b)], but  $u$  by the CL-DSC is seriously polluted by the measurement noise [see Fig. 5(b)], which results in much worse tracking performance [see Fig. 5(a)].

*Case 2: Regulation with partial IE or IE.* Consider a regulation problem under the partial IE or IE condition with the desired parameter  $\theta = [0.4, 0.5, 0.1]^T$  and the initial state  $x(0) = \mathbf{0}$ , where the reference trajectories  $y_r$ ,  $\dot{y}_r$ ,  $\ddot{y}_r$ , and  $\ddot{\ddot{y}}_r$  are generated by a reference model  $y_r(t) = \frac{a_0}{a(s)}[r(t)]$  with  $a_0 = 16$ ,  $a(s) = s^4 + 8s^3 + 24s^2 + 32s + 16$ , and

$$r(t) = \begin{cases} -0.3, & t < 60 \\ -1.5, & 60 \leq t < 100 \\ 0, & t \geq 100 \end{cases}$$

such that partial IE exists in  $t \in [0, 60)$  s, and IE exists in  $t \in [60, 120)$  s. Performance comparisons of the three




Fig. 4. Estimation accuracy comparisons of three controllers for the tracking problem under the PE condition.




Fig. 5. Various performance comparisons of three controllers for the tracking problem under the PE condition. (a) The absolute tracking errors  $|e_1|$ . (b) The control inputs  $u$ . (c) The exciting strengths  $\sigma_c$ .

controllers are depicted in Figs. 6 and 7. It is observed that the CL-DSC exhibits the rapid convergence of the estimation error  $\hat{\theta}$  at  $t \in [60, 120]$  s due to the establishment of IE but still has a steady-state error [see Fig. 6(a)], the MRE-HOT does show the convergence of  $\hat{\theta}$  to  $\mathbf{0}$  after 60 s [see Fig. 6(b)] due to the lack of PE, and the proposed CLBC shows the convergence of partial elements  $\hat{\theta}_1$  and  $\hat{\theta}_2$  to 0 at  $t \in [0, 60]$  s and then all elements  $\hat{\theta}_i$  ( $i = 1$  to 3) to 0 after  $t = 60$  s [see Fig. 6(c)], which is consistent with the theoretical result in




Fig. 6. Estimation accuracy comparisons of three controllers for the regulation problem under partial IE or IE condition.




Fig. 7. Various performance comparisons of three controllers for the regulation problem under partial IE or IE condition. (a) The absolute tracking errors  $|e_1|$ . (b) The control inputs  $u$ . (c) The exciting strengths  $\sigma_c$ .

Theorem 1. Regarding the tracking performance, the proposed CLBC owns the highest tracking accuracy after  $\hat{\theta}$  converges to  $\mathbf{0}$  [see Fig. 7(a)]. Moreover, the control inputs  $u$  by the proposed CLBC and the MRE-HOT are comparable in this case, and the control input  $u$  by the CL-DSC is still sensitive to the measurement noise [see Fig. 7(b)]. It is worth noting that the exciting strengths  $\sigma_c$  by the CL-DSC and MRE-HOT are 0 at  $t \in [0, 60]$  s due to the inactive channel  $\phi_3$  [see Fig. 7(c)], but their different control designs lead in obviously different




Fig. 8. Estimation accuracy comparisons of three controllers for slowly time-varying parameter learning under the PE condition.




Fig. 9. Various performance comparisons of three controllers for the slowly time-varying parameter learning under the PE condition. (a) The absolute tracking errors  $|e_1|$ . (b) The control inputs  $u$ . (c) The exciting strengths  $\sigma_c$ .

tracking results as shown above.

*Case 3: Slowly time-varying parameter learning.* Let the reference trajectory  $y_r = \sin(0.5t)$  such that PE exists and the desired parameter  $\theta(t) = [0.1, 0.5, 1.5]^T(1 + 0.2 \sin(\pi/100t))$  so that it is slowly time-varying. We use the exciting information corresponding to the current exciting strength  $\sigma_{\min}(\Psi(t))$  instead of the maximal exciting strength  $\sigma_c$  defined in Algorithm 1 in this case. Performance comparisons of the three controllers are exhibited in Figs. 8 and 9. In this case, the param-

eter estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  by all controllers can follow the desired time-varying parameter  $\theta(t)$  [see Fig. 8] due to the establishment of PE, but the proposed CLBC achieves the best performance of parameter estimation [see Fig. 8(c)] as its exciting strength  $\sigma_c$  is greatest [see Fig. 9(c)]. Besides, the proposed CLBC also shows the best tracking performance [see Fig. 9(a)], which validates that: 1) it is also suitable for the case of slowly time-varying parameter learning; 2) it can enhance both the tracking performance and parameter convergence by combining two different prediction errors; 3) it guarantees strong robustness against perturbations resulting from measurement noise.

### B. Transient Performance Comparison

This section is devoted to demonstrating that the transient performance of the proposed CLBC in (3) with (19) can still be guaranteed without the nonlinear damping terms  $k_{d_i} \|\psi_i\|^2$  ( $i = 1$  to  $n$ ). Consider a second-order system [8]

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = x_2 + \varphi_1(x_1)\theta, \\ \dot{x}_2 = u, \\ y = x_1 \end{cases}$$

with  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varphi_1(x_1) = x_1^2$ ,  $\theta = 2$ , and  $x(0) = [0.6, 0]^T$ . Note that for existing modular backstepping control methods, if the damping coefficients  $k_{d_i}$  are close to 0, the transient performance of the above system can be deteriorated by the modeling error term  $\Phi^T \tilde{\theta}$  regardless of the convergence of the estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}$  [8]. The reference trajectories  $y_r$ ,  $\dot{y}_r$ , and  $\ddot{y}_r$  are generated by  $y_r(t) = \frac{a_0}{a(s)}[r(t)]$  with  $a_0 = 1$ ,  $a(s) = s^3 + 3s^2 + 3s + 1$ , and  $r(t) = \sin(2t)$ . Choose the control parameters  $k_{c1} = k_{c2} = 1$ ,  $\Gamma = 1$ ,  $\kappa = 1$ ,  $\tau_d = 1$ ,  $\hat{\theta}(0) = 0$ , and  $\sigma = 10^{-4}$ , and the stable filter  $H(s) = 25/(s + 25)$ . The HOT adaptive backstepping control (HOT-ABC) in [23] and the MRE-HOT in [24] are selected as baseline controllers, where their shared parameters are set to be the same values for fair comparisons.

Performance comparisons of transient tracking and parameter convergence of the three controllers are exhibited in Fig. 10, where both the damping parameters  $k_{d1}$  and  $k_{d2}$  increase from 0.01 to 0.19 with a step size of 0.03, and the arrows indicate the increasing direction  $k_{d1}$  and  $k_{d2}$ . It is observed that the transient results of the HOT-ABC and MRE-HOT are deteriorated by decreasing  $k_{d1}$  and  $k_{d2}$  [see green and red dash lines in Fig. 10(a)]. For the MRE-HOT, increasing  $k_{d1}$  and  $k_{d2}$  reduces the initial oscillations of the tracking error  $|e_1|$  [see green dash lines in Fig. 10(a)] but also slows down parameter convergence [see green dash lines in Fig. 10(b)]. The proposed CLBC provides the convergence of  $|e_1|$  to 0 with the smallest initial oscillations [see Fig. 10(a)] and achieves the fastest parameter convergence [see Fig. 10(b)], which implies that: 1) the transient tracking and parameter convergence of the HOT-ABC and MRE-HOT are sensitive to damping parameters; 2) the transient performance of the proposed CLBC is enhanced by introducing the extra prediction error  $\epsilon$  in (18) without resorting to nonlinear damping terms; 3) The combination of two prediction errors  $\xi$  in (15) and  $\epsilon$  in (18) accelerates parameter convergence.




Fig. 10. Performance comparisons of three controllers for the tracking problem under different values of the damping parameters  $k_{d1}$  and  $k_{d2}$ . (a) The absolute tracking errors  $|e_1|$ . (b) The absolute estimation errors  $|\hat{\theta}|$ . Note that the arrows indicate the increasing direction  $k_{d1}$  and  $k_{d2}$ .

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has presented a feasible modular backstepping control strategy named CLBC for strict-feedback uncertain nonlinear systems. The proposed composite learning HOT allows the exact implementation of the high-order time derivatives of parameter estimates and the offset of modeling errors, such that the transient performance can be guaranteed without resorting to nonlinear damping terms. The proposed algorithm of staged exciting strength maximization ensures that the exciting strength is monotonously non-decreasing in each excitation stage, such that the exponential stability of the closed-loop system with parameter convergence is obtainable under the much weaker condition of IE or partial IE. Simulation studies have validated that the proposed CLBC greatly outperforms two state-of-the-art modular backstepping controllers, namely HOT-ABC and MRE-HOT, in both parameter estimation and control. Further work would focus on robot control based on the proposed method.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Tao, "Multivariable adaptive control: A survey," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 2737–2764, Nov. 2014.
- [2] L. Chan, F. Naghdy, and D. Stirling, "Application of adaptive controllers in teleoperation systems: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Human-Mach. Syst.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 337–352, Jun. 2014.
- [3] S. P. Nagesh Rao, G. A. D. Lopes, D. Jeltsema, and R. Babuška, "Port-hamiltonian systems in adaptive and learning control: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1223–1238, May 2016.
- [4] A. M. Annaswamy and A. L. Fradkov, "A historical perspective of adaptive control and learning," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 52, pp. 18–41, Dec. 2021.
- [5] R. Ortega, V. Nikiforov, and D. Gerasimov, "On modified parameter estimators for identification and adaptive control. A unified framework and some new schemes," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 50, pp. 278–293, 2020.
- [6] K. Guo and Y. Pan, "Composite adaptation and learning for robot control: A survey," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 55, pp. 279–290, Dec. 2023.
- [7] I. Kanellakopoulos, P. V. Kokotović, and A. S. Morse, "Systematic design of adaptive controllers for feedback linearizable systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 1241–1253, Nov. 1991.
- [8] M. Krstić, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. V. Kokotović, *Nonlinear and Adaptive Control Design*. New York, NY: Wiley, 1995.
- [9] G. Tao and L. Wen, "Higher-order tracking properties of adaptive backstepping control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 153, Art. No. 111019, Jul. 2023.

- [10] Y. Pan, T. Sun, and H. Yu, "Composite adaptive dynamic surface control using online recorded data," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 26, no. 18, pp. 3921–3936, Dec. 2016.
- [11] D. Wang, "Neural network-based adaptive dynamic surface control of uncertain nonlinear pure-feedback systems," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 527–541, Mar. 2011.
- [12] Z. Zhang, G. Duan, and M. Hou, "An improved adaptive dynamic surface control approach for uncertain nonlinear systems," *Int. J. Adapt. Control Signal Process.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 713–728, May 2018.
- [13] S. Ling, H. Wang, and P. X. Liu, "Adaptive tracking control of high-order nonlinear systems under asymmetric output constraint," *Automatica*, vol. 122, Art. No. 109281, Dec. 2020.
- [14] K. Zhao, Y. Song, and Z. Zhang, "Tracking control of MIMO nonlinear systems under full state constraints: A single-parameter adaptation approach free from feasibility conditions," *Automatica*, vol. 107, pp. 52–60, Sep. 2019.
- [15] C. Bechlioulis and G. Rovithakis, "Reinforcing robustness of adaptive dynamic surface control," *Int. J. Adapt. Control Signal Process.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 323–339, Apr. 2013.
- [16] J. A. Farrell, M. Polycarpou, M. Sharma, and W. Dong, "Command filtered backstepping," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 1391–1395, Jun. 2009.
- [17] J. Farrell, M. Sharma, and M. Polycarpou, "Backstepping-based flight control with adaptive function approximation," *J. Guid., Control, Dyn.*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1089–1102, Nov.-Dec. 2005.
- [18] Y. Pan, Y. Liu, and H. Yu, "Online data-driven composite adaptive backstepping control with exact differentiators," *Int. J. Adapt. Control Signal Process.*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 779–789, May 2016.
- [19] J. Hu and H. Zhang, "Immersion and invariance based command-filtered adaptive backstepping control of VTOL vehicles," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 2160–2167, Jul. 2013.
- [20] Y. Pan, T. Sun, and H. Yu, "Composite learning from adaptive dynamic surface control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 2603–2609, Sep. 2016.
- [21] W. Wang and C. Wen, "Adaptive compensation for infinite number of actuator failures or faults," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 10, pp. 2197–2210, Oct. 2011.
- [22] A. S. Morse, "High-order parameter tuners for the adaptive control of linear and nonlinear systems," in *Systems, Models and Feedback: Theory and Applications*, A. Isidori and T.-J. Tarn, Eds., vol. 12. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 1992, pp. 339–364.
- [23] V. O. Nikiforov and K. V. Voronov, "Adaptive backstepping with a high-order tuner," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 1953–1960, Dec. 2001.
- [24] V. Nikiforov, D. Gerasimov, and A. Pashenko, "Modular adaptive backstepping design with a high-order tuner," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2663–2668, May 2022.
- [25] S. Sastry and M. Bodson, *Adaptive Control: Stability, Convergence and Robustness*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 1989.
- [26] G. Kreisselmeier and G. Rietze-Augst, "Richness and excitation on an interval-with application to continuous-time adaptive control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 165–171, Feb. 1990.
- [27] D. N. Gerasimov and V. O. Nikiforov, "On key properties of the Lion's and Kreisselmeier's adaptation algorithms," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 3773–3778, 2020.
- [28] J. A. Farrell and M. M. Polycarpou, *Adaptive Approximation Based Control: Unifying Neural, Fuzzy and Traditional Adaptive Approximation Approaches*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2006.
- [29] W. Dong, J. A. Farrell, M. M. Polycarpou, V. Djapic, and M. Sharma, "Command filtered adaptive backstepping," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 566–580, May 2012.
- [30] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [31] B. Lai, Z. Li, W. Li, C. Yang, and Y. Pan, "Homography-based visual servoing of eye-in-hand robots with exact depth estimation," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 3832–3841, Apr. 2024.
- [32] Y. Pan, Z. Li, T. Shi, and C. Wen, "Composite learning variable impedance robot control with stability and passivity guarantees," *IEEE Robot. Autom. Lett.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 119–126, Jan. 2024.
- [33] Y. Pan, K. Guo, A. Bobtsov, C. Yang, and H. Yu, "Composite error learning robot control using discontinuous Lyapunov analysis," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. to be published, 2024.
- [34] Z. Li, B. Lai, H. Wang, and Y. Pan, "Homography-based visual servoing of robot pose under an uncalibrated eye-to-hand camera," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatron.*, vol. to be published, 2024.
- [35] Z. Li, B. Lai, and Y. Pan, "Image-based composite learning robot visual servoing with an uncalibrated eye-to-hand camera," *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatron.*, vol. to be published, 2024.

- [36] P. A. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust Adaptive Control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 1996.
- [37] V. Adetola and M. Guay, "Performance improvement in adaptive control of linearly parameterized nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 2182–2186, Sep. 2010.



**Tian Shi** (Student Member, IEEE) received the M.S. degree in control engineering from the Jilin University, Changchun, China, in 2021. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in computer science and technology at the Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China.

His research interests include adaptive control and interaction control for flexible-joint robots.



**Changyun Wen** (Fellow, IEEE) received the B.Eng. degree from Xi'an Jiaotong University, China, in 1983 and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Newcastle, Australia, in 1990.

From August 1989 to August 1991, he was a Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Adelaide, Australia. Since August 1991, he has been with Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, where he is currently a Full Professor. His main research activities are in the areas of control systems and applications, cyber-physical systems, smart grids, and complex

systems and networks.

Prof Wen is a Fellow of IEEE and Fellow of the Academy of Engineering, Singapore. He was a member of the IEEE Fellow Committee from January 2011 to December 2013 and a Distinguished Lecturer of the IEEE Control Systems Society from 2010 to 2013. Currently, he is the co-Editor-in-Chief of *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, Associate Editor of *Automatica* (from Feb 2006), and Executive Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Control and Decision*. He also served as an Associate Editor of *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* from 2000 to 2002, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* from 2013 to 2020, and *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* from 2009 to 2019. He has been actively involved in organizing international conferences, playing the roles of General Chair (including the General Chair of *IECON 2020* and *IECON 2023*), TPC Chair (e.g., the TPC Chair of Chinese Control and Decision Conference since 2008), etc. He was the recipient of a number of awards, including the Prestigious Engineering Achievement Award from the Institution of Engineers, Singapore, in 2005 and the Best Paper Award of *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* in 2017.



**Yongping Pan** (Senior Member, IEEE) received a Ph.D. degree in control theory and control engineering from the South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, China, in 2011.

He spent one year in the industry as a Control Systems Engineer in Shenzhen and Guangzhou, China, during 2007-2008, and has long-term research experience at the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, National University of Singapore, Singapore, and University of Tokyo, Japan, during 2011-2019. He is currently a Professor who leads the Robot

Control and Learning Lab at Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen. His research interests lie in automatic control, machine learning, and optimization for robotic applications, such as compliant actuation, interaction control, visual servoing, and motion planning. He has authored or co-authored over 160 peer-reviewed academic papers, including more than 120 papers in reputable refereed journals.

Dr. Pan serves as the Chair of the IEEE Robotics and Automation Society Guangzhou Chapter and an Associate Editor of several top-tier journals, such as *IEEE Transactions* and *IFAC* journals. He has served as the Lead Guest Editor of four special issues in reputable refereed journals, an Organizing Committee Member of three international conferences, and the Lead Workshop Organizer of the 2023 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Singapore.