
Arbitrarily Fast Tracking Multivariable Least-squares MRAC

Liu Hsu, Ramon R. Costa, Fernando Lizarralde, Alessandro J. Peixoto

COPPE, Department of Electrical Engineering
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

[02:13] December 30, 2024

Abstract

A novel least-squares model-reference direct adaptive control (LS MRAC) algorithm for multivariable (MIMO) plants is presented. The controller parameters are directly updated based on the output tracking error. The control law is crucially modified to reduce the relative degree of the error model to zero. A comprehensive Lyapunov-based stability analysis as well as a tracking error convergence characterization is provided demonstrating that the LS MRAC can achieve arbitrarily fast tracking while maintaining satisfactory parameter convergence for quite large adaptation gains. Simulation results show a significant improvement in tracking performance compared to previous methods.

Keywords — Adaptive control, model-reference adaptive control, stability, transient performance, least-squares.

1 Introduction

Model Reference Adaptive Control (MRAC) is one of the primary approaches in adaptive control. Over the past decades, extensive research has been conducted on designing MRAC systems with proven stability and convergence properties [Ioannou and Sun \[1996\]](#)[Sastry and Bodson \[1989\]](#)[Tao \[2003\]](#)[Nguyen \[2018\]](#).

Two common alternatives for adaptation are the gradient and least-squares (LS) methods. While the former can be applied for direct or indirect adaptation, the latter has been used for indirect adaptation [Nguyen \[2018\]](#). It is well known that LS can potentially lead to faster parameter estimation [Berghuis et al. \[1995\]](#)[Krstic \[2009\]](#)[Guler et al. \[2016\]](#), [Fidan et al. \[2015\]](#). Therefore, it would be highly interesting to develop a direct singularity-free LS adaptive control algorithm, to compute the control law when calculated indirectly from the identified plant parameters based on the certainty equivalence principle. An early attempt was made by [Elliott et al. \[1985\]](#), but stability and tracking issues remained unresolved [Tao \[2014\]](#). Direct LS adaptive control was also proposed by [Slotine and Li \[1991\]](#), departing from a static error equation (relative degree zero), but his approach requires output differentiation.

Recently, [Zengin et al. \[2022\]](#) proposed a direct LS-MRAC scheme for relative degree one SISO plants. Unfortunately, the adaptation law requires an unavailable signal to be implemented, namely the instantaneous parameter estimation error.

In this paper, we present a solution for designing output feedback direct LS adaptive control for linear time-invariant (LTI) MIMO plants, considering only plants with uniform relative degree one.

Besides the uncertainty of K_p , which is amenable by SDU factorization [Costa et al. \[2003\]](#), another challenge is how to avoid the need for output differentiation to implement the LS adaptation law. Here, we circumvent this problem with the strategy proposed in [Costa \[2024, 2020\]](#), which consists in introducing a modified control law derived from Monopoli's multiplier. As a result, the output error equation becomes of relative degree zero. This property is crucial as it leads to an implementable direct LS adaptive law using output feedback for MIMO plants.

A novelty of the new adaptive law is that it does not require normalization (which tend to decrease the equivalent adaptation gain) to ensure stability. We believe that the proposed LS MRAC, with a comprehensive Lyapunov-based stability analysis, is the first of its kind in the literature.

A further important contribution is that a detailed tracking error convergence analysis is presented showing that the LS MRAC can be designed to achieve arbitrarily fast tracking while keeping parameter convergence for quite large adaptation gains under the usual persistency of excitation condition.

This note is organized as follows: In [Sec. 2](#), the problem formulation and the assumptions made are formulated. Then the controller parametrization based on SDU factorization of the Control input matrix is described in ([Sec. 2.1](#)). The controller design follows in [Sec. 2.3](#). A fast converging LS-MRAC is described with its stability analysis in [Sec. 2.4](#). The remarkable convergence properties are characterized in [Sec. 2.6](#). Simulation examples are presented in [Sec. 3](#) to illustrate the significant improvement in the speed of adaptation compared to alternative adaptation laws.

arXiv:2412.19601v1 [eess.SY] 27 Dec 2024

2 Multivariable MRAC

The plant and the reference model are given by¹

$$y(t) = P(s)u(t), \quad P(s) = K_p N(s)D^{-1}(s), \quad (1)$$

$$y_m(t) = M(s)r, \quad (2)$$

where $P(s)$ and $M(s)$ are $m \times m$ transfer matrices, and $y, u, y_m, r(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The high frequency gain matrix K_p and the coefficients of the $m \times m$ polynomial matrices $D(s)$ and $N(s)$ are unknown.

The objective is to adaptively track the reference model by designing the control u so that $e_0 = y(t) - y_m(t) \rightarrow 0$ asymptotically while all signals of the closed-loop system remain bounded (stability).

The following assumptions regarding $P(s)$ are required:

- 1) the observability index ν of $P(s)$ is known;
- 2) $P(s)$ has relative degree 1;
- 3) the transmission zeros of $P(s)$ have negative real parts; (minimum-phase assumption)
- 4) the signs of the leading principal minors $\{\Delta_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of the matrix K_p are known;
- 5) the reference signal $r(t)$ is piecewise continuous and uniformly bounded.

Assumption 4) is a counterpart of a similar high-frequency gain sign assumption made for the SISO LS-MRAC.

In view of assumption 2), $M(s)$ is chosen as

$$M(s) = (sI - A_m)^{-1} \quad (3)$$

where

$$A_m = \text{diag}\{-a_i\}_{i=1}^m, \quad a_i > 0, \quad (4)$$

The *state variable filters* are given by

$$\dot{v}_{1,i} = \Lambda v_{1,i} + g u_i, \quad v_{1,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu-1}, \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{v}_{2,i} = \Lambda v_{2,i} + g y_i, \quad v_{2,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu-1}, \quad (6)$$

$$v_1^T = [v_{1,1}^T \quad v_{1,2}^T \quad \cdots \quad v_{1,m}^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{m(\nu-1)},$$

$$v_2^T = [v_{2,1}^T \quad v_{2,2}^T \quad \cdots \quad v_{2,m}^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{m(\nu-1)},$$

where Λ is a Hurwitz matrix. The regressor vector is set as

$$\omega^T = [v_1^T \quad v_2^T \quad y^T \quad r^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{2m\nu}.$$

If $P(s)$ is known, then a control law which achieves matching between the closed-loop transfer matrix and $M(s)$, i.e. $y = P(s)u^* = M(s)r = y_m$, is given by [Tao \[2003\]](#)

$$u^* = \theta_1^{*T} v_1 + \theta_2^{*T} v_2 + \theta_3^* y + \theta_4^* r = \theta^{*T} \omega, \quad (7)$$

¹The symbol s stands either as the differential operator or as the Laplace variable, according the context of time-domain or frequency-domain.

where $\theta^{*T} = [\theta_1^{*T} \quad \theta_2^{*T} \quad \theta_3^* \quad \theta_4^*]$, $\theta_1^*, \theta_2^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m(\nu-1) \times m}$, $\theta_3^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $\theta_4^* = K_p^{-1}$. The dynamics of the tracking error is given by [[Tao, 2003](#), p. 201]

$$e_0 = M(s)K_p [u - \theta^{*T} \omega], \quad (8)$$

$$u = \theta^T(t)\omega = \theta_1^T(t)v_1 + \theta_2^T(t)v_2 + \theta_3(t)y + \theta_4(t)r. \quad (9)$$

2.1 SDU factorization

In order to circumvent strong prior limitations about K_p such as its symmetry, the MIMO MRAC algorithm proposed in [Costa et al. \[2003\]](#) relies on a control parametrization derived from an *SDU* factorization of the matrix K_p . The following Lemma is central for this algorithm. It assures the existence of a *SDU* factorization.

Lemma 1. *Every $m \times m$ real matrix K_p with nonzero leading principal minors $\{\Delta_i\}_{i=1}^m$ can be factored as*

$$K_p = SDU, \quad (10)$$

where S is symmetric positive definite, D is diagonal, and U is unity upper triangular.

Proof. From [Costa et al. \[2003\]](#).

Since all Δ_i are nonzero, there exists a unique factorization [Strang \[1988\]](#),

$$K_p = L_p D_p U_p, \quad (11)$$

where L_p is unity lower triangular, U_p is unity upper triangular, and

$$D_p = \text{diag}\left\{\Delta_1, \frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta_1}, \dots, \frac{\Delta_m}{\Delta_{m-1}}\right\}. \quad (12)$$

Factoring D_p as

$$D_p = D_+ D, \quad (13)$$

where D_+ is a diagonal matrix with positive entries, (11) is rewritten as

$$K_p = (L_p D_+ L_p^T) D (D^{-1} L_p^{-T} D U_p),$$

so that (10) is satisfied by

$$S = L_p D_+ L_p^T, \quad (14)$$

$$U = D^{-1} L_p^{-T} D U_p. \quad (15)$$

□

Note that while the LDU factorization is unique the *SDU* factorization is not since $D_+ > 0$ is arbitrary.

2.2 Control parametrization

Applying the *SDU* factorization (10), the error equation (8) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} e_0 &= M(s)SDU[u - \theta^{*T} \omega] \\ &= M(s)SD[Uu - U\theta^{*T} \omega] \\ &= M(s)SD[u - U\theta^{*T} \omega - (I - U)u]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Note that the matrix $(I - U)$ is strictly upper triangular. Therefore, the control signal u can be defined as a function of $(I - U)u$ without given rise to any static loop since no individual control signal u_i would depend on itself.

The unknown U is incorporated in the parametrization by introducing the parameter vector Θ^* via the identity

$$\Theta^{*T}\Omega \equiv U\theta^{*T}\omega + (I - U)u, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\Theta^{*T} = [\Theta_1^{*T} \quad \Theta_2^{*T} \quad \dots \quad \Theta_m^{*T}], \quad (18)$$

$$\Omega^T = \text{diag}\{\Omega_i^T\}_{i=1}^m, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1^T &= [\omega^T \quad u_2 \quad u_3 \quad \dots \quad u_m], \\ \Omega_2^T &= [\omega^T \quad u_3 \quad \dots \quad u_m], \\ &\vdots \\ \Omega_{m-1}^T &= [\omega^T \quad u_m], \\ \Omega_m^T &= [\omega^T]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Each vector Θ_i^{*T} concatenates the i -th row of the matrix $U\theta^{*T}$ and also the non zero entries of the i -th row of $(I - U)$. The error equation (16) has thus been brought to the form

$$e_0 = M(s)SD[u - \Omega^T\Theta^*]. \quad (21)$$

Note that this parametrization introduces $m(m - 1)/2$ additional adaptive parameters.

A special parametrization of the matrix D_+ is proposed in Lemma 2 below. This result will be useful to conclude the stability of the MIMO extension of the LS-MRAC algorithm developed in the next in terms of the unique LDU factorization.

Lemma 2. *For any $A = \text{diag}\{-a_i\}_{i=1}^m$, $a_i > 0$, and any $m \times m$ unity lower triangular matrix L_p , there is a positive constant d^* such that*

$$2Q = -(AS^{-1} + S^{-1}A) > 0$$

with $S = L_p D_+ L_p^T$ and

$$D_+ = \text{diag}\{1, d_+^2, d_+^4, \dots, d_+^{2(m-1)}\}, \quad \forall d_+ > d^*.$$

and for $L_+ = D_+^{-1/2} L_p D_+^{1/2}$ we have

$$\lim_{d_+ \rightarrow \infty} L_+ = I.$$

There exists $d^* > 0$ such that

$$L_+ L_+^T A + A L_+ L_+^T < 0, \quad \forall d_+ > d^*,$$

and, as a result, $Q > 0$.

(see Appendix A for a proof)

2.3 Design procedure

The control law is chosen as

$$u = L(s)[\Xi^T \Theta] = \Omega^T \Theta + \Xi^T \dot{\Theta}, \quad (22)$$

where

$$L(s) = (s + \ell_0)I, \quad (23)$$

with $\ell_0 > 0$ and $I \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and

$$\Xi^T = L^{-1}(s)\Omega^T. \quad (24)$$

Applying the control (22), the error equation (21) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} e_0 &= M(s)L(s)SD[\Xi^T \Theta - \Xi^T \Theta^*] \\ &= M(s)L(s)SD[\Xi^T \tilde{\Theta}], \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{\Theta} = \Theta - \Theta^*$. Now, introduce the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} M(s)L(s) &= \text{diag}\left\{\frac{s + \ell_0}{s + a_i}\right\}_{i=1}^m \\ &= \text{diag}\left\{\frac{\alpha_i}{s + a_i} + 1\right\}_{i=1}^m \\ &= \mathcal{A}M(s) + I, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A} = \text{diag}\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m, \quad \alpha_i = \ell_0 - a_i.$$

Then, the error equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} e_0 &= (\mathcal{A}M(s) + I)SD[\Xi^T \tilde{\Theta}] \\ &= \mathcal{A}M(s)SD[\Xi^T \tilde{\Theta}] + SD[\Xi^T \tilde{\Theta}]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

For simplicity, let us denote

$$v = D[\Xi^T \tilde{\Theta}]. \quad (27)$$

Then, defining the error state vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we can write the following non-minimal state space realization of (26)

$$\dot{e} = A_c e + B_c S v, \quad (28)$$

$$e_0 = \mathcal{A}C_c e + S v, \quad (29)$$

where $M(s) = C_c(sI - A_c)^{-1}B_c$, and $\{A_c, B_c, C_c\}$ satisfies the MKY Lemma (appropriate for nonminimal state-space realizations):

$$A_c^T P' + P' A_c = -2Q', \quad (30)$$

$$P' B_c = C_c^T, \quad (31)$$

with $P' = P'^T > 0$ and $Q' = Q'^T > 0$. The total order of the system comprising the plant (1) and filters (5)-(6) and (24) is $N = n + 4m\nu - m - 1$.

Remark 1. *Note that we need to filter only Ω_1 to form Ξ .*

Tracking error	$e_0 = y - y_m$
SV filters	$\dot{v}_{1,i} = \Lambda v_{1,i} + g u_i$ (5)
	$\dot{v}_{2,i} = \Lambda v_{2,i} + g y_i$ (6)
	$v_1^T = [v_{1,1}^T \ v_{1,2}^T \ \cdots \ v_{1,m}^T]$
	$v_2^T = [v_{2,1}^T \ v_{2,2}^T \ \cdots \ v_{2,m}^T]$
	$\omega^T = [v_1^T \ y^T \ v_2^T \ r^T]$
	$\Omega_i^T = [\omega^T \ u_{i+1} \ \cdots \ u_m]$ (20)
	$\Omega^T = \text{diag}\{\Omega_i^T\}_{i=1}^m$ (19)
Ξ -filter	$\dot{\Xi} = -\ell_0 \Xi + \Omega$ (24)
	$\ell_0 = a, \quad a_i \equiv a, \quad \forall i \in [1, m]$
Control	$u = \Omega^T \Theta + \Xi^T \dot{\Theta}$ (22)
Update laws	$\dot{\Theta} = -\gamma R \Xi \text{sign}(D) e_0$
	$\dot{R} = -R \Xi \Xi^T R$
	$R(0) = \text{diag}\{R_i(0)\}_{i=1}^m$
	$R_i(0) = R_i^T(0) > 0$
	$R_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times N_i}$

Table 1: MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm.

2.4 Fast converging LS-MRAC

This section emphasizes a particular variant of the above proposed LS-MRAC characterized by a reference model given by a scaled identity matrix:

$$A_m = -aI. \quad (32)$$

In this case ($\mathcal{A} = 0$), defining the error state vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have the following non-minimal state space realization of (26)

$$\dot{e} = A_c e + B_c S v, \quad (33)$$

$$e_0 = S v. \quad (34)$$

Obviously, the state e is not observable from the tracking error e_0 but remains important to consider for overall stability analysis. Equivalently, one has

$$\dot{e} = A_c e + B_c e_0, \quad (35)$$

$$e_0 = S v. \quad (36)$$

Consider the time varying positive definite function

$$2V_1(\tilde{\Theta}, t) = \tilde{\Theta}^T |\mathbb{D}| R^{-1}(t) \tilde{\Theta}, \quad (37)$$

where the covariance matrix is given by

$$R(t) = \text{diag}\{R_i(t)\}_{i=1}^m, \\ R_i(0) = R_i(0)^T > 0, \quad R_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times N_i}.$$

Note that $|\mathbb{D}| R^{-1} = R^{-1} |D|$. Using the fact that $\dot{R}^{-1} = -R^{-1} \dot{R} R^{-1}$, then

$$\dot{V}_1 = \tilde{\Theta}^T |\mathbb{D}| R^{-1} \dot{\Theta} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\Theta}^T |\mathbb{D}| R^{-1} \dot{R} R^{-1} \tilde{\Theta}. \quad (38)$$

In view of the above equation, we choose the update laws for Θ and R given in Table 1. Since Ξ is block diagonal, then $\Xi \Xi^T$ is also block diagonal. Hence, for $R(0)$ block diagonal, \dot{R} and R result block diagonal and also $\dot{R}^{-1} = \Xi \Xi^T$. Thus, the derivative (38) becomes

$$\dot{V}_1 = \tilde{\Theta}^T |\mathbb{D}| R^{-1} \dot{\Theta} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\Theta}^T |\mathbb{D}| \Xi \Xi^T \tilde{\Theta} \quad (39)$$

which, upon setting the update law

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Theta} &= -\gamma R \text{sign}(\mathbb{D}) \Xi e_0 \\ &= -\gamma R \Xi \text{sign}(D) e_0 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

is reduced using (27) to

$$\dot{V}_1 = -v^T (\gamma D S D - \frac{1}{2} |D|) v \leq 0 \quad (41)$$

for sufficiently large $\gamma > 0$. Note that $D S D > 0$. From (41), we get

$$\dot{V}_1 = -v^T D (\gamma S - \frac{1}{2} |D^{-1}|) D v \leq -\gamma v^T Q_4 v, \quad (42)$$

for some appropriate $Q_4 > 0$. Next, we take into account the error dynamic equation (33) by introducing the positive definite function of e

$$V_2 = -\frac{e^T P_c e}{2}, \quad (43)$$

such that $A_c^T P_c + P_c A_c = -Q_c < 0$, for some $P_c, Q_c > 0$, which exist since A_c is Hurwitz. Then, consider the Lyapunov function for the adaptive system (33), (34), and (40)

$$V = \varepsilon V_2(e) + V_1(\tilde{\Theta}, t), \quad (44)$$

which has time-derivative given by

$$\dot{V} = [e^T \ v^T] \begin{bmatrix} -\varepsilon Q_c & \varepsilon P_c B_c S \\ 0 & -D(\gamma S - \frac{1}{2} |D^{-1}|) D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e \\ v \end{bmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

which is negative definite in $[e^T \ v^T]$ if ε is small enough and γ is sufficiently large so that

$$D \left(S - \frac{1}{2\gamma} |D^{-1}| \right) D \geq Q_4 > 0. \quad (46)$$

Such condition can be simply expressed in terms of the original LDU decomposition of K_p as in the general case. This can be concluded from the D_+ parameterization $S = L_p D_+ L_p^T$ and from the fact that L_+ (13,A) is close to the identity for large d_+ . Indeed, (46) holds if

$$S = L_p D_+ L_p^T > \frac{1}{2\gamma} |D^{-1}| = \frac{1}{2\gamma} |D_p^{-1}| D_+ \quad (47)$$

or, equivalently

$$L_+ L_+^T > \frac{1}{2\gamma} |D_p^{-1}|. \quad (48)$$

Since L_+ can be chosen arbitrarily close to the identity, the following theorem can be proved.

Theorem 1. For the closed-loop system consisting of the plant (1), reference model (2-32), and the MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm summarized in Table 1, where $l_0 = a$, if

$$\gamma > \frac{1}{2} \max_i (|d_{p_i}|^{-1}), \quad i \in [1, m], \quad (49)$$

where $\{d_{p_i}\}_{i=1}^m$ are the diagonal elements of matrix D_p , then (a) all system signals are globally uniformly bounded and $e(t), e_0(t), \tilde{\Theta}^T \Xi(t) \in \mathcal{L}_2 \cap \mathcal{L}_\infty$ and tend to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$; (b) if $R(0) \geq c\gamma I$ for some constant $c > 0$, then the norms $\|e_0\|_2^2, \|v\|_2^2, \|e - e_h\|_2^2$ are of order $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-2})$, where e_h is the homogeneous exponentially decaying solution of the linear subsystem (33).

Proof. From (45) (49) $\dot{V} < 0$. Then we conclude that V is bounded.

To show the boundedness of $e(t), \tilde{\Theta}(t)$ we must take into account that V_1 (as a function of $\tilde{\Theta}$) is time-varying due to the term $R^{-1}(t)$. To this end, note that since $R(0) = R^T(0) > 0$, then from the R update law

$$\dot{R}^{-1}(t) = \Xi \Xi^T,$$

which by integrating gives

$$R^{-1}(t) = R^{-1}(0) + J(t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (50)$$

where $J(t) = \int_0^t \Xi(\tau) \Xi^T(\tau) d\tau$. From (44) and (50),

$$V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = \varepsilon V_2(e) + \tilde{\Theta}^T |D| R^{-1}(0) \tilde{\Theta} + \tilde{\Theta}^T |D| J(t) \tilde{\Theta}.$$

Since all the terms in the above sum are nonnegative, they must be bounded. Consequently, $e, \tilde{\Theta}, \Theta \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Since \dot{V} is bounded from above by a negative definite quadratic form of e, v , then $e, v \in \mathcal{L}_2$.

Considering the Ω structure in (20), we easily conclude subsequently from $(\Omega_m \in \mathcal{L}_\infty)$ that $(u_m \in \mathcal{L}_\infty) \Rightarrow (\Omega_{m-1} \in \mathcal{L}_\infty) \Rightarrow (u_{m-1} \in \mathcal{L}_\infty) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (u_2 \in \mathcal{L}_\infty) \Rightarrow (\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{L}_\infty) \Rightarrow (u_1 \in \mathcal{L}_\infty)$. This allows us to conclude that $\Omega, \Xi, \tilde{\Xi} \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, and $u \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Therefore, all system signals are globally uniformly bounded.

Moreover, since $e, \tilde{\Theta}^T \Xi \in \mathcal{L}_2 \cap \mathcal{L}_\infty$ and $\dot{e}, \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\Theta}^T \Xi \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$ then, from Barbălat Lemma [Tao, 2003, p. 81], it follows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\Theta}^T \Xi = 0$.

It is also clear that $v \in \mathcal{L}_2 \cap \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Indeed, V_1 is bounded by its initial value since $\dot{V}_1 \leq 0$. Moreover, by integrating both extreme sides of (42), $\|v\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-2})$. Note that $V_1(0) = \mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-1})$ by the $R(0)$ assumption in (b). Since in (33) A_c is Hurwitz and e_0 is given by (34), then property (b) holds. \square

2.5 Summary of the MIMO LS-MRAC

Table 1 summarizes the MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm.

Remark 2. The control law (22) can be written as

$$u = \Theta^T \Omega - \gamma e_0^T \text{sign}(D) \Xi^T R \Xi,$$

which shows a feedback term of the tracking error e_0 . This seems related to the proposed algorithm fast tracking error convergence.

2.5.1 The M-MRAC

The M-MRAC algorithm described in Costa [2020] is a particular case of the LS-MRAC. It is easily obtained by using a constant adaptation gain Γ setting

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{R} &= 0, \\ R(0) &= \gamma^{-1} \text{diag}\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^m, \\ \Gamma_i &= \Gamma_i^T > 0, \quad \Gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times N_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The M-MRAC reduces to the MRAC with gradient adaptive law applied to a relative degree zero output error equation. Thus, Remark 2 applies in this case and a fast convergence of the tracking error results. However, as illustrated in Section 3, the parametric convergence can be very slow.

The foregoing LS-MRAC stability analysis can be easily extended to the M-MRAC case by just setting $\dot{R} = 0$. In this case, inequality (46) becomes simply $\gamma S > 0$, i.e., it suffices that γ be positive, for stability of the M-MRAC.

2.6 Convergence analysis

First, let us present the following lemmas.

Lemma 3. Given the inequality

$$\dot{V}_1(t) \leq -\gamma e_1^2(t), \quad (51)$$

where $V_1(t) \geq 0 \forall t$, $e_1(t)$ is continuous, and $\gamma > 0$. For any given $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$e_1^2(t) \geq \varepsilon^2, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_0 + \Delta_\varepsilon], \quad (52)$$

then, if $V_1(0) = c_0 \gamma^{-1}$, the time interval Δ_ε must satisfy,

$$\Delta_\varepsilon \leq c_0 (\varepsilon \gamma)^{-2}. \quad (53)$$

Proof. Suppose that initially $e_1^2(t_0) \geq \varepsilon^2$. By continuity, (52) follows for some $\Delta_\varepsilon \geq 0$. Then, from (51) we have

$$0 \leq V_1(t) \leq V_1(0) - \gamma \varepsilon^2 \Delta_\varepsilon \quad (54)$$

and thus,

$$\Delta_\varepsilon \leq c_0 (\varepsilon \gamma)^{-2}. \quad (55)$$

\square

The following result relates \mathcal{L}_2 -norm and \mathcal{L}_∞ -norm of uniformly Lipschitz-continuous functions.

Lemma 4. Let $f(t)$ be uniformly continuous with Lipschitz constant K . Then, for any positive ε

$$\|f(t)\|_2^2 = \varepsilon \rightarrow \|f(t)\|_\infty \leq (3K\varepsilon)^{1/3}. \quad (56)$$

Proof. Given the Lipschitz constant K , we have $|f(t)| \geq |f(t_0)| - K(t - t_0)$, $\forall t, t_0$. Let $t_m = |f(t_0)|/K + t_0$ be the time when the right-hand-side of the latter inequality is zero. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon = \|f\|_2^2 &\geq \int_{t_0}^{t_m} (|f(t_0)| - K(t - t_0))^2 dt \\ &= -(|f(t_0)| - K(t - t_0))^3 / 3K \Big|_{t_0}^{t_m} = |f(t_0)|^3 / 3K. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Since, this holds for any t_0 ,

$$|f(t)| \leq (3K\varepsilon)^{1/3}, \quad \forall t. \quad (58)$$

This proves the Lemma. \square

Now we can prove the convergence theorem.

Theorem 2 (Convergence Characterization).

In the LS-MRAC system of Theorem 1, if the $R(0) \geq c\gamma I$ for some constant $c > 0$ the tracking error converges to an arbitrarily small residual value ε within a time of order $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-1})$, then will remain norm-bounded by a constant of order $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-1/2})$ and ultimately converge to zero.

Proof. From (34) we have

$$\dot{e}_0 = S\dot{v} = D[\dot{\Xi}^T \tilde{\Theta} + \Xi^T \dot{\tilde{\Theta}}]. \quad (59)$$

Since $\Xi, \dot{\Xi}^T \tilde{\Theta}, R, \dot{R}$ are all uniformly bounded, from (40) we can write, for some constant $c_1 > 0$

$$|\dot{\tilde{\Theta}}| \leq \gamma c_1 \|e_0\|_\infty. \quad (60)$$

Then, from (59), the Lipschitz constant satisfies

$$K \leq \gamma c_2 \|e_0\|_\infty,$$

for some $c_2 > 0$ and large enough γ .

From (41) and (37), noting that $R(0) \geq c\gamma I$

$$\|e_0\|_2^2 \leq c_3 / (\gamma)^2, \quad \exists c_3 > 0.$$

Now, from Lemma 4, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_0\|_\infty &\leq (3\gamma c_2 \|e_0\|_\infty)^{1/3} \|e_0\|_2 \\ &\leq (3\gamma c_2 \|e_0\|_\infty)^{1/3} c_4 \gamma^{-1/3}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Now, solving (61) we get

$$\|e_0\|_\infty \leq c_5 \gamma^{-1/2}. \quad (62)$$

Moreover, using Lemma 4, after a time interval of at most Δ_ε , the tracking error reaches the residual error given by (62). \square

Remark 3 (The case of a general diagonal A_m (4)). *The convergence properties of the general case was verified to be similar to the particular case analysed above. A full analysis seems possible but possibly more involved*

and is not pursued here. However, note that tracking a more general model reference can be achieved with the particular model of Theorem 1. Indeed, it sufficient to filter the reference signal with a simple first order filter given by

$$F(s) = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{s+a}{s+a_i} \right\}_1^m.$$

3 Simulation results

To illustrate the improvement introduced by the presented MIMO algorithms two plants are considered Hsu et al. [2001]. The first example corresponds to the simplest possible 2I2O adaptive control problem that appears in visual servoing with an uncalibrated camera. The system is described by

$$P(s) = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{s+2}, \frac{1}{s+2} \right\} K_p, \quad (63)$$

$$K_p = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi & \sin \phi \\ -h \sin \phi & h \cos \phi \end{bmatrix}, \quad (64)$$

$$M(s) = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{2}{s+2}, \frac{2}{s+2} \right\}, \quad (65)$$

where the only unknown parameters are ϕ and h . The simulation results are obtained with $\phi = 1$ and $h = 0.5$. The corresponding matching parameter for this system is $\Theta_1^{*T} = [0.54 \quad -1.68 \quad 0]$, $\Theta_2^{*T} = [0.84 \quad 1.08]$, $\|\Theta^*\| = 2.34$.

The second example is a 2I2O plant of third order. The simulations are performed with

$$P(s) = \frac{1}{s^2-1} \begin{bmatrix} s+3 & 2s \\ -2s-4 & s+3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (66)$$

$$M(s) = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{s+1}, \frac{2}{s+2} \right\}. \quad (67)$$

This plant has poles at $s = \{1, 1, -1\}$, transmission zero at $s = -1.8$, and

$$K_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ -2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

and state-space realization

$$A_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}; B_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}; C_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 2 & -5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This case requires 17 parameters to be adapted, that is, $\Omega_1 \in \mathbb{R}^9$, and $\Omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}^8$.

Plant (63) is considered for simulations 1 to 3

$$\begin{aligned} y_p(0) &= [1 \quad 1]^T, & y_M(0) &= [0 \quad 0]^T, \\ r(t) &= [1 + 10\sin(5t) \quad -1 + 5\sin(3t)]^T. \end{aligned}$$

All initial conditions not mentioned are zero.

Simulation 1. For comparison, Fig. 1 shows the simulation results of the plant (63) with the MIMO MRAC algorithm of Costa et al. [2003]. The following gain is set:

$$\Gamma = 10 I.$$

The large transient tracking error shown in Fig. 1 would hardly be acceptable in practice. Increasing the gain Γ in this algorithm does not help.




Figure 1: Simulation result of the first order plant (63) with the MIMO MRAC algorithm.

Simulation 2. Figure 2 shows the simulation results of the plant (63) with the MIMO M-MRAC algorithm summarized in Table 1 and Section 2.5.1. The following data are used:

$$\ell_0 = 3, \quad \Gamma = 500 I.$$

The tracking error transient and the control mismatch are remarkably improved. Here we can verify the effect of a large adaptation gain Γ , as pointed out in Remarks 2 and 4. Large Γ reduces the tracking error and the control mismatch, but also reduces the convergence rate of the parameter (due to small e_0).




Figure 2: Simulation result of the first order plant (63) with the MIMO M-MRAC algorithm.

Simulation 3. Figure 3 shows the simulation results of the plant (63) with the MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm summarized in Table 1. The following data are used:

$$\ell_0 = 3, \quad \gamma = 50, \quad R(0) = 20 I.$$

Note the fast and smooth convergence of the parameter even when employing large gains.




Figure 3: Simulation result of the first order plant (63) with the MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm.

The next simulations refer to the 3rd order plant (66).

Simulation 4. Figures 4 to 8 show the simulation results of the plant (66) with the MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm. This is a case with 17 parameters where

$$\nu = 2, \quad \ell_0 = 2, \quad \Lambda = -2 I, \quad g = I, \quad A_M = -2 I, \quad r(t) = [1 + 10 \text{sign}(\sin(5t)) \quad -1 + 5 \text{sign}(\sin(3t))]^T.$$

All initial conditions not mentioned are zero.

3.1 On Parametric Convergence

Since A_c is Hurwitz, the state error asymptotically tends to a small \mathcal{L}_2 signal. This implies that the regressor $\xi(t)$ is asymptotically persistently exciting (PE) if the reference signal is rich and $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-1})$ is sufficiently small. Consequently, the parameters converge to the matching values with the regressor approaching the model regressor ξ_m . Thus, the parametric adaptation inherits the favorable convergence properties for the least-squares (LS) identification of the linear regression problem (8) with $\xi = \xi_m$. This is illustrated in Fig. 3b.

Figures 6 and 7 illustrate the transient behavior for very large initial conditions in the plant state. In Fig. 6, a rather large residual error persists. A possible explanation is that the transient excursion of some adaptive parameters is quite large, causing the residual error to remain significant for a longer period. This is predicted by Lemma 4, as the Lipschitz constant K becomes large during the transient phase, and the PE property of the reference regressor may be weakened. This poor transient and steady-state residual can be easily avoided by introducing a switched σ -modification Ioannou and Sun [1996] to reduce the initial transient of the adaptive parameters. Consequently, the residual error almost vanishes, as shown in Fig. 7.




Figure 4: Simulation result of the third order plant (66) with the MIMO LS-MRAC algorithm, $x_p(0) = [0.65 \ 1 \ -0.37]^T$, $R(0) = I$.




Figure 5: As in Fig. 4, with larger $R(0)=10$. Note that the transient is faster and with smaller error, as expected.

Remark 4. A similar tracking behavior as in Figs. 4 or 5 occurs with the M-MRAC during the initial transient in Fig.2 showing a fast tracking error convergence to a small residual set. However, the parametric adaptation will follow the gradient identification process rather than the faster LS identification process. In contrast to Fig. 3, Figure 2 shows that the tracking is precise but parameter convergence is far from being reached.

4 Conclusion

A direct least-squares adaptive model reference control (LS-MRAC) is proposed for MIMO systems with uniform relative degree one, accompanied by a comprehensive




Figure 6: As in Fig. 4, with large initial conditions, $x_p(0) = [0.65 \ 100 \ -0.37]^T$, $\gamma = 10$, $R(0) = 20$. Large residual errors result due to large transients in the adaptive parameters. The subpicture displays the residual set around the reference trajectory consisting of a polygonal Lissajoux pattern (in red).




Figure 7: As in Fig. 6, with large initial conditions but with switched σ -modification (0 to 10). Small residual errors result due to reduced transients in the adaptive parameters.




Figure 8: Parameter convergence (θ_1) for the case of Figure 7. Similar behavior occurs with θ_2 .

Lyapunov-based stability analysis and convergence characterization. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first such solution in the adaptive control literature. The MIMO LS-MRAC achieves, in ideal conditions, arbitrarily fast tracking error convergence while maintaining parameter convergence for quite large

adaptation gains. Simulations are presented to illustrate the significant improvement in both tracking and parameter convergence behavior. LS-adaptation with covariance reset and forgetting factor for increased robustness are promising topics for future research. The extension of the algorithm to the case of general relative degree is a significant and challenging open problem.

A Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Using the factorization $D_+ = D_+^{1/2} D_+^{1/2}$, we have with (14)

$$2Q = -S^{-1} D_+^{1/2} (L_+ L_+^T A + A L_+ L_+^T) D_+^{1/2} S^{-1}, \quad (68)$$

where $L_+ = D_+^{-1/2} L_p D_+^{1/2}$. Denoting $L_p = (\ell_{ij})$, $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, we get

$$L_+ = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \frac{\ell_{21}}{d_+} & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \frac{\ell_{31}}{d_+^2} & \frac{\ell_{32}}{d_+} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \frac{\ell_{41}}{d_+^3} & \frac{\ell_{42}}{d_+^2} & \frac{\ell_{43}}{d_+} & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\ell_{m1}}{d_+^{m-1}} & \frac{\ell_{m2}}{d_+^{m-2}} & \frac{\ell_{m3}}{d_+^{m-3}} & \frac{\ell_{m4}}{d_+^{m-4}} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which clearly shows that

$$\lim_{d_+ \rightarrow \infty} L_+ = I.$$

This means that for a sufficiently large d_+ , $L_+ L_+^T$ is diagonal dominant. Consequently, there exists $d^* > 0$ such that

$$L_+ L_+^T A + A L_+ L_+^T < 0, \quad \forall d_+ > d^*,$$

and, as a result, $Q > 0$. \square

Acknowledgements — This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001, by the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), and by the Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho (FAPERJ) under grant E-26/204.669/2024.

References

H. Berghuis, H. Roebbers, and H. Nijmeijer. Experimental comparison of parameter estimation methods in adaptive robot control. *Automatica*, 31:1275–1285, 1995.

R. R. Costa. Lyapunov design of least-squares model reference adaptive control. In *1st Virtual IFAC World Congress (IFAC-V 2020)*, Berlin, Germany, July 11-17 2020.

R. R. Costa. Least-squares model-reference adaptive control with high-order parameter tuners. *Automatica*, 163:111544, 2024.

R. R. Costa, L. Hsu, A. K. Imai, and P. Kokotović. Lyapunov-based adaptive control of MIMO systems. *Automatica*, 39(7):1251–1257, 2003.

H. Elliott, R. Cristi, and M. Das. Global stability of adaptive pole placement algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 30(4):348–356, 1985.

B. Fidan, A. Camlica, and S. Guler. Least-squares-based adaptive target localization by mobile distance measurement sensors. *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, 29(2):259–271, 2015.

S. Guler, B. Fidan, S. Dasgupta, B. D. Anderson, and I. Shames. Adaptive source localization based station keeping of autonomous vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(7):3122–3135, 2016.

L. Hsu, R. R. Costa, A. K. Imai, and P. Kokotović. Lyapunov-based adaptive control of MIMO systems. In *Proc. American Contr. Conf.*, pages 4808–4813, Arlington, July 2001.

P. Ioannou and K. Sun. *Robust Adaptive Control*. Prentice Hall, 1996.

M. Krstic. On using least-squares updates without regressor filtering in identification and adaptive control of nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 45:731–735, March 2009.

N. Nguyen. *Model-Reference Adaptive Control*. Advanced Textbooks in Control and Signal Processing. Springer, Cham, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-56393-0_5. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56393-0_5.

S. S. Sastry and M. Bodson. *Adaptive Control: Stability, Convergence and Robustness*. Prentice Hall, 1989.

J.-J. E. Slotine and W. Li. *Applied Nonlinear Control*. Prentice Hall, 1991.

G. Strang. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1988.

G. Tao. *Adaptive Control Design and Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2003.

G. Tao. Multivariable adaptive control: A survey. *Automatica*, 50(11):2737–2764, 2014.

N. Zengin, B. Fidan, and L. Khoshnevisan. Lyapunov analysis of least squares based direct adaptive control. In *IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Cancun, Mexico, Dec 6-9 2022.