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Abstract: Output-feedback control of general underactuated mechanical systems is currently considered a major open problem. This study is focused on the output-feedback stabilisation control problems for a special class of underactuated mechanical systems, which appear in robotics and aerospace applications. For the synthesis of controller, first, the considered underactuated mechanical system is explicitly transformed into two cascade connected subsystems, and then an auxiliary filter-based virtual stabilisation controller is developed to locally asymptotically stabilise the first subsystem. Further, the designed virtual controller is again involved into the second subsystem using backstepping procedure to construct the actual control law, in which a series of auxiliary time-varying first-order low-pass filters are also implemented to avoid using the derivative of the system non-linear functions. Moreover, in the second step, finite-time observer technique is utilised to precisely reconstruct the immeasurable states to achieve the finite-time stabilisation control in the sense of output feedback. Lyapunov analysis shows the local asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system through the cascade system stability criteria. Simulation results are presented by using two benchmark non-linear underactuated mechanical systems to demonstrate the feasibility and the effectiveness of the proposed controller.

1 Introduction
Underactuated mechanical systems, systems with fewer inputs than degree of freedom, appear in a variety of practical plants including Robotics (e.g. flexible-link robot, non-holonomic mobile robots and walking robots), Aerospace Vehicles (e.g. helicopters, aircraft, spacecraft and satellites), underwater vehicles and surface vessels. Owing to their broad range of applications, how to control these underactuated systems, especially, with only output information available, has received much attention over the past decades.

The main difficulties lying in control of these underactuated mechanical systems are caused by the lack of actuation for some configuration variables. The underactuated variables can only be driven by the coupling movement of actuated variables. Besides, the existence of under-actuation would commonly admit second-order non-holonomic constraints to the mechanical systems. For these circumstances, the control problem of underactuated mechanical systems is a changeling one and open problem to be solved. Moreover today, much of the research is still focused on finding state feedback asymptotical stabilisation controllers. Few progresses have been made in the output–feedback-tracking control cases of such systems. While, the controller design for underactuated mechanical system is closely related to the controllability and accessibility analysis. Early researcher’s work reveals that potential energy plays a vital role in the controllability of underactuated mechanical systems. When, certain underactuated mechanical systems, such as ground-based robot manipulators, performing tasks in potential field, they are proved to be linearisable around equilibriums and thus locally controllable. Correspondingly, the control system design is relatively easy and various control algorithms are available and have been presented for such kinds of underactuated systems, for example, energy-based control [1, 2], controlled Lagrangian [3], interconnection and damping assignment passivity-based control (IDAP) [4, 5]. However, for the underactuated mechanical systems without potential energy, the linearised system around working equilibrium is proved not to be controllable; furthermore, it can be verified that this kind of underactuated systems does not satisfy Brockett’s necessary conditions, which means there exists no time-invariant and continuous control law that can asymptotically stabilise this system to its equilibrium [6]. Thus, the conventional control algorithms are ruled out in such conditions. The stabilisation for such systems might be solved with either discontinuous or time-varying control law. Different control strategies are discussed in literature, for example, sliding-mode control [7–10], motion-planning-based control [11, 12], backstepping control [13, 14], fuzzy control [15, 16]. However, these controllers are either too complicated to be adopted in practical applications or only applicable for specific systems considered. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, no control algorithms are derived for a general class of underactuated mechanical systems.

Nevertheless, all of the above-mentioned results hold only for the full-state feedback control cases, and as far as we know, the problem of output-feedback control for the underactuated mechanical systems remains open. In some underactuated systems, the lack of actuation is usually designed
to reduce expense, size or weight, for example, under-actuated industrial manipulators [17]. In those situations, velocity measurement sensors are not equipped. Furthermore, output-feedback control has the ability of avoiding the measurement noise of velocity signals. Thus, research on output-feedback control for underactuated mechanical system would be meaningful. However, just as mentioned above, owing to the complex dynamics in underactuated mechanical systems, very few results have been presented about the output-feedback control case. Only certain for specific systems are available, for example, the output-feedback control for translational oscillator with rotational actuator (TORA) system [18, 19], spherical inverted pendulum [20], mobile robot manipulator [21] and quad-rotor underactuated aerial vehicles (UAV) [22]. It should be noted that all the above-mentioned output-feedback controllers are designed for particular underactuated systems and are not applicable to other kinds of underactuated mechanical systems. In this paper, we will tackle this problem by using an auxiliary filter in a spirit similar to the recently proposed control technique in [23] for robotics and aerospace vehicles.

The main contribution is to find explicit change of coordinates and output control that transform a class of underactuated mechanical systems into cascade non-linear systems with structural properties that are convenient for control design purposes. More specifically, using the transformation and reduction technique, the underactuated mechanical system considered is firstly transformed into a cascade structure including two subsystems, and under this, an auxiliary filter is developed for designing the virtual control law for the first subsystem. Then, a new stabilisation method as stabilising non-linear output-feedback control law is introduced to the second systems. This controller is obtained via a simple recursive method like backstepping technique through a series of first-order time-varying low-pass filters that is convenient for implementation. Note that in this step a finite-time observer is involved to reconstruct the immeasurable states for finite-time stability of the closed-loop. A Lyapunov argument is used to show local asymptotical stability of the special classes of cascade underactuated systems and then the output-feedback control problem is solved explicitly. This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, a formal problem statement accompanied by all the governing equations is presented. In Section 3, the control scheme and the associated stability analysis for the resulting closed-loop are investigated. Section 4 presents numerical simulation results, and the paper is ended with some concluding remarks in Section 5.

2 Preliminary and problem formulation

In this work, the dynamics of the mechanical systems is formulated through the Euler–Lagrange equation. The Lagrange of a simple mechanical system is the difference between a (positive semi-definite) kinetic energy and a potential energy as

$$\mathcal{L}(q, \dot{q}) = K - V = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^T M(q) \dot{q} - V(q)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $q \in U$ denotes the configuration vector that belongs to an $n$-dimensional configuration manifold $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $M(q)$ is the positive-definite symmetric inertia matrix, $K$ is the kinetic energy and $V(q)$ is the potential energy of the system. Then, the Euler–Lagrange equation for the mechanical system is as follows

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{q}} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q} = \tau$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\tau$ is the generalised control inputs including either forces or torques applied on this mechanical system.

Consider the mechanical systems described by Euler–Lagrange equation in (2), two terminologies are needed in the problem formulation, that is, ‘shape variable and kinematic symmetry’. Here, Shape variables-$q$, are the variables that appear in the inertia matrix $M$, that is, $M = M(q)$, and a Lagrange system is kinetic symmetry w.r.t. $q_s$, if and only if the kinetic energy $K$ of the mechanical system is invariant with respect to the configuration variable $q_s$, that is

$$\frac{\partial K}{\partial q_s} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

In this work, the main research is restricted to a class of underactuated mechanical systems with the properties of: (i) full-actuated shape variable $q_s$, (ii) kinetic symmetry w.r.t $q_s$, and (iii) $q_r$ does not appear in the centrifugal, Coriolis and gravity terms. When using the Euler–Lagrange expression, this special class of underactuated mechanical systems can be formulated as

$$\begin{align*}
m_{x_s}(q_s) \ddot{q}_s + m_{x_r}(q_s) \ddot{q}_r + h_s(q_s, \dot{q}_s, \dot{q}_r) = 0 \\
m_{x_s}(q_s) \ddot{q}_s + m_{x_r}(q_s) \ddot{q}_r + h_r(q_s, \dot{q}_s, \dot{q}_r) = \tau
\end{align*}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Under these conditions, the problem of output-feedback stabilisation of system in (4) is considered with only the measurement of the configuration variables ($q_s, q_r$).

Remark 1: The special system considered in this paper is similar to the Class I underactuated mechanical systems defined in [23]. However, compared with [23], the additional property 3) is required, which is used to extend the state-partial feedback transformation into the new cases of output-feedback.

3 Main results

3.1 Model transformation

The explicit cascade transformation to the original system is described in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1 [23]: let $\tau = \alpha(q_s) u + \beta(q_s, \dot{q}_s)$ be the collected partially linearising change of control for (4). Assuming all the elements of $\omega = m_{x_s}(q_s) m_{x_r}(q_s) \dot{q}_s$, are exact forms and let $\omega = d\gamma(q_s)$, then there exists a global change of coordinates obtained from the Lagrangian of the system

$$\begin{align*}
qu &= \dot{q}_s + \gamma(q_s) \equiv \Phi(q_s, q_r) \\
p &= m_{x_s}(q_s) \ddot{q}_s + m_{x_r}(q_s) \ddot{q}_r
\end{align*}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

and transforms the dynamics of the underactuated system into a cascade normal form in strict feedback form

$$\begin{align*}
\sum_a \dot{q}_a &= m^{-1}(q_s) p_a \\
\dot{p}_a &= g_r(q_r, q_s) \\
\sum_b \dot{q}_b &= p_b \\
\dot{p}_b &= u
\end{align*}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)
with \( p_r = \dot{q}_r \) and
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{m}_r(q_r) &= m_i(q_r) \\
\dot{g}_r(q_r, q_i) &= -\partial V(q_r - \gamma(q_i), q_i) / \partial q_r
\end{align*}
\] (7)

Note that the shape variable \( q_i \) can be regarded as the virtual control input for \( \sum_i \)-subsystem. However, it is implicitly included in unknown function \( g_r(.) \), which poses considerable obstacles in controller design. To linearly factor out the virtual control input \( q_i \), the feedback change of input described by Lemma 2 is introduced.

**Lemma 2 [23]:** Consider the following non-linear system non-affine in control
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{q}_r &= N(q_r) p_r \\
\dot{p}_r &= g_r(q_r, q_i)
\end{align*}
\] (8)
where \( q_r, p_r, q_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, g_r(q_r, q_i) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is a smooth function with \( g_r(0, 0) = 0, N(q_r) \) is a invertible matrix for all \( q_r \), and \( m_i(q_r) = N^{-1}(q_r) \) is a positive-definite and symmetric inertia matrix. Suppose there exists an isolated root \( q_i = \sigma(q_i) \) of \( g_r(q_r, q_i) = 0 \) with the property \( \sigma(0) = 0 \) such that
\[
\det \left( \frac{\partial g_r}{\partial q_i} (q_r, \sigma(q_r)) \right) \neq 0
\] (9)
and let
\[
\psi(q_r, v) \triangleq [m_i(q_r) g_r(q_r, q_i)]_{w=\sigma(q_i)+v}
\] (10)
Then, for all \( q_r \in \mathbb{R}^n, w = \psi(q_r, v) \) is a local diffeomorphism around a neighbourhood of \( v = 0 \). Assume there exists an open ball of \( B_r(0) \) around \( w = 0 \) and a function \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) such that
\[
\psi(q_r, \varphi(q_r, w)) = w, \quad \forall w \in B_r(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n
\] (11)
uniformly in \( q_r \). Then the feedback change of input
\[
q_i = \sigma(q_r) + \varphi(q_r, w)
\] (12)
transforms (8) into the following form
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{q}_r &= N(q_r) p_r \\
\dot{p}_r &= N(q_r) w
\end{align*}
\] (13)
It should be noted that Lemmas 1 and 2 together constitute the explicit transformation to be used in the following parts. For clarity, the following representation of coordinates is made in controller design procedures. Let
\[
x_1 = q_r, \quad x_2 = p_r, \quad x_3 = q_i, \quad x_4 = p_i
\] (14)
Note that here only \( x_1, x_3 \) are measurable.

In view of Lemmas 1 and 2, the control task now changes to find a control law asymptotically stabilises the following cascade system with only the measurement of variables \( x_1 \) and \( x_3 \)
\[
\sum_1 \sum_2 \begin{cases}
\dot{x}_1 = N(x_1)x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 = N(x_1)w \\
x_3 = \sigma(x_1) + \varphi(x_1, w) \\
\dot{x}_4 = u \\
\tau = \alpha(x_1)u + \beta(x_1, x_3, x_4)
\end{cases}
\] (15)
Generally, input-to-state stability theorem can be employed in the controller design for cascade connected systems. However, the existence of the intermediate term \( x_1 = \sigma(x_1) + \varphi(x_1, w) \) rules out its application to this paper. However, for the general cascade systems, the following lemma reveals the intrinsic stability property between cascaded subsystems, and will be used in the design and analysis of controllers for system in (15).

**Lemma 3 [24]:** For the cascade system
\[
\begin{cases}
\dot{x} = f(x, z) \\
\dot{z} = g(z)
\end{cases}
\] (16)
If \( x = 0 \) is a locally asymptotically stable equilibrium of \( \dot{x} = f(x, 0) \), and if \( \dot{z} = g(z) \) is also locally asymptotically stable, then the composite system (16) also is locally asymptotically stable.

On the basis of Lemma 3, it can be known that if the virtual control input \( x_3 \) for \( \sum_i \)-subsystem can locally asymptotically stabilise the \( \sum_i \)-subsystem, and \( \tau \) can also locally asymptotically stabilise the \( \sum_i \)-subsystem, then the cascade system is locally asymptotically stable. In the following parts, virtual controllers of \( x_3 \) and \( \tau \) will be designed separately to achieve local asymptotical stabilisation of corresponding subsystems.

### 3.2 Controller design for \( \sum_i \)-subsystem

In view of the above definition of variables, \( x_1 \) can be measurable, and thus if \( w \) can be designed to locally asymptotically stabilise the \( \sum_i \)-subsystem, then the virtual control input \( x_3 \) for \( \sum_i \)-subsystem can be derived straightforwardly from \( x_3 = \sigma(x_1) + \varphi(x_1, w) \). To this end, viewing work of Loria and Nijmeijer [25], the following output-feedback controller for \( \sum_i \)-subsystem is designed and the conclusion is stated in Theorem 1.

**Lemma 4 (theorem of Barbashin [26]):** Let \( x = 0 \) be an equilibrium point of system \( \dot{x} = f(x) \). Let \( V : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a continuously differentiable, positive definite function on a domain \( \mathbb{D} \) containing the origin \( x = 0 \), such that \( V(x) \leq 0 \) in \( \mathbb{D} \). Let \( S = \{x \in \mathbb{D} | V(x) = 0 \} \) and suppose that no solution can stay identically in \( S \), other than the trivial solution \( x(t) = 0 \). Then, the origin is asymptotically stable.

**Theorem 1:** For the subsystem
\[
\sum_1 \begin{cases}
\dot{x}_1 = N(x_1)x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 = N(x_1)w
\end{cases}
\] (17)
where \( N(\cdot) \) is a positive-definite function. If the output-feedback controller is designed to be
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{w} &= -k_p \tanh(x_1) - k_d \tanh(\theta) \\
\dot{\theta} &= q_p + bx_1 \\
\dot{q}_p &= -a \tanh(q_p + bx_1)
\end{align*}
\]
(18)
where \( a, b, k_p, k_d \) are positive real numbers. Then this system is asymptotically stable.

**Proof:** Choose the following candidate Lyapunov function for system (17)
\[
V = V_1 + V_2
\]
(19)
where \( V_1, V_2 \) is defined respectively as
\[
\begin{align*}
V_1 &= \frac{1}{2} x_1^2 + k_p \ln \cosh(x_1) + \frac{k_d}{b} \ln \cosh(\theta) \\
V_2 &= \varepsilon x_2 (\tanh(x_1) - \tanh(\theta))
\end{align*}
\]
(20)
\[\text{with } \varepsilon \text{ is a positive real number to be determined. To prove the positive-definite property of } V, \text{ the following two auxiliary functions are considered}
\[
\begin{align*}
W_1 &= \frac{1}{4} x_1^2 + \frac{1}{4} \tanh^2(x_1) k_p + \varepsilon \tanh(x_1) x_2 \\
W_2 &= \frac{1}{4} x_1^2 + \frac{1}{4} \tanh^2(\theta) k_d - \varepsilon \tanh(\theta) x_2
\end{align*}
\]
(22)
It is easy to prove that \( \ln |\cosh(z)| \geq \alpha \tanh^2(z) \) for all \( \alpha \leq 1/2 \) and for all \( z \in \mathbb{R} \); therefore
\[
V \geq W_1 + W_2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( k_p \ln \cosh(x_1) + \frac{k_d}{b} \ln \cosh(\theta) \right)
\]
(23)
If \( \varepsilon \) is constrained to
\[
\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \left( \sqrt{k_p}, \sqrt{k_d/b} \right)
\]
(24)
Then, \( W_1, W_2 \) are positive definite. Thus, the candidate Lyapunov function \( V \) is positive definite as well. Under the designed control law (18), the closed-loop system can be rewritten as
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= Nx_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= N \left( -k_p \tanh(x_1) - k_d \tanh(\theta) \right) \\
\dot{\theta} &= -a \tanh(\theta) + bn x_2
\end{align*}
\]
(25)
Taking the derivative of (20) along trajectories (25), one can obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{V}_1 &= x_1 \dot{x}_2 + k_p \tanh(x_1) N x_2 + k_d \tanh(\theta) \\
&\quad \times \left( -a \tanh(\theta) + bn x_2 \right) \\
&= -\frac{a k_d}{b} \tanh^2(\theta)
\end{align*}
\]
(26)
Further, the derivative of the second Lyapunov function \( V_2 \) along the trajectory of (25) can be calculated as
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{V}_2/\varepsilon &= \tanh^2(x_1)(-k_p N) + \tanh^2(\theta)(k_d N) \\
&\quad + x_1^2 \left( \sech^2(x_1) N - \sech^2(\theta) b N \right) \\
&\quad + \tanh(x_1) \tanh(\theta) (k_p N + k_d N) \\
&\quad + \tanh(\theta) x_2 (a \sech^2(\theta))
\end{align*}
\]
(27)
Thus
\[
\dot{V} = \dot{V}_1 + \dot{V}_2 = -[\tanh(x_1), \tanh(\theta), x_2] \mathbf{Q}
\times [\tanh(x_1), \tanh(\theta), x_2]^T
\]
(28)
where \( \mathbf{Q} \) is a matrix with sub-matrix as
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{Q} &= \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{21} & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\
Q_{11} &= \varepsilon k_p N \\
Q_{12} &= Q_{21}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \alpha (k_p N + k_d N) \\
0.5 \alpha \sech^2(\theta) - \varepsilon (\sech(x_1) N - \sech^2(\theta) b N) \end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]
(29)

In the following part, we will show that by appropriately choosing \( \varepsilon \), matrix \( \mathbf{Q} \) can be rendered positive definite.

Since \( Q_{11} > 0 \), based on Schur complement lemma, if one wants to set \( \mathbf{Q} > 0 \), the matrix \( \mathbf{Q}_{22} - \mathbf{Q}_{21}^T \mathbf{Q}_{11} \mathbf{Q}_{21} \) needs to be positive definite, that is
\[
S \leq \mathbf{Q}_{22} - \mathbf{Q}_{12}^T \mathbf{Q}_{11} \mathbf{Q}_{12} > 0 
\]
(30)
where
\[
S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{bmatrix}
\]
(31)
The positive-definite requirement implies that all the order principal minor determinants of symmetric matrix \( S \) should be greater than zero, that is
\[
S_{11} \leq \frac{ak_d}{b} - \varepsilon k_d N - \frac{\varepsilon N (k_p + k_d)^2}{4k_p} > 0
\]
(32)
\[
S_{22} S_{11} - S_{12} S_{21} = \varepsilon^2 N^2 \left( \sech^2(x_1) - b \sech^2(\theta) \right) \\
\quad \times \left( \frac{(k_p + k_d)^2}{4k_p} + k_d \right) - \varepsilon^2 a^2 \sech^4(\theta) 4 \\
\quad - \varepsilon N \left( \sech^2(x_1) - b \sech^2(\theta) \right) \frac{ak_d}{b} > 0
\]
(33)
Equation (32) implies the following constraint for \( \varepsilon \)
\[
\varepsilon < \frac{4ak_d}{bN(4k_p k_d + (k_p + k_d)^2)}
\]
(34)
As for (33), define the set
\[
B_n = \left\{ x \in [x_1, \theta] \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < ||x_2|| < \eta \right\}
\]
(35)
It could be observed that in the ball set \( B_n, \sech(x_1), \sech(\theta) \) are always bounded and their lower and upper bounds are represented here by positive real numbers \( x_{1m}, \theta_m, x_{1M}, \theta_M \), respectively. So, if \( \varepsilon \) is sufficiently small enough and the controller parameters \( b \) is chosen to satisfy the following inequality
\[
b > \frac{\sech^2(x_{1M})}{\sech^2(\theta_m)}
\]
(36)
Then the following inequality would always holds in \( B_n \) (see (37) on bottom of the next page)

As the left part of this inequality converges to zero if \( \varepsilon \) is sufficiently small enough, whereas the right part of this
inequality actually is always negative if constraint (36) is satisfied; thus (37) do always holds in \( B_\epsilon \). Moreover, (37) actually leads to the desired results for (33).

From the above analysis, matrix \( Q \) can be made positive definite in \( [x_1, \theta] \in B_\epsilon \) if sufficiently small \( \epsilon \) is chosen and \( b \) is chosen to satisfy constrain (36). It should be noted that because \( \epsilon \) does not appear in the control law and appears only in the stability analysis part, sufficiently small \( \epsilon \) always exists.

Based on the above calculation, we know that by appropriately choosing the positive number \( \epsilon \), \( V \) can be set to be positive definite at the same time \( \dot{V} \) is set to be negative definite. Thus from Lemma 4, we can infer that \( \dot{V} \) will eventually converge to zero, which implies asymptotically convergence of system state \( x_1, \vartheta, x_2 \). All these prove the asymptotical stability of system (17) under controller (18). This completes the proof. \( \square \)

When to backstepping the virtual control law of \( \Sigma_1 \)-subsystem to the \( \Sigma_2 \)-subsystem, reference signal of \( x_3 \) following (15) should be given as

\[
\bar{x}_3 = \sigma(x_1) + \varphi(x_1, -k_p \tanh(x_1) - k_d \tanh(\vartheta)) \\
\vartheta = q_c + bx_1 \\
\dot{q}_c = -a \tanh(q_c + bx_1)
\]  

(38)

Remark 2: Compared with the stability analysis procedure of Loria and Nijmeijer [24], the use of Schur complement lemma in this paper significantly simplify the stability analysis procedure and design process of the control gain.

Remark 3: The proof of Theorem 1 requires \( a, k_p, k_d \) to be positive numbers and \( b \) to satisfy (36). As long as this requirement is ensured, the existences of sufficient small positive number \( \epsilon \) can be guaranteed to satisfy the stabilization conditions. However, it should be noted that if we only deals with systems (17), arbitrary satisfactory positive values can be chosen for those controller parameters. However, in the context of this paper, the choice of \( a, b, k_p, k_d \) are limited to certain values to allow for the conduction of model transformation stated in Lemma 2. Thus, the value of \( a, b, k_p, k_d \) should be disposed specifically for different underactuated mechanical systems.

### 3.3 Controller design for \( \Sigma_2 \)-subsystem

From the above analysis, the virtual tracking signal for \( \Sigma_2 \)-subsystem is already derived as given by \( \bar{x}_3 \). Then, in view of backstepping design technique, \( \bar{x}_3 \) can be involved into the \( \Sigma_2 \)-subsystem to design the control law \( u \), and then from \( \tau = \alpha(x_3)u + \beta(x_1, x_3, x_4) \), the actual control law \( \tau \) can be calculated. However, this method can be directly applied to state feedback form, while, for the output-feedback case, there are two issues to be solved. The one is: the variable \( x_4 \) in \( \tau = \alpha(x_3)u + \beta(x_1, x_3, x_4) \) is immeasurable, which renders the transform of input hardly feasible in output-feedback form, and the other problem is: in the backstepping design procedure, the derivative of virtual signal \( \tilde{x}_3 \) is needed, which may require additional information of the immeasurable signal \( x_2 \).

In the following parts, the two problems are solved with finite-time observer and low-pass filter techniques. The finite-time observers are used to reconstruct the immeasurable states in finite time, which renders the input transformation \( \tau = \alpha(x_3)u + \beta(x_1, x_3, x_4) \) applicable; under this condition, the introduction of first-order low-pass filters during each recursive step avoids the derivatives of virtual signals from the front step, and thus the output-feedback circumstances are solved totally. The detailed design procedure is shown as follows.

#### 3.3.1 Finite-time observer design:

For the purpose of estimation of the unmeasured coordinate \( x_4 \), the following finite-time observer [27] is introduced

\[
\dot{x}_3 = \dot{x}_4 + k_{a1} |x_3 - \hat{x}_3|^\alpha \operatorname{sgn}(x_3 - \hat{x}_3) \\
\dot{x}_4 = u + k_{a2} |x_3 - \hat{x}_3|^{2\alpha-1} \operatorname{sgn}(x_3 - \hat{x}_3)
\]  

(39)

It has been proved that if parameters are chosen to satisfy \( a_0 \in (0.5, 1), k_{a1}, k_{a2} \in \mathbb{R}^+ \), then the observer error system is finite-time stable, which means when \( t > t_i \) (\( t_i \) is the setting time for finite-time observers), the observer states equal to the system states, that is, \( \bar{x}_3 = x_3, \bar{x}_4 = x_4 \). For space limitation, the details of the derivative process are omitted here; see for example, [27].

To this end, the following design procedure of the controllers is assumed that states \( x_1 \) and \( x_4 \) can be reconstructed precisely in finite-time period. The design procedure is given below.

#### 3.3.2 Backstepping controller design for \( \Sigma_2 \)-subsystem:

Step 1: To avoid the derivative of \( \bar{x}_3 \) in the controller design step, an auxiliary system is introduced for the virtual input \( \bar{x}_3 \) by using a time-varying first-order low-pass filter, that is

\[
e_3(t)\dot{\bar{x}}_3 + \bar{x}_3 = \bar{x}_\bar{3}, \quad \bar{x}_3(0) = x_3(0)
\]  

(40)

where \( e_3(t) \) is a time-varying function to be designed later. Define the following error variables

\[
z_3 = x_3 - x_3
\]  

(41)

The derivative of \( z_3 \) can be given as

\[
\dot{z}_3 = \dot{x}_3 - \dot{x}_3 = x_4 - \dot{x}_4
\]  

(42)

To this end, the virtual input for \( x_4 \) can be designed to be

\[
\ddot{x}_4 = -k_3z_3 + \ddot{x}_y
\]  

(43)

with \( k_3 \) to be positive control gains.

\[
\epsilon \left( \text{sech}^2(x_1)N - \text{sech}^2(\vartheta)bN \right) \ast \left( \frac{N(k_p + k_d)^2}{4k_p} + Nk_d \right) \leq \frac{a^2 \text{sech}^2(\vartheta)}{4} \]  

(37)
Step 2: Similarly, another auxiliary system for $\bar{x}_4$ is designed by the following low-pass filter

$$\epsilon_4(t)\bar{x}_4' + x_4' = \bar{x}_4, \quad \bar{x}_4(0) = x_4(0)$$

(44)

where $\epsilon_4(t)$ is a time-varying function to be designed later.

Accordingly, define the following error variable $z_4$

$$z_4 = x_4 - x_4'$$

(45)

Then, the error dynamics can be calculated as

$$\dot{z}_4 = \dot{x}_4 - \dot{x}_4' = u - \dot{\bar{x}}_4$$

(46)

Then, the control input is chosen as

$$u = -k_4z_4 + \dot{\bar{x}}_4$$

(47)

where $k_4 \in \mathbb{R}$.

In the following section, the asymptotical stability property is thoroughly analysed.

### 3.3.3 Stability analysis for $\sum_3$-subsystem:

First, let us define the following filter error variables

$$y_3 = x_3' - \bar{x}_3, \quad y_4 = x_4' - \bar{x}_4$$

(48)

From the definition of $z_3$ and $z_4$ in (40) and (44), respectively, one has

$$x_3 = z_3 + x_3' = z_3 + y_3 + \bar{x}_3$$

(49)

$$x_4 = z_4 + x_4' = z_4 + y_4 + \bar{x}_4$$

(50)

Further from the relations (48) and (49), the dynamics of the closed-loop system for $\sum_3$ in the form of new coordinates $y_3, z_3, y_4, z_4$ under control law in (46) can be formulated as

$$\begin{align*}
\sum_3 \dot{y}_3 &= -k_3z_3 + z_3' + y_4 \\
\dot{z}_3 &= -k_4z_4 + z_4' \\
\dot{y}_4 &= y_4' - \bar{x}_4 + B_y(x_1, x_2, x_3, \vartheta)
\end{align*}$$

(51)

where $B_y(x_1, x_2, x_3, \vartheta) = -\bar{x}_3, B_z(x_1, x_2, x_3, \vartheta) = -\bar{x}_4$.

It can be easily verified that the stability property of the original closed-loop system is the same as the transforms systems in (50). To analyze the stability property of $\sum_3$-subsystem, the following assumption is introduced in advance.

**Assumption 1:** There exist time-varying positive functions $\delta(t)$ converging to zero as $t \to 0$ and satisfying

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \int_0^t \delta(o) \, dw = \rho < \infty$$

and

$$\dot{\delta}(t) = -l(t)\delta(t)$$

with finite positive real constants $\rho$ and functions $l(t) > 0$.

Note that there are many choices for $\delta(t)$ that satisfies the Assumption 1. For example, $e^{-lt}$ with $l_1 > 0, (1 + t)^{-b}$ with $l_2 > 1$. Then the following conclusion statement can be given:

**Theorem 2:** For $\sum_3$-subsystem in (50), if $\epsilon_3(t)$ and $\epsilon_4(t)$ are selected with

$$\epsilon_i(t) = \varrho_i \delta(t), \quad (i = 3, 4)$$

$$\varrho_3 < \frac{2}{\delta_3(0)}, \quad \varrho_4 < \frac{2}{\delta_4(0) + 1}$$

(52)

and $k_3 > 1, k_4 > 1/2$, then given any positive number $p$, for all initial conditions satisfying $(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + \vartheta^2) < 2p$, the closed-loop $\sum_3$-subsystem is asymptotically stable.

**Proof:** Define the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_3 = \frac{1}{2}z_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}z_4^2 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_3(t)y_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_4(t)y_4^2$$

(53)

The derivative of the Lyapunov function can be calculated as

$$\dot{V}_3 = z_3z_4 + z_3'z_4 - \frac{l_3(t)\delta_3(t)}{2}y_3^2 + \delta_3(t)y_3'y_3$$

(54)

$$- \frac{l_4(t)\delta_4(t)}{2}y_4^2$$

Substituting system dynamics in (50) into $\dot{V}_3$, one obtains

$$\dot{V}_3 = z_3z_4 + z_3'z_4 - \frac{l_3(t)\delta_3(t)}{2}y_3^2 + \delta_3(t)y_3'y_3$$

(55)

Since for any $p > 0$, the set $\Pi : (x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + \vartheta^2) < 2p$ is a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^4$ Therefore $\|B\|$ has a maximum $M_B$ on $\Pi$.

$$\dot{V}_3 \leq -\left(\frac{l_3(t)\delta_3(t)}{2} + \frac{\delta_3(t)}{\epsilon_3(t)}\right)y_3^2 + \delta_3(t)y_3'y_3$$

$$+ \delta_3(t)y_3'M_3 + \delta_4(t)y_4'M_4 - k_3z_3^2 - k_4z_4^2 + M_3^2 + M_4^2$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}z_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}z_4^2 + \frac{1}{2}y_3^2$$

$$\leq -\left(\frac{\delta_3(t)}{\epsilon_3(t)} - \frac{l_3(t)}{2}\right)y_3^2 - \left(\frac{\delta_4(t)}{\epsilon_4(t)} - \frac{l_4(t)}{2}\right)y_4^2$$

$$- (k_3 - 1)z_3^2 - (k_4 - 1)\frac{1}{2}z_4^2$$

(56)

If the time-varying functions $\epsilon_3(t), \epsilon_4(t)$ are chosen to satisfy (51), then we can obtain that

$$\dot{V}_3 \leq -\left(\frac{1}{\varrho_3} - \frac{1}{\epsilon_3(t)}\right)y_3^2 - \left(\frac{1}{\varrho_4} - \frac{1 + \delta_4(t)}{2}\right)y_4^2$$

$$- (k_3 - 1)z_3^2 - (k_4 - 1)\frac{1}{2}z_4^2 + \delta_3(t)\frac{M_3^2}{2} + \delta_4(t)\frac{M_4^2}{2}$$

(57)

Define

$$s = [y_3, y_4, z_3, z_4]^T$$

(58)
When the designed control torque is applied to \( \epsilon_s \bar{3}, \bar{4}d + \bar{2} \) changes to time-varying and \( M_k = -50 \)

Consider the system \((1 + \epsilon_s \leq \infty)\)

\[
\rho(t) \sum \left[ V_{i} \right]_{i=3,4} \text{ with the control laws} \]

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\dot{y}_i = -y_i - y_i(t) \tilde{x}_i \\
\dot{z}_i = -k_i z_i + z_i \end{array} \right. \quad (i = 3, 4)
\]

Futhermore, by appropriately choosing the parameters \( k_3, k_4 \) system (63) can be rendered stable. This singular perturbation model also implies that the reducing \( \epsilon_i (i = 3, 4) \) diminishes the effect \( y_3 \) in (63), which tells us that the introduction of the low-pass filters does not significantly affect the stability property of system (63).

Remark 7: The closed-loop system (50) is in the form of the so-called standard singular perturbation model [25].

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\dot{e}_3(t)y_3 = -y_3 - e_3(t)\tilde{x}_3 \\
\dot{e}_4(t)y_4 = -y_4 - e_4(t)\tilde{x}_4 \\
\end{array} \right. \quad (63)
\]

3.4 Stability results and further remarks

In Sections 3.2 and 3.3, the controllers are designed separately for \( \sum_3 \) and \( \sum_4 \)-subsystem and the asymptotical stability property of the corresponding closed-loop system is thoroughly analysed. Under this, based on Lemma 3, the following results can be further concluded for the underactuated mechanical system considered in (4):

Theorem 3: Consider the system (4) with the control laws in (37) and (46). If the control gains are selected properly, the closed-loop is locally asymptotically stable in sense of output feedback, that is, \( \lim_{t \to \infty} q(t) = 0 \).

Proof: Combining Theorems 1 and 2 with Lemma 3, the proof of Theorem 3 can be given straightforwardly.

Remark 4: The full-state feedback scheme proposed in [23] is extended to output-feedback situation via a series of constructed controllers and filters. If the estimated velocity \( \dot{\theta} \) is replaced with real one \( x_2 \), the filter gains \( \dot{e}_3(t), \dot{e}_4(t) \) are set to be zero and the finite-time observers are removed, the proposed output-feedback controllers degrades to the full-state feedback one. This distinction is utilised in the simulation part to verify the effectiveness of the proposed controller.

Remark 5: Here the finite-time observer design satisfies the 'separation principle' such that the observer and controller can be designed separately. The only requirement for parameters of the observer is to ensure all the states of the system stay in the locally controllable domain before the setting time is arrived. If the applied controller has the ability to stabilise the system, one admissible way is to choose the observer dynamics fast enough to provide the exact evaluation of the unmeasured states. This can be easily achieved by selecting the parameters of the observer, which can be verified by simulation (see following examples).

Remark 6: From the cascade backstepping structure of the controller, it can be known that any control algorithm that can asymptotically stabilise \( \sum_3 \)-subsystem in (15), can also be used in the recursive design procedure in \( \sum_4 \)-subsystem to develop the control input \( u \). Moreover, this conclusion is used in the following simulation to relax the complexity in controller designs for \( \sum_4 \)-subsystem.

Remark 8: At each step in backstepping procedure, an auxiliary low-pass filter is also introduced to avoid the derivative of the virtual control input. This is essentially the same strategy used in the dynamic surface control algorithm [28] to relax the computational burden caused by derivatives of nonlinear functions in intermediate virtual inputs. However, compared with conventional adaptive dynamic surface control methods introduced in [28], the design of the time-varying first-order low-pass filter renders the tracking error asymptotically converges to zero as time evolves to infinity.

When referred to conventional dynamic surface control, the designed function \( \epsilon_i (i = 3, 4) \) could be regarded as specific constant real numbers. However, as to the proposed controller in this paper, \( \epsilon_i (i = 3, 4) \) changes to time-varying functions decreasing quickly towards zero, which essentially means the expanding of the bandwidth of the first-order low-pass filters. Especially, when time evolves to infinity, the low-pass filter will change to a full-pass filter, which is actually a direct-pass block. Then, the designed dynamic surface control degrades to backstepping control with the replacement of the symbolic derivative calculation to a numerical one. It should be noted that the computation burden would increase dramatically when \( \epsilon_i (i = 3, 4) \) becomes small enough. In this case, the compromise between computation burden and control performance should be made by deciding when to stop changing the gains of the designed first-order low-pass filters.

Remark 9: When the designed control torque is applied to the underactuated system, the closed-loop dynamics for \( \sum_4 \)-subsystem turns out to be

\[
\sum_4 \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\dot{x}_1 = N (x_3 + y_3 + \tilde{x}_3) x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 = g (x_1, z_3 + y_3 + \tilde{x}_3) \\
\end{array} \right. \quad (65)
\]
The coordinates \((y_3, z_3)\) act as a perturbation term to \(\sum \dot{z}_3\) subsystem. If the convergence rate of \((y_3, z_3)\) could be made faster, one would expect a better performance of \(\sum z_3\)-subsystem. Based on this philosophy, the following calculation tries to deduce the explicit upper \(L_2\)-norm bounds for the perturbation term \((y_3, z_3)\).

From (56), one has

\[
\dot{V}_3 \leq \left( \frac{1}{\varrho_3} - \frac{\delta_3(0)}{2} \right) y_3^2 + \delta_3(t) \frac{M^2}{2} + \delta_4(t) \frac{M^2}{2} \tag{66}
\]

Integrating both sides the above equation, one can obtain

\[
\int_0^\infty y_3(\tau)^T y_3(\tau) \, d\tau \leq \frac{1}{(1/\varrho_3) - [(\delta_3(0))/2]} \times \left( V_3(0) + 0.5 \rho_3 M^2 + 0.5 \rho_4 M^2 \right) \tag{67}
\]

Thus

\[
\| y_3(\tau) \|^2_{L_2} \leq \frac{1}{(1/\varrho_3) - [(\delta_3(0))/2]} \times \left( V_3(0) + 0.5 \rho_3 M^2 + 0.5 \rho_4 M^2 \right) \tag{68}
\]

Similarly, one can also obtain

\[
\| z_3(\tau) \|^2_{L_2} \leq \frac{1}{(1/\varrho_3) - [(\delta_4(0))/2]} \times \left( V_3(0) + 0.5 \rho_3 M^2 + 0.5 \rho_4 M^2 \right) \tag{69}
\]

It could be observed from (67) and (68) that the upper bounds on signals \(y_3\) and \(z_3\) are partially decided by \(\varrho_3\) and \(\varrho_4\), respectively. The smaller the \(\varrho_3\) and \(\varrho_4\), the smaller the values of \(\| y_3 \|^2_{L_2}\) and \(\| z_3 \|^2_{L_2}\) would be. Thus, we would expect a faster convergence of the errors with a smaller value of \(\varrho_3\) and \(\varrho_4\).

### 4 Simulation studies

To study the effectiveness of the proposed control strategies, the detailed response is numerically simulated with two benchmark non-linear underactuated mechanical systems, that is, the TORA system and the inertia-wheel pendulum (IWP) system, in conjunction with the proposed control laws. Simulations comparisons are also conducted with the full-state feedback scheme signalled in Remark 4 to valid the performance of the proposed controller.

#### 4.1 Simulations of the TORA system

The TORA system consists of a translational oscillating platform with mass \(m_1\) which is controlled via a rotational eccentric mass \(m_2\). Configuration of this system is depicted in the Fig. 1.

The Lagrange dynamics of the TORA system is formulated as

\[
\begin{align*}
(m_1 + m_2) \ddot{q}_r + m_2 r \cos(q_3) \ddot{q}_r + m_2 r \sin(q_3) \dot{q}_r^2 + k_1 q_3 &= 0 \\
m_2 r \cos(q_3) \ddot{q}_r + (m_2 r^2 + I) \dot{q}_r + m_2 g r \sin(q_3) &= \tau
\end{align*}
\tag{70}
\]

![Fig. 1 TORA system](image)

**Table 1 Physical parameters of TORA system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cart mass</td>
<td>(m_1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm mass</td>
<td>(m_2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm eccentricity</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm inertia</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kg/m(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring stiffness</td>
<td>(k_t)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of Lemma 1, the following global change of coordinates

\[
\begin{align*}
q_r &= q_3 + (m_2 r \sin(q_3))/(m_1 + m_2) \\
p_r &= (m_1 + m_2) \dot{q}_r + m_2 r \cos(q_3) \dot{q}_r
\end{align*}
\tag{71}
\]

would transform the dynamics of TORA system into a cascade non-linear system in strict feedback form

\[
\sum_{\text{TORA}-1} \begin{cases} 
\dot{x}_1 &= (m_1 + m_2)^{-1} \dot{x}_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= -k_1 x_1 + k_2 m_2 r \sin(x_3)/(m_1 + m_2) 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\sum_{\text{TORA}-2} \begin{cases} 
\dot{x}_3 &= x_4 \\
\dot{x}_4 &= u
\end{cases}
\tag{72}
\]

with \(x_i (i = 1, \ldots, 4)\) defined in (14).

In the simulation, the parameters for the TORA system are chosen to be the same as in [23], which is given in Table 1.

It is easy to design the virtual control law as

\[
\begin{align*}
\ddot{x}_3 &= -k_p \tan(h(x_3)) - k_d \tanh(\bar{h}) \\
\dot{\bar{h}} &= q_r + b x_1 \\
\dot{q}_r &= -a \tanh(q_r + b x_1)
\end{align*}
\tag{73}
\]

with

\[
k_p + k_d \leq 0.5\pi
\tag{74}
\]

and it can asymptotically stabilise the \(\sum_{\text{TORA}-1}\)-subsystem to its original. Based on the conclusions drawn in Remark 5, this virtual control law can be used in the following backstepping procedure to derive the final control torque.

For the full-state feedback, the controller parameters are chosen to be: \(\epsilon_1(t) = \epsilon_2(t) = 0, k_p = 0.9, k_d = 0.65,\)

Fig. 2  Simulated results of the TORA system

a Full-state and output-feedback comparison – cart response
b Full-state and output-feedback comparison – eccentric mass response
c Position and velocity responses of the cart
d Phase portrait of the cart
e Position and velocity responses of the eccentric mass
f Phase portrait of the eccentric mass
g Observer errors of the designed finite-time observer
h Time response of the control torque
\( k_3 = 2 \) and \( k_4 = 2 \). The output-feedback controller parameters are chosen to be: \( a = 20, b = 60, \epsilon_3(t) = \epsilon_4(t) = e^{-0.1t}, k_p = 0.3, k_d = 1.25, k_1 = 2 \) and \( k_4 = 4 \), the observer gain are chosen to be \( k_o1 = 10, k_o2 = 40 \) and \( \alpha_o = 0.7 \). The simulation results are shown in Fig. 2.

Figs. 2a and b show the comparisons between full-state and output-feedback controllers. As it can be seen, the closed-loop trajectory with the proposed output-feedback controller shows an almost identical behaviour with the trajectory of the full-state feedback system, concluding the effectiveness of the proposed scheme. Figs. 2c and d show the responses of the cart position and velocity. It could be observed that after finite times of oscillations, the cart position and velocity converge and stay at zero. The same is also true for the response of eccentric mass shown in Figs. 2e and 2f. Fig. 2g shows the observer errors of the designed finite-time observer. It takes about 0.7 s for the finite-time observer to precisely reconstruct the auxiliary variables \( x_3 \) and \( x_4 \). Then after the setting time, the observer errors stay to zero permanently. Fig. 2h illustrates the control torque generated by the controller. Smooth control torque is generated by the proposed output-feedback controller.

### 4.2 Simulations of the IWP system

The inertia wheel pendulum consists of a pendulum with a rotating inertia-wheel at its end. The pendulum is unactuated and the system has to be controlled via the rotating wheel. The task is to stabilise the pendulum in its upright equilibrium point while the wheel stops rotating. The configuration of the IWP is shown in Fig. 3.

The Lagrange dynamics of this system can be formulated as

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{IWP-1} & \left\{ \dot{x}_1 = d_{11}^{1/2} x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 = (m_1 l_1 + m_2 l_1) g \sin(x_1 - d_1 x_3/d_11) \right\} \\
\sum_{IWP-2} & \left\{ \dot{x}_3 = x_4 \\
\dot{x}_4 &= a \end{align*}
\]  

(77)

where \( k_p + k_d \leq 0.5\pi \)  

(79)

Then based on Theorem 3, we may draw the conclusion that the system could be locally asymptotically stabilised to zero.

For the full-state back, the controller parameters are chosen to be \( \epsilon_3(t) = \epsilon_4(t) = 0, k_p = 0.25, k_2 = 1.25, k_1 = 2 \) and \( k_4 = 2 \). The output-feedback controller parameters are chosen to be \( a = 15, b = 2, \epsilon_3(t) = \epsilon_4(t) = 0.01 e^{-0.1t}, k_p = 0.25, k_d = 1.25, k_1 = 20 \) and \( k_4 = 20 \); the observer gain are chosen to be \( k_o1 = 10, k_o2 = 20 \) and \( \alpha_o = 0.7 \). The simulation results are shown in Fig. 4.

Figs. 4a and b show the comparisons between full-state and output-feedback controllers. As it can be seen, the closed-loop trajectory with the proposed output-feedback controller shows an almost identical behaviour with the trajectory of the full-state feedback system, concluding the effectiveness of the proposed scheme. Figs. 4c and d show the responses of the pendulum position and velocity. The pendulum position stays in the range of \((-0.1 \text{ rad}, 0.1 \text{ Euler-rad})\), which do not escape the linearly controllable area. Even though the velocity has a big ranges of \((-3 \text{ rad/s}, 1 \text{ rad/s})\), the time response of the pendulum position and velocity is still attractive for it only appears small overshoot and exhibits a short setting time. Figs. 4e and f show the time responses of the rotating wheel position and velocity. It can be observed that the maximum velocity of the rotating wheel can be 300 rad/s, which appear during the starting time of the simulation. However, the time response only oscillates several times and it also has a quick setting time. Fig. 4g shows observer errors of the designed finite-time observer. Then setting time of observer is about 0.6s. After the setting time, the observer error turns to zero permanently. Fig. 4h illustrates the time response of the torque that also appears a peaking phenomenon. Then, it goes back below the bound of 0.5 Nm. All these prove the feasibility of the proposed controller.

### Table 2 Physical parameters of the IWP system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pendulum length</td>
<td>( l_1 )</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pendulum CM</td>
<td>( k_1 )</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pendulum mass</td>
<td>( m_1 )</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheel mass</td>
<td>( m_2 )</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pendulum inertia</td>
<td>( l_1 )</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>Kg/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheel inertia</td>
<td>( l_2 )</td>
<td>( 32 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>Kg/m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 4  Simulated results of the IWP system

a  Full-state and output-feedback comparison – pendulum response
b  Full-state and output-feedback comparison – wheel response
c  Position and velocity responses of the pendulum
d  Phase portrait of the pendulum
e  Angle and velocity responses of the rotating wheel
f  Phase portrait of the rotating wheel
g  Observer errors of the designed finite-time observer
h  Time response of the control torque
5 Conclusions

The output-feedback control problem for a special class of underactuated mechanical systems is investigated in this paper. The transformation and reduction technique are used for the underactuated mechanical systems to change into the cascade nonlinear systems with structural properties that are convenient for control design purposes. Then, a filter-based output-feedback controller for the changed subsystem is developed, called virtual control in sense of recursive method, and this designed virtual control is involved, like backstepping technique, into the another subsystem through a series of first-order time-varying low-pass filters to develop the actual control of the closed-loop system, in which a finite-time observer is also used to reconstruct immeasurable states. The local asymptotical stability property of the closed-loop system is analysed through the cascade system stability criterion. Simulation of two benchmark non-linear underactuated mechanical system is conducted to show the feasibility of the proposed controller. While, it should be pointed that accurate knowledge of the system dynamics is assumed to be known in advance for the control system design. Practically, because of the unavoidable uncertainties in modelling, further work is still needed for the controller design in the presence of model uncertainties.
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