Output feedback control: a robust solution based on second order sliding mode
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Abstract: This paper proposes a new second order sliding mode output feedback controller. In the continuous case for which sampling frequency is supposed infinite, this controller uses only the output information and ensures desired trajectory tracking in a finite time in spite of uncertainties and perturbations. Moreover, in case of finite sampling frequency, it is shown that the controller needs also the sign of output time derivative to ensure the finite time convergence to an origin neighborhood.
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1. INTRODUCTION

High order sliding mode control is a nonlinear control strategy, robust with respect to uncertainties and perturbation. Several algorithms have been published, more or less usable on practical applications (Levant [2001], Bartolini et al., [2000], Laghrouche et al., [2007], Plestan et al., [2008]). Since few years, applications to experimental set-up have proved the feasibility and applicability of these approaches for robots (high-order sliding mode observers in (Lebasterd et al., [2006], Lebasterd et al., [2006a]), electrical machines (Plestan et al., [2008]), pneumatic actuators (Laghrouche et al., [2006]), (Girin et al., [2007]). However, a lack of higher order sliding mode control is the use of high order time derivatives of sliding variables; by a practical point-of-view, it can decrease the interest of such controllers, due to the bad effect of measurement noise on the control. In order to remove this lack, a mean is to consider output feedback. The objective is then to propose output feedback control which ensures both robustness and accuracy by minimizing the noise effect. Two kinds of approaches are possible: the first one consists in designing state observer coupled to a controller: it is necessary to verify the stability of the observer-based controlled system which is in main cases a hard task. In the case of high order sliding mode, it has been done in (Levant [2003]) but this solution suffers of a lack of constructibility.

Very few results are available on second order sliding mode static output feedback. In (Khan et al., [2003]), a second order sliding mode output feedback controller is proposed: its main drawback is the absence of a formal proof of the closed-loop system stability. This current paper proposes a constructive method for the design of an output feedback controller. It ensures the convergence in a finite time to the origin of the theoretical system and to a neighborhood of the origin of the real system.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 states the problem of high order sliding mode output feedback controller. Section 3 displays the design of the output feedback controller by detailing both bases of infinite (ideal) and finite sampling frequency. Section 4 applies the controller for speed control of a series DC motor.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a single-input nonlinear system
\[
\dot{x} = f(x) + g(x)u \\
y = h(x)
\]
with \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) the state variable, \( u \in \mathbb{R} \) the input, and \( y \in \mathbb{R} \) a smooth output function. Let \( s(x,t) \) denote the sliding variable defined as
\[
s(x,t) = h(x) - h_d(t)
\]
\( h_d(t) \) being the smooth desired trajectory. \( f \) and \( g \) are smooth uncertain functions. Assume that

**H1.** The relative degree of (1) with respect to \( s \) is constant and equal to 2, and the associated zero dynamics are stable. Only the sliding variable \( s \) is measured.

The control objective is to fulfill the constraint \( s(x,t) = 0 \) in finite time and to keep it exactly by discontinuous output feedback control. Let us recall the definition of second order sliding mode given in Levant [2001]

**Definition 1.** Consider the nonlinear system (1), and let the system be closed by some possibly-dynamical discontinuous feedback. Then, provided that \( s \) and \( s \) are continuous functions, and the set
\[
S = \{ x \mid s(x,t) = \dot{s}(x,t) = 0 \},
\]
called “second order sliding set”, is non-empty and is locally an integral set in the Filippov sense (see Filippov [1988]), the motion on \( S \) is called second order sliding mode with respect to the sliding variable \( s \).

The second order sliding mode output feedback control problem allows the finite time stabilization to zero of the sliding variable \( s \) and its first time derivatives by defining a suitable control function. The output \( s \) fulfills
\[
\ddot{s} = \ddot{a}(x) + b(x)u(s) - \dot{h}_d(t) := a(x,t) + b(x)u(s) \quad (2)
\]
Assume that
H2. The solutions are understood in the Filippov sense (see Filippov [1988]), and the system trajectories are supposed to be infinitely extendible in time for any bounded Lebesgue measurable input.

H3. Functions \(a(x,t)\) and \(b(x)\) are bounded uncertain functions and \(b(x)\) is strictly positive. Thus, there exists positive constants \(b_m > 0, b_M > 0\) and \(a_M \geq 0\) such that \(0 < b_m < b(x) < b_M\) and

\[
|a(x,t)| \leq a_M
\]

for \(x \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^n, X\) being a bounded open subset of \(\mathbb{R}^n\) within which the boundedness of the system dynamics is ensured, and \(t > 0\).

Then, by setting \(z_1 = s\) and \(z_2 = \dot{s}\), the second order sliding mode output feedback control of (1) with respect to the sliding variable \(s\) is equivalent to the finite time stabilization of the system

\[
\dot{z}_1 = z_2, \quad \dot{z}_2 = a(\cdot) + b(\cdot) \cdot u(z_1)
\]

under Assumptions H1-H3.

3. A FINITE TIME SECOND ORDER SLIDING MODE OUTPUT FEEDBACK CONTROLLER

In this section, solutions of output feedback controllers for linear systems and time-varying ones are proposed. These control laws will be used in order to define sliding surface and switching variables in the next section.

3.1 Preliminaries

From (3), consider the following double integrator without uncertainties

\[
\dot{z}_1 = z_2, \quad \dot{z}_2 = u
\]

where the control input \(u\) is a discontinuous output feedback reading as

\[
u(z_1) = -K \text{ sign } (z_1)
\]

with \(K > 0\). As \(\ddot{z}_1 = -K \text{ sign } (z_1)\), one gets

\[
z_1(t) = -K \text{ sign } (z_1) \frac{t^2}{2} + z_{2,0} t + z_{1,0}
\]

and

\[
z_2(t) = -K \text{ sign } (z_1) t + z_{2,0}
\]

with \(z_{1,0} := z_1(0)\) and \(z_{2,0} := z_2(0)\). The equation of the phase portrait reads as

\[
z_1^2 + 2K |z_1| = z_2^2 + 2K \text{ sign } (z_1) z_{1,0}.
\]

This equation leads to two branches of parabola \(P_K^+_1\) and \(P_K^-\), with horizontal \(z_1\)-axis of symmetry in the half-planes \(z_1 \geq 0\) and \(z_1 \leq 0\) (see Figure 1 for different values of \(K\)). The vertices which are the intersection points between the branches of parabola and the \(z_1\)-axis are given by (see Figure 1)

\[
V = \left( \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K \text{ sign } (z_1)} + z_{1,0}, 0 \right).
\]

The intersection points \(I\) between the branches of parabola and the \(z_2\)-axis are given by

\[
I^+ = \left( 0, \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K \text{ sign } (z_1)} + z_{1,0} \right)
\]

and

\[
I^- = \left( 0, -\frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K \text{ sign } (z_1)} + z_{1,0} \right).
\]

Note that \(I^+\) and \(I^-\) are symmetric with respect to the horizontal \(z_1\)-axis. Without loss of generality, suppose that system (4) starts from initial values \(z_1^0 > 0, z_2^0 > 0\). System (4) evolves on a branch of parabola \(P_K^+\) with vertex

\[
V^+ = \left( \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K} + z_{1,0}, 0 \right).
\]

From (5), it is obvious that, after a finite amount of time, system (4) reaches the vertical \(z_2\)-axis at the point \(I^-\). Then, control input switches and system (4) is initialized at \(I^-\) by new values given by

\[
(z_{1,0}, z_{2,0}) = \left( 0, -\sqrt{z_{2,0}^2 + 2K z_{1,0}} \right).
\]

It leads to a new branch of parabola \(P_K^-\) with a new vertex

\[
V^- = \left( \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K \text{ sign } (z_1)} + z_{1,0}, 0 \right)
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K z_{1,0}}, 0 \right) \quad (10)
\]

\[
= \left( -\frac{z_{2,0}^2}{2K z_{1,0}} \right).
\]

\(P_K^-\) is symmetric to \(P_K^+\) with respect to the \(z_2\)-axis. By the same way, it can be shown that, after a finite amount of time, system (4) reaches and slides on \(P_K^-\).

Finally, system (4) evolves on the two branches of parabola \(P_K^+\) and \(P_K^-\) and \(P_K^- \cup P_K^+\) is symmetric with respect to the \(z_1\)-axis and the \(z_2\)-axis. Note also that initial point \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\) belongs to the curve \(P_K^\pm\).

**Theorem 1.** Under initial conditions \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\), system (4) controlled by

\[
u(z_1) = -K \text{ sign } (z_1), \quad K > 0
\]

is practically stable and evolves on two branches of parabola \(P_K^- \cup P_K^+\) whose equations are given by (6) and vertices \(V\) by (7).

3.2 Robustness analysis

In order to evaluate the robustness of previous output feedback control class, consider system (3) with Assumptions H1-H3 fulfilled and

\[
u(z_1) = -K \text{ sign } (z_1).
\]

From the previous result, it yields that system (3) is practically stable if for all \(t \geq 0\),

\[
a(\cdot) - b(\cdot) \leq K < 0, \quad z_1 > 0
\]

and

\[
a(\cdot) + b(\cdot) \geq K > 0, \quad z_1 < 0.
\]

This latter condition is fulfilled if (for \(t \geq 0\)
Theorem 2. Under initial conditions \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\) and assumptions H1-H3, system (3) controlled by
\[
u = -K \text{ sign}(z_1)
\]
with \(K > \frac{a_M}{b_m}\), is practically stable and evolves on
\[
\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{\alpha_m \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_M} \mathcal{P}_\alpha^- \cup \bigcup_{\beta_m \leq \beta \leq \beta_M} \mathcal{P}_\beta^+.
\]
where \(\alpha_m = -a_M - b_M K, \alpha_M = a_M - b_m K, \beta_m = -a_M + b_m K\) and \(\beta_M = a_M + b_M K\).

The second part of Theorem 2 is due to the fact that, on \(\mathcal{P}^-\) for \(z_1 < 0\), we have
\[-a_M - b_M K < a(t) - b(t) < a_M - b_m K\]
and on \(\mathcal{P}^+\) for \(z_1 > 0\), we have
\[-a_M + b_m K < a(t) + b(t) < a_M + b_M K.\]

Remark 1. In the case where \(a\) and \(b\) are constant \((b \neq 0)\), \(z_1\)-dynamics reads as
\[
\ddot{z}_1 = a - b K \text{ sign}(z_1)
\]
It yields
\[
\begin{align*}
    \dot{z}_1 & = a - b K, \quad z_1 > 0 \\
    \ddot{z}_1 & = a + b K, \quad z_1 < 0
\end{align*}
\]
The fact that the system is no more symmetric in the half-planes \(z_1 > 0\) and \(z_1 < 0\), implies that \(\mathcal{P}^+_K\) and \(\mathcal{P}^-_K\) are no more symmetric with respect to the \(z_2\)-axis. The vertices are now defined by
\[
\begin{align*}
    V^+ & = \left( \frac{z^2_0}{2(a - b K)} + z_{1,0}, 0 \right), \\
    V^- & = \left( \frac{z^2_0}{2(a + b K)} + z_{1,0}, 0 \right)
\end{align*}
\]
and are not symmetric with respect to the \(z_2\)-axis (Figure 2).

3.3 Extension in case of finite sample frequency

Suppose now that system (4) is viewed under a practical point-of-view, i.e. the sample frequency is finite inducing that the "sign" function does not switch instantaneously. Due to the finite sample time \(T_e\), control input usually does not switch exactly on the \(z_2\)-axis, but with a delay bounded by the sample time value. From this latter remark, discontinuous control input of system (3) can be applied with a bounded delay \(d(t)\), such that \(0 \leq d(t) < T_e\); it yields that, under the finite sample frequency hypothesis, system (3) behavior is equivalent to behavior of
\[
\begin{align*}
    \dot{z}_1(t) & = z_2(t) \\
    \dot{z}_2(t) & = a(\cdot) - b(\cdot) K \text{ sign}(z_1(t - d(t)))
\end{align*}
\]
Due to the time delay, solutions of system (12) can switch on branches of parabola which are more and more far away from the origin (see Figure 3 with constant functions \(a\) and \(b\)). System (12) can become unstable which is proved by using Pontrjagin’s conditions to time delay systems (see [Bhatt et al., 1966, Case 1, Subcase 1B]). In order to ensure the stability of the system, a solution consists in modifying the control input.

For a sake of clarity, before extending the following result to system (3), consider the double integrator system (4) and the following theorem\(^1\).

Theorem 3. Under initial conditions \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\), system (4) converges to the domain
\[
\mathcal{D} = \{ (z_1, z_2) \mid |z_1| \leq \epsilon + KT_e^2, |z_2| \leq 3KT_e \}
\]
under the control input
\[
u = -K \text{ sign}(z_1 + \epsilon \text{ sign}(z_2))
\]
if \(K > 0\) and
\[
\epsilon > T_e \sqrt{\frac{z^2_2}{2} + 2 K |z_{1,0}|} - \frac{KT_e^2}{2}.
\]

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that, at \(t = 0\), system (4) is initialized at \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\) such that \(0 < \epsilon < z_{1,0} < \infty\) and \(0 < z_{2,0} < \infty\). As it has been previously mentioned, the continuous function \(z_1(t)\) reads as
\[
z_1(t) = -K \frac{t^2}{2} + z_{2,0} t + z_{1,0}.
\]
Then, there exists a time instant \(t_0\) such that \(z_1(t) = 0\) which reads as
\[
t_0 = \frac{z_{2,0}}{K} + \sqrt{\frac{z^2_{2,0}}{K^2} + \frac{2z_{1,0}}{K}}.
\]
A sufficient condition for the convergence of system (4) to \(\mathcal{D}\) is that trajectories reach a parabola closer to the origin through the commutation of the input in the \(z_1\)-interval \([0, \epsilon]\), which yields
\[\text{Working with sign}(z_2)\] does not matter in an output feedback control scheme with a finite sampling period because, for all \(t > T_e\), \(z_2(t)\) may be approximated by \(\frac{z_2(t - d(t))}{K}\).

---

\(^1\) Working with sign\((z_2)\) does not matter in an output feedback control scheme with a finite sampling period because, for all \(t > T_e\), \(z_2(t)\) may be approximated by \(\frac{z_2(t - d(t))}{K}\).
\[ z_1(t_0 - T_e) < \epsilon \]

leading to
\[ -K \frac{(t_0 - T_e)^2}{2} + z_{2,0}(t_0 - T_e) + z_{1,0} < \epsilon. \]

From the previous inequality and (16), one gets (14). It yields that there exists a time instant \( t_1 \) such that
\[ |z_1(t_1)| < \epsilon, \quad z_2(t_1) > 0 \]
and \( z_2(t_1 + T_e) \) with an opposite sign of \( z_2(t_1) \). Let \( z_{1,1} \) (resp. \( z_{2,1} \)) denote \( z_1(t_1) \) (resp. \( z_2(t_1) \)). For a sake of clarity, suppose that \( z_{2,1} > 0 \) and \( z_2(t_1 + T_e) < 0 \). Then, one gets, at \( t = t_1 \), (see Figure 4)\(^2\)
\[ \dot{z}_1(t_1) = z_{2,1}, \quad \dot{z}_2(t_1) = -K \]
It yields
\[ z_2(t_1 + T_e) = z_{2,1} - KT_e < 0, \]
\[ z_1(t_1 + T_e) = z_{1,1} + z_{2,1}T_e. \]

Note that one has
\[ 0 < z_{2,1} < KT_e. \]

Then, two cases have to be considered.

**First case.** Without loss of generality, suppose that
\[ 0 < z_1(t_1 + T_e) < \epsilon \]
Then, one gets
\[ \dot{z}_1(t_1 + T_e) = z_2(t_1 + T_e), \quad \dot{z}_2(t_1 + T_e) = K \]
At \( t = t_1 + 2T_e \), one gets
\[ z_2(t_1 + 2T_e) = z_{2,1}, \]
\[ z_1(t_1 + 2T_e) = z_1(t_1 + T_e) + z_2(t_1 + T_e)T_e \]
\[ = z_{1,1} + 2z_{2,1}T_e - KT_e^2. \]

It means that, between \( t_1 \) and \( t_1 + 2T_e \), variable \( z_2 \) is keeping the same value. From previous equation, as it is not possible to establish the behavior of \( z_1 \), it is necessary to consider now two subcases (see Figure 4).

**Point (a).** Fig. 4: \( KT_e/2 < z_{2,1} < KT_e \). This inequality on \( z_2 \)-value at \( t = t_1 \) implies
\[ -KT_e^2 < 2z_{2,1}T_e - KT_e^2 < 0. \]
Then, one gets
\[ z_1(t_1 + 2T_e) < z_{1,1}. \]

This latter value of \( z_1 \) is displayed by point (c) whereas \( z_1(t_1 + T_e) \) is displayed by point (b). It yields that \( z_1 \) is increasing between \( t_1 \) to \( t_1 + 2T_e \), its average velocity being
\[ z_{2,1} - \frac{KT_e}{2} > 0. \]

**Point (d).** Fig. 4: \( KT_e/2 < z_{2,1} < KT_e \). This inequality on \( z_2 \)-value at \( t = t_1 \) implies
\[ -KT_e^2 < 2z_{2,1}T_e - KT_e^2 < 0. \]
Then, one gets
\[ z_1(t_1 + 2T_e) < z_{1,1}. \]

This latter value of \( z_1 \) is displayed by point (f) whereas \( z_1(t_1 + T_e) \) is displayed by point (e). It yields that \( z_1 \) is decreasing between \( t_1 \) and \( t_1 + 2T_e \), its average velocity being
\[ z_{2,1} - \frac{KT_e}{2} < 0. \]

As the average value of \( z_2 \) is constant, it implies that, in a finite time, \( z_1 \) is evolving until crossing \( \epsilon \)-vertical axis. Then, the system is evolving as in the sequel described by “Second case” item.

**Second case.** As seen in the previous “First case”, there exists a finite time instant \( t_2 \) such that
\[ |z_1(t_2)| < \epsilon, \quad |z_1(t_2 + T_e)| > \epsilon. \]
with \( z_2(t_2 + T_e) \) with an opposite sign of \( z_2(t_2) \). For a sake of clarity, but without loss of generality, suppose that (see Figure 5 - Point (A))
\[ 0 < z_1(t_2) < \epsilon, \quad z_1(t_2 + T_e) > \epsilon, \quad z_2(t_2) > 0. \]
From
\[ \dot{z}_1(t_2) = z_2(t_2), \quad \dot{z}_2(t_2) = -K \]
and previous assumptions, it yields (Point (B) of Figure 5)
\[ z_1(t_2 + T_e) > \epsilon, \quad z_2(t_2 + T_e) < 0, \]
and
\[ \dot{z}_1(t_2 + T_e) = z_2(t_2 + T_e), \quad \dot{z}_2(t_2 + T_e) = -K. \]
As \( z_1(t_2) < \epsilon \) and \( z_1(t_2 + T_e) > \epsilon \), it means that
\[ \epsilon - KT_e^2 < z_1(t_2) < \epsilon, \quad \epsilon < z_1(t_2 + T_e) < \epsilon + KT_e^2. \]
Furthermore, one has

\(\text{Fig. 4. Trajectories evolution in phase plan } (z_1, z_2). \text{ State vector } [z_1 \ z_2]^T \text{ at } t = t_1 \text{ is plotted in (a) when } KT_e/2 < z_1(t_1) < KT_e \text{ (resp. (e) when } 0 < z_1(t_1) < KT_e/2 \text{), which induces a constant positive (resp. negative) average } z_2 \text{-velocity positive.} \)
Then, at \( t = t_2 + 2T_e \), from
\[
z_1(t_2 + 2T_e) = z_1(t_2 + T_e) + z_2(t_2 + T_e)T_e,
\]
\[
z_2(t_2 + 2T_e) = z_2(t_2 + T_e) - KT_e,
\]
one gets
\[
\epsilon - KT_e^2 < z_1(t_2 + 2T_e) < \epsilon + KT_e^2,
\]
\[
-2KT_e < z_2(t_2 + 2T_e) < -KT_e.
\]
Then, two subcases must now be considered

- **Point (C).** Fig. 5: \( \epsilon < z_1(t_2 + 2T_e) < \epsilon + KT_e^2 \).
  One has
  \[
  \dot{z}_1(t_2 + 2T_e) = z_2, \quad \dot{z}_2(t_2 + 2T_e) = -K
  \]
  At \( t = t_2 + 3T_e \), one has
  \[
  \epsilon - 2KT_e^2 < z_1(t_2 + 3T_e) < \epsilon
  \]
  which ensures that trajectories cross \( \epsilon \)-vertical axis to reach point (E) of Figure 5. Furthermore, at point (E), \( z_2 \) and dynamics of \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \) are such that
  \[
  -3KT_e < z_2(t_2 + 3T_e) < -2KT_e
  \]
  and
  \[
  \dot{z}_1(t_2 + 3T_e) = z_2(t_2 + 3T_e), \quad \dot{z}_2(t_2 + 3T_e) = K
  \]
  Then, \( z_2 \) is increasing while \( z_1 \) is decreasing (see arrow at point (E)).

- **Point (D).** Fig. 5: \( \epsilon - KT_e^2 < z_1(t_2 + T_e) < \epsilon \). One has
  \[
  \dot{z}_1(t_2 + 2T_e) = z_2, \quad \dot{z}_2(t_2 + 2T_e) = K
  \]
  At \( t = t_2 + 3T_e \), one has
  \[
  \epsilon - 3KT_e^2 < z_1(t_2 + 3T_e) < \epsilon - KT_e^2
  \]
  which ensures that trajectories stay in the left part of \((z_1, z_2)\) plan w.r.t. \( \epsilon \)-vertical. Furthermore, \( z_2 \) and dynamics of \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \) are such that
  \[
  -KT_e < z_2(t_2 + 3T_e) < 0
  \]
  and
  \[
  \dot{z}_1(t_2 + 3T_e) = z_2(t_2 + 3T_e), \quad \dot{z}_2(t_2 + 3T_e) = K
  \]
  Then, \( z_2 \) is increasing while \( z_1 \) is decreasing (see arrow at point (D)).

By the same way, for all initial condition \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\), it can be shown that, for \( K > 0 \), \( z_2(t) \) is evolving in \([-3KT_e, 3KT_e]\) whereas \( z_1(t) \) in \([-\epsilon - KT_e^2, \epsilon + KT_e^2]\).

### 3.4 Extension to uncertain systems second order sliding mode control

Consider now system (3): Theorem 3 is rewritten for this class of system. Note that the convergence proof takes the same way than previously, with condition
\[
K > \frac{a_M}{b_m}
\]
which is the classical sliding mode gain condition ensuring that dynamics of \( z_2 \) is controlled by sign-function in spite of uncertainties.

**Theorem 4.** Under initial conditions \((z_{1,0}, z_{2,0})\) and assumptions H1-H3, system (3) converges to a bounded neighbourhood of the origin of the plan \((s, \dot{s})\) in a finite time under the control
\[
u = -K \text{sign}(s + \epsilon \text{sign}(\dot{s})) \quad (17)
\]
if \( K > \frac{a_M}{b_m} \) and
\[
\epsilon > \text{Max}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2),
\]
\[
\epsilon_1 = T_e \sqrt{(z_{2,0}^2 + 2(a_M + Kb_M)|z_{1,0}|)^2} - \frac{(a_M + Kb_M)T_e^2}{2},
\]
\[
\epsilon_2 = T_e \sqrt{(z_{2,0}^2 + 2(-a_M + Kb_m)|z_{1,0}|)^2} - \frac{(-a_M + Kb_m)T_e^2}{2}.
\]

**Sketch of proof.** Consider system (3) with \( z_1(0) = z_{1,0} > 0 \) and \( z_2(0) = z_{2,0} > 0 \) and \( u \) given by (17). It yields
\[
\dot{z}_1(0) = z_{2,0} > 0, \quad \dot{z}_2(0) = a(\cdot) - Kb(\cdot) < 0.
\]
Then, one has
\[
-(Kb_M + a_M)t + z_{2,0} < z_2(t) < -(Kb_m - a_M)t + z_{2,0},
\]
\[
z_{1,0}(t) < z_1(t) < z_{1,0}(t).
\]
with
\[
z_{1,0}(t) = -(Kb_M + a_M)\frac{t^2}{2} + z_{2,0}t + z_{1,0}
\]
and
\[
z_{1,0}(t) = -(Kb_m - a_M)\frac{t^2}{2} + z_{2,0}t + z_{1,0}.
\]
Then, there exists a time \( t_0 \) such that \( z_1(t_0) = 0 \). It yields
\[
t_{0,m} < t_0 < t_{0,M} \quad (19)
\]
with
\[
t_{0,m} = \frac{z_{2,0}}{Kb_M + a_M} + \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{(Kb_M + a_M)^2} + \frac{2z_{1,0}}{Kb_M + a_M}
\]
and
\[
t_{0,M} = \frac{z_{2,0}}{Kb_m - a_M} + \frac{z_{2,0}^2}{(Kb_m - a_M)^2} + \frac{2z_{1,0}}{Kb_m - a_M}
\]
A sufficient condition for the convergence of system (3) is that trajectories reach a parabola closer to the origin through the commutation of the input in the \( z_1 \)-interval \([0, \epsilon]\), which yields.
4. Example

In this section, the speed control of a series DC motor is displayed. As detailed in [Chiasson (1994)], the model of a such motor reads as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= -K_n x_1 x_2 - \frac{R_a + R_f}{K_e} x_1 + u \\
\dot{x}_2 &= -\frac{B}{J} x_2 - x_3 + \frac{K_m}{J} K x_1^2 \\
\dot{x}_3 &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

with \( x_1 \) the field flux, \( x_2 \) the rotor speed and \( x_3 \) the ration between load torque and inertia. \( R_a (= 0.00989 \, \Omega) \) and \( R_f (= 0.01485 \, \Omega) \) denote the resistance of the armature and field windings, respectively. \( K_n (= 0.004329 \, \text{Nm/Wb} - A) \) denotes the torque/back-end constant, whereas \( B (= 1 \, T) \) is the magnetic field. \( K_e (= 0.057 \, \text{SI}) \) is a constant which lies flux and current. \( J \) is the inertia. The control objective is to drive the rotor speed to a reference value \( x_2, \text{ref} = 1000 \, \text{rad/s} \) by using only the information of speed and the sign of acceleration: the desired trajectories have been computed by using technique displayed in Plestan et al., [2008] which ensures a finite time convergence which is \textit{a priori} well-known. In this paper, the convergence has been stated at \( t_f = 3 \, \text{s} \). The controller gain value equals \( K = 10^5 \). Initial state variables are stated at \( x_1(0) = 0.001 \), \( x_2(0) = 0 \, \text{rad/s} \) and \( x_3(0) = 0 \, \text{N.m} \), which give \( \dot{x}_2(0) = 8.2183e - 012 \, \text{rad/s} \). Denoting \( z_1 = x_2 - x_2, \text{ref} \) and \( z_2 = \dot{x}_2 \), one gets a system as (3). From Theorem 4, with \( T_e = 1 \, \text{ms} \), one states \( \epsilon = 0.01 \). Figure 6 displays the speed rotor in case of a constant load torque on the rotor: it is shown that the motor reaches in a finite time a neighborhood (depending on \( \epsilon \)) of the objective. Figure 7 displays the speed rotor in case of dynamical perturbation load torque and thus shows the controller robustness.

Fig. 7. Evaluation of robustness. - Top. Rotor speed tracking error (rad.s\(^{-1}\)) versus time (s). Bottom. Load torque (Nm) versus time (s).
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