



Global finite-time observers for non linear systems

Tomas Menard, Emmanuel Moulay, Wilfrid Perruquetti

► **To cite this version:**

Tomas Menard, Emmanuel Moulay, Wilfrid Perruquetti. Global finite-time observers for non linear systems. IEEE. 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, CDC'09, Dec 2009, Shanghai, China. pp.6526 - 6531, 2009, <10.1109/CDC.2009.5399809>. <hal-00404143>

HAL Id: hal-00404143

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00404143>

Submitted on 7 Oct 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Global finite-time observers for non linear systems

Tomas Ménard*, Emmanuel Moulay† and Wilfrid Perruquetti‡

Abstract

A global finite-time observer is designed for nonlinear systems which are uniformly observable and globally Lipschitz. This result is based on a high-gain approach.

1. Introduction

The problem of observation has been studied by a number of researchers these last years. The linear case has been solved by Kalman and Luenberger, but the nonlinear case is still an active domain of research. Several ways of investigation have been borrowed. Linearization of nonlinear system with algebraic methods have been investigated in [1] and [2]. The high-gain observer approach which is closely related to triangular structure has been developed by Gauthier et al. (see [3] and [4]) and is derived from the uniform observability of nonlinear systems. Other methods have been developed

- Kazantzis and Kravaris observer which uses the Lyapunov auxiliary theorem and a direct coordinate transformation in [5],
- backstepping design in [6],
- adaptive observer in [7],

and many other ones. Almost all of these approaches give us asymptotic convergence. In some applicative fields, finite time convergence is needed for example like in secure communication, synchronisation or robot walks (see for instance [8, 9, 10]).

*Tomas Ménard is with IRCCyN UMR CNRS 6597, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, 44321 Nantes, France tomas.menard@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr

†Emmanuel Moulay is with IRCCyN UMR CNRS 6597, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, 44321 Nantes, France Emmanuel.Moulay@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr

‡Wilfrid Perruquetti is with ALIEN, INRIA Lille Nord Europe and LAGIS UMR CNRS 8146, Ecole Centrale de Lille, 59651 Villeneuve D'ascq, France wilfrid.perruquetti@ec-lille.fr

The problem of finite time observers has been less considered because it requires nonsmooth techniques. Nevertheless new conditions of stability and stabilization have been developed in the continuous finite-time domain, involving the settling time function, associated with the Lyapunov theory and homogeneous systems by Bhat and Bernstein in [11, 12], and by Moulay and Perruquetti in [13, 14].

There exists several methods achieving finite-time convergence, e.g. sliding mode observers (see [15, 16]), moving horizon observer (see [17]), but some of these are not continuous like sliding mode observers.

We consider here continuous finite-time observer. Such one has been designed for linear systems in [18] extended to linear time-varying system in [19]. A global finite time observer for a linearizable system via input output injection is constructed in [9] and extended to uniformly observable systems in [20] in a semi-global way. Let us note that such output injection structure : a linear part plus a homogeneous part can be derived from the results obtained by Andrieu-Praly-Astolfi ([21, 22] using the concept of homogeneity in the bi-limit : finite time convergence being obtained if the homogeneity degree in the 0-limit is negative. However, the construction and proof are recursive one.

This paper aim at designing a global observer for systems which are uniformly observable. For this class of systems, there exists a change of coordinates which transforms the system into an observability normal form.

This paper is organized as follows. The class of considered systems, the definitions and the properties of finite time stable systems are given in section 2. Section 3 presents a global finite-time observer followed by the proof of convergence and an illustrative example.

2. Preliminaries

Notations

- We denote by $t \mapsto x(t, x_0)$ a solution of the system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ x(t_0) = x_0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where f is a continuous vector field,

- $[x]^\alpha = \text{sign}(x) \cdot |x|^\alpha$, with $\alpha > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$,
- $\|\cdot\|_{i,k}$ denotes the i -norm on \mathbb{R}^k ,
- if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, \bar{x}_i denotes the truncated vector in \mathbb{R}^i with the i^{th} first components of x ($1 \leq i \leq n$),
- $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\varepsilon)$ is the ball centered at the origin and of radius ε , w.r.t. (with respect to) the norm $\|\cdot\|$,
- $L_f h(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} h(x) \cdot f(x)$ denotes the Lie derivative of h along the vector field f , and $L_f^n h = L_f(L_f^{n-1} h)$ is the n -th Lie derivative of h along the vector field f .

Context

Let us consider a multi-input single-output nonlinear system on \mathbb{R}^n

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m G_i(x) u_i, \\ y = h(x), \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where F and G_i are analytic functions. If system (2) is uniformly observable (see [3]). Then a coordinate change can be found to transform system (2) into the form

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = x_2 + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{1,j}(x_1) u_j \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_3 + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{2,j}(x_1, x_2) u_j \\ \vdots \\ \dot{x}_{n-1} = x_n + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{n-1,j}(x) u_j \\ \dot{x}_n = \varphi(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{n,j}(x) u_j \\ y = x_1 = Cx \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $C = (1 \ 0 \dots 0)$.

Finite-time stability

In this paper, we are interested in observer, but especially in finite-time observer. So we recall here the main definitions and properties for finite-time stability.

In system (1), f is a continuous but not Lipschitzian function, so it may happen that any solution of the system converges to zero in finite time.

Example 1. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the solutions of $\dot{x} = -\text{sign}(x) |x|^{\frac{1}{3}}$, are given by:

$$x(t, x_0) = \text{sign}(x_0) \left(|x_0|^{\frac{1}{3}} - \frac{t}{3} \right)^3, \text{ if } 0 < t < 3|x_0|^{\frac{1}{3}}$$

$$x(t, x_0) = 0, \text{ if } t \geq 3|x_0|^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

and thus reaches zero in finite time.

It is aimed here to exploit this property of such dynamical nonlinear systems to design a *finite time observer* (FTO). Due to the non Lipschitz condition on the right hand side of (1) backward uniqueness may be lost, and thus we only consider forward uniqueness which is recalled here.

Definition 1. The system (1) is said to have unique solutions in forward time on a neighbourhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ if for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ and two right maximally defined solutions of (1), $x(t, x_0) : [0, T_x[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y(t, x_0) : [0, T_y[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $0 < T_{x_0} \leq \min\{T_x, T_y\}$ such that $x(t, x_0) = y(t, x_0)$ for all $t \in [0, T_{x_0}[$.

It can be assumed that for each $x_0 \in \mathcal{U}$, T_{x_0} is chosen to be the largest in $\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$. Various sufficient conditions for forward uniqueness can be found in [23]. Let us consider the system (1) where f is continuous on \mathbb{R}^n and where f has unique solutions in forward time. We recall the definition of finite-time stability.

Definition 2. The origin of the system (1) is said finite time stable if:

1. there exists a function $T : \mathcal{V} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined on a neighbourhood \mathcal{V} of the origin, such that for all $x_0 \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{0\}$, $x(t, x_0)$ is defined (and unique) on $[0, T(x_0))$, $x(t, x_0) \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{0\}$ for all $t \in [0, T(x_0))$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow T(x_0)} x(t, x_0) = 0$.

T is called the settling-time function of the system (1).

2. for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for every $x_0 \in \left(\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{2,n}}(\delta(\varepsilon)) \setminus \{0\} \right) \cap \mathcal{V}$, $x(t, x_0) \in \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{2,n}}(\varepsilon)$ for all $t \in [0, T(x_0))$.

The following result gives a sufficient condition for system (1) to be finite time stable (see [24, 25] for ordinary differential equations, and [26] for Differential inclusions):

Theorem 1. [24, 25] Let the origin be an equilibrium point for the system (1), and let f be continuous on an open neighborhood \mathcal{V} of the origin. If there exists a Lyapunov function¹ $V : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a function $r : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(x(t)) \leq -r(V(x)), \quad (4)$$

along the solutions of (1) and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{dz}{r(z)} < +\infty, \quad (5)$$

¹ V is a continuously differentiable function defined on \mathcal{V} such that V is positive definite and $\frac{dV}{dt}$ is negative definite.

then the origin is finite time stable.

In particular, assuming forward uniqueness of the solution and the continuity of the settling time function, Bhat and Bernstein (see [12, Definition 2.2]) showed that finite time stability of the origin is equivalent to the existence of a Lyapunov function satisfying (4) where $r(x) = cx^a$, with $a \in]0, 1[$, $c > 0$. In order to circumvent the classical Lyapunov function art of design, one can use homogeneity conditions recalled hereafter.

Homogeneity

Definition 3. A function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is homogeneous of degree d w.r.t. the weights $(r_1, \dots, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ if

$$V(\lambda^{r_1}x_1, \dots, \lambda^{r_n}x_n) = \lambda^d V(x_1, \dots, x_n), \forall \lambda > 0. \quad (6)$$

Definition 4. A vector field f is homogeneous of degree d w.r.t. the weights $(r_1, \dots, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ if for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, the i -th component f_i is a homogeneous function of degree $r_i + d$. The system (1) is homogeneous of degree d if the vector field f is homogeneous of degree d .

Theorem 2. [27, Theorem 5.8 and Corollary 5.4] Let g be defined on \mathbb{R}^n and be a continuous vector field homogeneous of degree $d < 0$ with respect to dilation Λ_r . If the origin of (1) is locally asymptotically stable, then it is globally finite time stable.

Previous observers

Perruquetti et al. first construct a finite time observer for a canonical observable form in [9], i.e. for a linear system in the state. The proof of finite-time stability is based on homogeneity property (specifically on Theorem 2). Then, a semi-global observer was constructed by Shen and Xia in [20] based on the Perruquetti et al. observer. This result is recall here:

Theorem 3. System (3) admits a semi-global observer of the form:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\hat{x}}_1 = \hat{x}_2 + k_1 [y - \hat{x}_1]^{\alpha_1} + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{1,j}(\hat{x}_1) u_j \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_2 = \hat{x}_3 + k_2 [y - \hat{x}_1]^{\alpha_2} + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{2,j}(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) u_j \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_n = \varphi(\hat{x}) + k_n [y - \hat{x}_1]^{\alpha_n} + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{n,j}(\hat{x}) u_j \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where the powers α_i are defined by

$$\alpha_i = i\alpha + (i-1), \quad \alpha \in \left] 1 - \frac{1}{n}, 1 \right[\quad (8)$$

and

$$[k_1, \dots, k_n]^T = S_\infty^{-1}(\theta) C^T, \quad (9)$$

where $S_\infty(\theta)$ is the unique solution of the Riccati equation:

$$\begin{cases} \theta S_\infty(\theta) + A^T S_\infty(\theta) + S_\infty(\theta) A - C^T C = 0 \\ S_\infty(\theta) = S_\infty^T(\theta) \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $(A)_{ij} = \delta_{i,j-1}$ and $C = (1 \ 0 \dots 0)$.

3. Global Observers

In this section, we propose a global finite-time observer for system (3) based on the semi-global finite-time observer (7). In order to prove our result, we need the following lemma (issued from [28], remark 1):

Lemma 1. Assume system (1) is globally asymptotically stable and finite-time attractive on a neighborhood of the origin. Then system (1) is globally finite-time stable.

The proof of the following technical lemma is not given here, but an explicit computation (easy but long) gives the first equality and the second easily follows from the first.

Lemma 2. The matrix $S_\infty(\theta)$ and $S_\infty^{-1}(\theta)$ verify the following properties:

$$S_\infty(\theta)_{i,j} = S_\infty(1)_{i,j} \frac{1}{\theta^{i+j-1}} \quad (11)$$

$$S_\infty^{-1}(\theta)_{i,j} = S_\infty^{-1}(1)_{i,j} \theta^{i+j-1} \quad (12)$$

for any $\theta > 0$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Theorem 4. Let us consider system (3) with a bounded input $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ and assume functions $(g_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, and φ are globally Lipschitz. Then there exists $\theta^* > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\theta > \theta^*$ and $\alpha \in]1 - \varepsilon, 1[$, system (3) admits the following **global finite-time high-gain observer**:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\hat{x}}_1 = \hat{x}_2 + k_1 ([e_1]^{\alpha_1} + \rho e_1) + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{1,j}(\hat{x}_1) u_j \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_2 = \hat{x}_3 + k_2 ([e_1]^{\alpha_2} + \rho e_1) + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{2,j}(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) u_j \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_n = \varphi(\hat{x}) + k_n ([e_1]^{\alpha_n} + \rho e_1) + \sum_{j=1}^m g_{n,j}(\hat{x}) u_j \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where the powers α_i are defined by (8), the gains k_i are defined by (9), and $\rho = \left(\frac{n^2 \theta^{\frac{2}{3}} S_1 + 1}{2} \right)$, where $S_1 = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |S_\infty(1)_{i,j}| \cdot |S_\infty^{-1}(1)_{j,1}|$.

Proof. We denote $e = x - \hat{x}$. By using

$$D(x, \hat{x}, u) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \varphi(x) - \varphi(\hat{x}) \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{j=1}^m (g_j(x) - g_j(\hat{x})) u_j(t), \quad (14)$$

where $g_j = (g_{1,j}, \dots, g_{n,j})$, and

$$F(K, e) = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 [e_1]^{\alpha_1} \\ \vdots \\ k_n [e_1]^{\alpha_n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

the error system is given by:

$$\dot{e} = Ae - F(K, e) - \rho S_\infty^{-1}(\theta) C^T C e + D(x, \hat{x}, u). \quad (16)$$

In order to prove the global convergence of the observer, we prove first the existence of a "Lyapunov" function V for the error system (16) which is positive definite on \mathbb{R}^n and such that $\frac{d}{dt}V$ is negative definite on $\mathbb{R}^n - \mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(r)$. Then we will prove that the error system is finite time stable at the origin on $\mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(2r)$. The negativeness of $\frac{d}{dt}V$ on $\mathbb{R}^n - \mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(r)$ and the finite time stability on $\mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(2r)$ prove that the error equation is globally asymptotic stable and finite-time stable at the origin. We apply then the Lemma 1 which gives the result.

Let us consider:

$$V(e) = e^T S_\infty(\theta) e. \quad (17)$$

By using (10) and (16), the derivative of V is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(e^T S_\infty(\theta) e) &= -\theta e^T S_\infty(\theta) e - (2\rho - 1)(Ce)^2 \\ &\quad - 2e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e) \\ &\quad + 2e^T S_\infty(\theta) D(x, \hat{x}, u). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(e^T S_\infty(\theta) e) &\leq -\theta \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2 - (2\rho - 1)(Ce)^2 \\ &\quad - 2e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e) \\ &\quad + 2\|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)} \|D(x, \hat{x}, u)\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Since φ and $g_{i,j}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, m$) are globally Lipschitzian with a constant l and u is bounded by u_0 , it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D(x, \hat{x}, u)\|_{S_\infty(\theta)} \\ &= \left(\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} S_\infty(\theta)_{i,j} D_i(\bar{x}_i, \hat{x}_i, u) D_j(\bar{x}_j, \hat{x}_j, u) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left((lu_0)^2 \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |S_\infty(1)_{i,j}| \|\bar{e}_i\|_{1,i} \|\bar{e}_j\|_{1,j} \frac{1}{\theta^{i+j-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left((lu_0)^2 S \theta \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left\| \frac{1}{\theta^i} \bar{e}_i \right\|_{1,i} \left\| \frac{1}{\theta^j} \bar{e}_j \right\|_{1,j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $S = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |S_\infty(1)_{i,j}|$. Set $\xi_i = \frac{e_i}{\theta^i}$, clearly for $\theta \geq 1$:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\theta^i} \bar{e}_i \right\|_{1,i} \leq \left\| \bar{\xi}_i \right\|_{1,i} \leq \|\xi\|_{1,n}. \quad (21)$$

By norm equivalence, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that:

$$\|\xi\|_{1,n} \leq C_1 \|\xi\|_{S_\infty(1)}, \quad (22)$$

$$\|\xi\|_{S_\infty(1)}^2 = \frac{1}{\theta} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2, \quad (23)$$

it leads to

$$\|D(x, \hat{x}, u)\|_{S_\infty(\theta)} \leq nlu_0 C_1 \sqrt{S} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}. \quad (24)$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}V(e) &\leq (-\theta + M)V(e) \\ &\quad - (2\rho - 1)(Ce)^2 \\ &\quad - 2e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $M = 2nlu_0 C_1 \sqrt{S}$.

According to (25) in order to prove the negative definiteness of $\frac{d}{dt}V$ on $\mathbb{R}^n - \mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(r)$, we use an overvaluation of $e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)$. According to lemma 2, we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} &e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} e_i \frac{(S_\infty(1))_{i,j}}{\theta^{i+j-1}} (S_\infty^{-1}(1))_{j,1} \theta^j [e_1]^{\alpha_j}, \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n (S_\infty^{-1}(1))_{j,1} [e_1]^{\alpha_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e_i}{\theta^{i-1}} (S_\infty(1))_{i,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

We overvalue (26) in two times. We cut the subset $P^r = \mathbb{R}^n - \mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(r)$ in two complementary parts:

$$P_{<1}^r = \{e \in \mathbb{R}^n : |e_1| < 1\} \cap P^r, \quad (27)$$

$$P_{\geq 1}^r = \{e \in \mathbb{R}^n : |e_1| \geq 1\} \cap P^r. \quad (28)$$

On $P_{<1}^r$, we have:

$$|e_1|^{\alpha_i} < 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (29)$$

Hence

$$|e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)| \leq nS_1 \theta \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{e_i}{\theta^i} \right|, \quad (30)$$

where $S_1 = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |S_\infty^{-1}(1)_{j,1}| \times |S_\infty(1)_{i,j}|$. Let $\xi_i = \frac{e_i}{\theta^i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, it follows:

$$|e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)| \leq nS_1 \theta \|\xi\|_{1,n}. \quad (31)$$

As

$$\|\xi\|_{1,n} \leq C_1 \|\xi\|_{S_\infty(1)}, \quad (32)$$

$$\|\xi\|_{S_\infty(1)}^2 = \frac{1}{\theta} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2, \quad (33)$$

we have

$$|e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)| \leq nS.C_1 \sqrt{\theta} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}. \quad (34)$$

Let $C_2 = nSC_1$. Taking $r > 1$, then $\|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)} \leq \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2$ for $e \in P^r$, so:

$$|e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)| \leq C_2 \sqrt{\theta} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2. \quad (35)$$

Thus it leads to:

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(e) \leq (-\theta + M + C_2 \sqrt{\theta}) V(e) \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -(2\rho - 1)(Ce)^2 \\ & \leq (-\theta + M + C_2 \sqrt{\theta}) V(e). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

So there exists $\theta_1 > 0$ such that for all $\theta \geq \theta_1$, $\frac{d}{dt} V(e) < 0$ for all $e \in P^r_{<1}$.

On $P^r_{\geq 1}$, we have $|e_1| \geq 1$ so $|e_1|^{\alpha_i} \leq |e_1|$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

$$\begin{aligned} & |e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)| \\ & \leq nS\theta \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{e_i}{\theta^i} \right| \cdot |e_1|, \\ & \leq nS \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\theta^{\frac{2}{3}} \left| \frac{e_i}{\theta^i} \right| \right) \left(\theta^{\frac{1}{3}} |e_1| \right), \\ & \leq \frac{nS}{2} \left(\theta^{\frac{4}{3}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{e_i}{\theta^i} \right|^2 \right) + n\theta^{\frac{2}{3}} |e_1|^2 \right), \\ & \leq \frac{nS\theta^{\frac{4}{3}}}{2} \|\xi\|_{2,n}^2 + \frac{n^2\theta^{\frac{2}{3}}S}{2} |e_1|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

But

$$\|\xi\|_{2,n}^2 \leq C_3 \|\xi\|_{S_\infty(1)}^2, \quad (39)$$

$$\|\xi\|_{S_\infty(1)}^2 = \frac{1}{\theta} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2, \quad (40)$$

hence

$$|e^T S_\infty(\theta) F(K, e)| \leq C_4 \theta^{\frac{1}{3}} \|e\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}^2 + \frac{n^2\theta^{\frac{2}{3}}S}{2} |e_1|^2, \quad (41)$$

where $C_4 = nSC_3$. Thus we have:

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(e) \leq \left(-\theta + M + C_4 \theta^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) V(e), \quad (42)$$

and there exists $\theta_2 > 0$ such that for all $\theta \geq \theta_2$, $\frac{d}{dt} V(e) < 0$ for all $e \in P^r_{\geq 1}$.

Combining the two previous parts, for all $\theta \geq \max\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, we have:

$$\frac{d}{dt} V(e) < 0, \quad e \in P^r, \quad r > 1. \quad (43)$$

Let us prove the finite-time stability of the error system (16) on $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$. We consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$\tilde{V}_\alpha(e) = \tilde{e}^T S_\infty(\theta) \tilde{e}, \quad (44)$$

where $\tilde{e} = \left(\lceil e_1 \rceil^{\frac{1}{q}} \lceil e_2 \rceil^{\frac{1}{\alpha_1 q}} \dots \lceil e_n \rceil^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{n-1} q}} \right)$, $q = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} [(i-1)\alpha - (i-2)]$ is the product of the weights. We have:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{V}_\alpha(e) = A + B + C \quad (45)$$

where

$$A = 2\tilde{e}^T S_\infty(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{q} |e_1|^{\frac{1}{q}-1} (\frac{1}{2} e_2 - k_1 \lceil e_1 \rceil^{\alpha_1}) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{\alpha_n q} |e_n|^{\frac{1}{\alpha_n q}-1} (-k_n \lceil e_1 \rceil^{\alpha_n}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

and

$$B = 2\tilde{e}^T S_\infty(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{q} |e_1|^{\frac{1}{q}-1} (\frac{1}{2} e_2 - \rho k_1 e_1) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{\alpha_n q} |e_n|^{\frac{1}{\alpha_n q}-1} (-\rho k_n e_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

and

$$C = 2\tilde{e}^T S_\infty(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{q} |e_1|^{\frac{1}{q}-1} D_1 \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{\alpha_{n-1} q} |e_n|^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{n-1} q}-1} D_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (48)$$

We prove now that the second term B is negative. We use the same technique as in [9], i.e. we use the tube lemma. As V is proper, $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$ is a compact set of \mathbb{R}^n . Define the function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$(\alpha, e) \mapsto B. \quad (49)$$

Using the same technique as in Gauthier et al. [3], we easily prove that $\varphi(1, e) < 0$ for $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since φ is continuous, $\varphi^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{<0})$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$ containing the slice $\{1\} \times \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$. Since $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$ is compact, it follows from the tube lemma that $\varphi^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{<0})$ contains some tube $(1 - \mu_1, 1 + \mu_2) \times \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$ about $\{1\} \times \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$. For all $(\alpha, e) \in (1 - \mu_1, 1 + \mu_2) \times \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_{S_\infty(\theta)}}(2r)$

$$\varphi(\alpha, e) < 0. \quad (50)$$

Thus there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for $\alpha \in (1 - \varepsilon_1, 1)$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{V}_\alpha(e) \leq A + C. \quad (51)$$

According to the proof of the main theorem of [20], it follows that for every compact set \mathcal{U} containing the origin, there exists $\theta_3 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that for $\theta \geq \theta_3$ and $\alpha \in (1 - \varepsilon_2, 1)$, $\mathcal{U} \subset \Omega$, where Ω is the domain of

attraction of the observer. But according to [3], there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that:

$$S_\infty(\theta) \geq \delta_0 I, \quad \forall \theta \geq 0. \quad (52)$$

Hence, there exists $\theta_4 > 0$ such that for all $\theta \geq \theta_4$:

$$\mathcal{B}_{S_\infty(\theta)}(2r) \subset \delta_0 \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|_2}(2r) \subset \mathcal{U}. \quad (53)$$

Finally we take $\theta^* = \max\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_4\}$ and $\varepsilon = \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$. \square

References

- [1] G. Conte, C. Moog, and A. Perdon, *Algebraic Methods for Nonlinear Control Systems*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2007.
- [2] A. Glumineau, C. Moog, and F. Plestan, "New algebroid conditions for the linearization by input-output injection," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 40(4), pp. 598–603, 1996.
- [3] J. Gauthier, H. Hammouri, and S. Othman, "A simple observer for nonlinear systems. applications to bioreactors," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 37(6), pp. 875–880, 1992.
- [4] J. Gauthier and I. Kupka, "Observability and observers for nonlinear systems," *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, vol. 32, pp. 975–994, 1994.
- [5] N. Kazantzis and C. Kravaris, "Nonlinear observer design using lyapunov's auxiliary theorem," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 34, pp. 241–247, 1998.
- [6] J. Li and C. Qian, "Global finite-time stabilization by dynamic output feedback for a class of continuous nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 51(5), pp. 879–884, 2006.
- [7] M. C. Young and R. Rajamani, "A systematic approach to adaptive observer synthesis for nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 42(4), pp. 534–537, 1997.
- [8] A. Azemi and E. Yaz, "Sliding-mode adaptive observer approach to chaotic synchronization," *J. Dyn. Sys., Meas., Control*, vol. 122, pp. 758–765, 2000.
- [9] W. Perruquetti, T. Floquet, and E. Moulay, "Finite-time observers: application to secure communication," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 53(1), pp. 356–360, 2008.
- [10] F. Plestan, J. Grizzle, E. Westervelt, and G. Abba, "Stable walking of a 7-dof biped robot," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 19(4), pp. 653–668, 2003.
- [11] S. P. Bhat and D. S. Bernstein, "Geometric homogeneity with applications to finite-time stability," *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, vol. 17, pp. 101–127, 2005.
- [12] —, "Finite-time stability of continuous autonomous systems," *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, vol. 38(3), pp. 751–766, 2000.
- [13] E. Moulay and W. Perruquetti, "Finite-time stability of nonlinear systems," in *42th IEEE conference on decision and control*, Maui, Hawaii USA, december 2003, pp. 3641–3646.
- [14] —, "Finite time stability and stabilization of a class of continuous systems," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application*, vol. 323(2), pp. 1430–1443, 2006.
- [15] S. Drakunov and V. Utkin, "Sliding mode observers. tutorial," in *Proceedings of the 34th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 1995.
- [16] I. Haskara, U. Ozguner, and V. Utkin, "On sliding mode observers via equivalent control approach," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 71, pp. 1051–1067, 1998.
- [17] H. Michalska and D. Mayne, "Moving horizon observers and observer-based control," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 40, pp. 995–1006, 1995.
- [18] R. Engel and G. Kreisselmeier, "A continuous-time observer which converges in finite-time," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, vol. 47(7), pp. 1202–1204, 2002.
- [19] P. Menold, R. Findeisen, and F. Allgöwer, "finite-time convergent observers for linear time varying systems," in *Proceedings of the 11th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation*, 2003.
- [20] Y. Shen and X. Xia, "Semi-global finite-time observers for nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44(12), pp. 3152–3156, 2008.
- [21] V. Andrieu, L. Praly, and A. Astolfi, "Homogeneous approximation, recursive observer design and output feedback," *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1814–1850, June 2008.
- [22] —, "High gain observers with updated high-gain and homogeneous correction terms," *Automatica*, vol. 45(2), pp. 422–428, February 2009.
- [23] M. Kawski, "Stabilization of nonlinear systems in the plane," *Systems and control letters*, vol. 12, pp. 169–175, 1989.
- [24] E. Moulay and W. Perruquetti, "Finite-time stability conditions for non-autonomous continuous systems," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 81(5), pp. 797–803, 2008.
- [25] W. Perruquetti and S. Drakunov, "Finite time stability and stabilisation," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Sydney, Australia, 2000.
- [26] E. Moulay and W. Perruquetti, "Finite time stability of differential inclusions," *IMA J. Math. Control Inform*, 2005.
- [27] A. Bacciotti and L. Rosier, *Lyapunov Functions and Stability in Control Theory*, 2nd ed., B. Springer, Ed. Springer, 2005.
- [28] Y. Hong, Y. Xu, and J. Huang, "Finite-time control for robot manipulators," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 46, pp. 243–253, 2002.