Fuzzy adaptive tracking control within the full envelope for an unmanned aerial vehicle
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Abstract Motivated by the autopilot of an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) with a wide flight envelope span experiencing large parametric variations in the presence of uncertainties, a fuzzy adaptive tracking controller (FATC) is proposed. The controller consists of a fuzzy baseline controller and an adaptive increment, and the main highlight is that the fuzzy baseline controller and adaptation laws are both based on the fuzzy multiple Lyapunov function approach, which helps to reduce the conservatism for the large envelope and guarantees satisfactory tracking performances with strong robustness simultaneously within the whole envelope. The constraint condition of the fuzzy baseline controller is provided in the form of linear matrix inequality (LMI), and it specifies the satisfactory tracking performances in the absence of uncertainties. The adaptive increment ensures the uniformly ultimately bounded (UUB) predication errors to recover satisfactory responses in the presence of uncertainties. Simulation results show that the proposed controller helps to achieve high-accuracy tracking of airspeed and altitude desirable commands with strong robustness to uncertainties throughout the entire flight envelope.

1. Introduction

As the development of modern UAVs, the flight envelope is expanded constantly. Flight control confronts the challenge of high-precision tracking of desirable instruments with strong robustness for the entire flight envelope. A UAV is a multi-input, multi-output nonlinear system with strong coupling, and the aerodynamic forces and moments for the kinetics depend not only on the dynamic pressure but also on the force and moment coefficients as a function of aerodynamic derivatives. The engine thrust, dynamic pressure, and aerodynamic derivatives vary significantly along with the changes of Mach number and altitude, especially during a transonic flight. Therefore, the operating and stability characteristics of a UAV at different operating points vary remarkably. In addition, undesirable uncertainties intensify the difficulty due to modeling errors, parametric perturbations, and control efficiency failures within the full envelope.

Although local model based robust control, adaptive dynamic inversion control, and L1 adaptive control enhance performances, they are not applicable for a flight over a large envelope. The interpolation of local linearization-based
controllers in terms of flight condition is widely applied in engineering, but stability could not be guaranteed.\(^7\) The gap metric\(^3\) and guardian maps\(^8\) approaches extend stability to the entire envelope iteratively, but the processes are time-consuming.

The linear parameter varying (LPV) control is a popular gain-scheduling approach for a large envelope. However, the conservatism of the common Lyapunov method based robust\(^7\) or adaptive controllers\(^6,9\) may lead to no feasible solution for desired performances. To relax the conservatism, Huang et al.\(^10\) provided switching the LPV robust controller using multiple Lyapunov functions for air-breathing hypersonic vehicles, while Lu et al.\(^11\) switched the LPV controller using hysteresis average dwell time logics respectively. However, higher computational complexities emerge and they ensure robustness at the price of response performances. Hou et al.\(^12,13\) enhanced the response performances with the adaptive increment, but dwell time restricts the arbitrary switching and switching dynamics may cause underlying damages.

The fuzzy control is also an attractive alternative for robust control within a full envelope.\(^14\) The generalized fuzzy hybrid controllers blend the common Lyapunov function with \(H_\infty\)\(^15\) the sliding mode,\(^16\) or MRAC,\(^17\) and they degrade control performances due to the conservatism. To reduce the conservatism, Feng\(^18\) proposed a piecewise Lyapunov function based fuzzy \(H_\infty\) controller, but the switching dynamics could not be avoided. The fuzzy multiple Lyapunov functions can reduce the control conservatism with the advantage of a continuity feature,\(^19\) and Bouarrar et al.\(^20\) reduced computational complexity by adopting the descriptor system approach, yet the local \(H_\infty\) controller guarantees robustness at the cost of response performances.\(^21\) Although Wu and Juang\(^22\) employed a fuzzy adaptive sliding-mode controller to relax the cost of response for robustness, chattering emerges owing to the discontinuous control signals across the sliding surfaces.

Based on the above analysis, a fuzzy multiple Lyapunov function based tracking controller augmenting a fuzzy baseline controller with an adaptive increment is proposed. The key breakthroughs can be concluded as follows:

1. The conservatism of the fuzzy baseline controller and the adaptation law for the entire flight envelope is relaxed by employing the fuzzy multiple Lyapunov method.
2. The computational complexity of LMI for the fuzzy baseline controller is reduced by using the descriptor system approach.
3. The controller provides smooth control signals throughout the flight envelope.

### 2. Problem formation

#### 2.1. Nonlinear kinetic model

The flight envelope\(^23\) of a UAV refers to the capabilities of operating ranges in terms of Mach number and altitude. For a fix-wing UAV, the flight envelope is restricted by the stalling angle, service ceiling, maximum march, maximum dynamic pressure, performances of the engine, etc.

The original nonlinear model\(^23,24\) in the path coordinate frame can be constructed as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{V}_T &= (T \cos(x + \varphi) - D - mg \sin \gamma) / m \\
\dot{\gamma} &= (T \sin(x + \varphi) + L - mg \cos \gamma) / (mV_T) \\
\dot{q} &= M / J_z \\
\dot{\theta} &= q \\
x &= \theta - \gamma \\
H &= V_T \sin \gamma
\end{align*}
\]

where \(V_T, x, q, \theta, \gamma\) and \(H\) are the airspeed, angle of attack, pitch rate, pitch angle, path angle, and altitude, respectively; \(\varphi\) is the angle of the thrust line; \(m\) is the mass; \(g\) is the gravitational constant; \(J_z\) is the pitch moment of inertia; \(T, D\) and \(M\) are the engine thrust, lift, drag, and pitch moment\(^24\) expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
T &= P(\delta_{th}, Ma, H) \\
L &= qSC_L \\
D &= qSC_D \\
M &= qSC_M - e_{e}T
\end{align*}
\]

with \(P(\cdot)\) the thrust curve; \(\delta_{th}\) the throttle setting; \(Ma\) the Mach number; \(S, c, e, e_{e}\) the wing area, mean geometric chord, and thrust eccentricity; \(q = 0.5 \rho H V_T^2\) the dynamic pressure, and \(\rho(H) = 1.225 (1 - H/4431)^{4.2558}\) the air density; and \(C_L, C_D, C_M\) the lift, drag, and pitching moment coefficients defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
C_L &= C_{L0}Ma(x - \bar{z}) + C_{L\alpha}Ma\delta_e \\
C_D &= AMaC_L^2 + C_{D\alpha}Ma \\
C_M &= C_{M0}Ma + (x_{eR} - x_{eR}Ma)C_L \\
&\quad + C_{M\alpha}Ma\delta_e + C_{M\beta}Ma\bar{c} + C_{M\gamma}Ma\bar{c}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\bar{z}\) is the zero lift angle; \(\delta_e\) is the elevator deflections; \(\bar{z}\) is the derivative of the angle of attack; \(C_{L\alpha}, C_{D\alpha}, C_{M0}, C_{M\alpha}, C_{M\beta}\), and \(C_{M\gamma}\) are the aerodynamic derivatives; and \(x_{eR}, x_{eR}\) are the reference locations of the gravity and aerodynamic centers.

The relationship between the flight of a UAV over a large envelope and the nonlinear kinetics can be illustrated in Fig. 1. As shown in Fig. 1, the thrust and aerodynamic derivatives connect the operating points in the flight envelope with the forces and moments in the nonlinear model. The natural frequency and damp of short-period and phugoid-period vary remarkably along with airspeed, altitude, dynamic pressure, and aerodynamic derivatives.\(^25\) Hence, we can use the Mach number and the altitude as the premise variables to distinguish the natural characteristics of the UAV over a large flight envelope.\(^1\)

#### 2.2. Fuzzy T–S model

As the fuzzy system with the Gaussian membership function has been shown to realize the universal approximation of any nonlinear functions on the considered compact set,\(^26\) the nonlinear model of Eq. (1) can be transformed to an uncertain fuzzy T–S system as
where \( x(t) = [V_T, z, \alpha, \beta, \gamma]^T \), \( u(t) = [\delta, \theta, \phi]^T \) and \( y(t) = [V_T, H]^T \) denote the system state, input, and output vectors, respectively; \( N \) is the size of the fuzzy rules; \( z(t) = [z_1(t), z_2(t)]^T \) is the premise variable and \( z_2(t) = Ma, z_1(t) = H; L(x(t), z(t)) \) represents the modeling errors and unknown parametric perturbations; \( A(t) = \text{diag}(A_1(t), A_2(t)) \) is the unknown diagonal matrix with \( A_1(t) \) and \( A_2(t) \) modeling the control efficiency failures of thrust and elevator; \( A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}, B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 2}, C_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 5} \) \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, N)\) are the local system matrices; \( \mu_i(z(t)) \geq 0 \) is the membership degree defined as

\[
\mu_i(z(t)) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} f_i^k(z_k(t)) \left/ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f_i^k(z_k(t)) \right.,
\]

with \( f_i^k(z_k(t)) \) the \( k \)th Gaussian membership function of \( z_k(t) \) reflecting to the fuzzy set \( Z_i^k \), and

\[
f_i^k(z_k(t)) = \exp\left( -\frac{(z_k(t) - \bar{z}_i^k)^2}{\sigma_i^k} \right)
\]

where \( \bar{z}_i^k \) and \( \sigma_i^k \) are the center and width of \( f_i^k(z_k(t)) \). Note that we set symbols \( n = 5, \ m = 2, \ K = 2 \) to represent the sizes of the system states, inputs, and premise variables, respectively.

For any \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) and \( k = 1, 2 \), the parameters \( \bar{z}_i^k \) and \( \sigma_i^k \) are obtained through the orthogonal projection of fuzzy partition, which is realized by fuzzy c-means clustering of flight dynamics.\(^{12,26}\) \( A_i, B_i \) and \( C_i \) \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, N)\) are acquired via local linearization with respect to the centers of the fuzzy rules. The overlapped membership degrees of the fuzzy partition matrix renders the universe of discourse of the Gaussian membership function to exceed the boundary of the flight envelope, so the dynamics of the fuzzy T–S system can cover the flight envelope region sufficiently with \( N \) overlapped ellipses.\(^{2,27}\)

**Assumption 1.** The flight envelope constrains that \( z(t) \) belongs to the compact set \( \Omega_z \).

**Assumption 2.** The uncertainties \( L(x(t), z(t)) \) can be approximated by a single hidden layer neural network (SHLNN) over the compact set \( (x(t), z(t)) \in \Omega_x \times \Omega_z \), with a known structure and size as\(^{28}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_c(t) &= A_c x_c(t) + B_c r(t) \\
y_c(t) &= C_c x_c(t)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( x_c(t) = [V_{Tc}, \dot{V}_{Tc}, H_c, H_c]^T, r(t) = [V_{Tc}, H_c]^T \); \( V_{Tc} \) and \( H_c \) are the given airspeed and altitude inputs; \( V_{Tc} \) and \( H_c \) are the desired commands; and \( A_c, B_c \), \( C_c \), \( \text{nonlinear friction} \).

**2.3. Control objective**

The control objective is the precise tracking of airspeed and altitude commands with strong robustness within the full flight envelope. The desirable responses are specified by a command filter

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_c(t) &= A_c x_c(t) + B_c r(t) \\
y_c(t) &= C_c x_c(t)
\end{align*}
\]
$C_z$ are the system matrices. $r(t)$ is uniformly bounded. To remove steady-state errors, we define

$$d(t) = \int_0^t (y_c(\tau) - y(\tau))d\tau$$  

(12)

With the augmentation of the command filter, the extended tracking system can be constructed as

$$\dot{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i A_i \dot{x}(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i B_i [(I_m + A^T(t)) \times u(t) $$

$$+ L(x(t), z(t))] + GR(t)$$  

(13)

where $x(t) = [\hat{x}(t), \hat{z}(t), \dot{d}^T(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^6$ with $n = n + 3m, I_m$ is a unit matrix of dimension $m$, and

$$A_i = \begin{bmatrix} A_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A_i \\ -C_i & 0 & C_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_i = \begin{bmatrix} B_i \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_i \end{bmatrix} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, N)$$

3. Fuzzy adaptive tracking control for a UAV within the full envelope

Consider the following control law

$$u(t) = u_b(t) + u_{\Delta}(t)$$  

(14)

where $u_b(t)$ is the fuzzy baseline controller and $u_{\Delta}(t)$ is the adaptive increment. The fuzzy baseline controller specifies the satisfactory tracking performances in the absence of uncertainties, while the adaptive increment copes with the uncertainties to recover the specified tracking performances.

3.1. Fuzzy baseline controller

Define the quadratic performance index as

$$J = \int_0^{T_f} (\ddot{x}^T(t)Q \ddot{x}(t) + u^T(t)Ru(t))dt$$  

(15)

where $Q$ and $R$ are the given diagonal positive matrices, and $T_f$ is the terminal time.

Applying the fuzzy multiple Lyapunov function approach, we introduce the fuzzy baseline controller

$$u_b(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \bar{K}_i \ddot{x}(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \bar{N}_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu_j X_j^{-1} \ddot{x}(t)$$  

(16)

where $X_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} (j = 1, \ldots, N)$ is the $j$th Lyapunov positive definite matrix, $\bar{N}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\bar{K}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the $i$th $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, N)$ local proportional matrix and the composited gain matrix, respectively.

In the absence of uncertainties, the extended tracking system of Eq. (13) with $u_b(t)$ takes the form of

$$\ddot{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \bar{A}_i \ddot{x}(t) + \bar{G}r(t)$$  

(17)

and it can be represented in the form of an equivalent descriptor system

$$\tilde{E} \ddot{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \bar{A}_i \ddot{x}(t) + \bar{G}r(t)$$  

(18)

where

$$\tilde{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{x}(t) \\ u_{\Delta}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{E} = \begin{bmatrix} I \end{bmatrix} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, N)$$

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions 1–4, for a given quadratic performance index defined as Eq. (15) and a descriptor system given by Eq. (18), if there exists a feasible solution $(X_i, X_{21i}, X_{22i}, N_i, \bar{X}_i) i=1, 2, \ldots, N$ satisfying

$$\Theta_i \leq 0$$  

(19)

$$\Theta_i = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{ij} & * & * \\ * & \chi & * \\ * & * & -\bar{C}_i \end{bmatrix}$$

then $u_b(t)$ in Eq. (16) is a stabilizing controller rendering

$$J \leq J_0 + \int_0^{T_f} ^{r(\tau)}(\tau)dt$$  

(20)

where $\bar{x}_0 = \ddot{x}(t_0), \chi > 0$ is the attenuation level, and

$$\bar{P}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{P}^{1/2}_s \bar{0}^{1/2}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \bar{N}_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu_j X_j^{-1} \ddot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n \times n} \\ \bar{0}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}$$

and $X_{21i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, X_{22i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are the relative matrices for the solution of controller parameters in Eq. (16).

Proof. Consider the following candidate fuzzy multiple Lyapunov function

$$V(\ddot{x}(t)) = \ddot{x}^T(t)P(t) \ddot{x}(t)$$  

(21)

where $P(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i P_i = X_1^{-1} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i X_i \right)^{-1}$ with $X_i, P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} (i = 1, 2, \ldots, N), P_i$ is the nonsingular matrix restricted by

$$\ddot{P}^T(t) = P(t) \ddot{E} \geq 0$$  

(22)

The constraint condition Eq. (22) holds if

$$\ddot{X}_i = \begin{bmatrix} X_i & 0 \\ X_{21i} & X_{22i} \end{bmatrix}$$  

(23)

where $X_i, X_{21i}, X_{22i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.
The time derivative of $V(x(t))$ along trajectories of the descriptor system Eq. (18) renders
\[
\dot{V}(x(t)) + x^T(t) Q \ddot{x}(t) - \gamma r^T(t) r(t) = \left[ x^T(t), r^T(t) \right] \Omega \left[ x^T(t), r^T(t) \right]^T
\]
where
\[
\Omega = \begin{bmatrix}
A^T \hat{P} + \hat{P}^T A + \hat{E}^T \hat{P} + Q \\
G^T \hat{P} + -\chi I_m
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
Q = \text{diag}(Q, R)
\]
with $\hat{A}_h = \sum_{i,j} \mu_i \hat{A}_j$.

Multiplying $\Omega$ on the left and right by $\text{diag}(X_0, I_m)$ and $\text{diag}(X_m, I_m)$, respectively, we get a similar matrix $\tilde{\Omega}$. The property of $\mu_i$ defined by Eq. (5) and $X_N - X_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, N - 1)$ yield
\[
\tilde{\Omega} = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{hN} + X_N^T \hat{P} X_N + X_N^T Q X_N \\
G^T + -\chi I_m
\end{bmatrix} \leq \Omega
\]

with
\[
\Omega = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{hN} + X_N^T \hat{P} X_N \\
G^T + -\chi I_m
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega &= \begin{bmatrix}
\sum_{i,j} \mu_i \beta_{ij} + N_h X_N - X_N \\
- \sum_{i,j} \mu_i \beta_{ij} X_N + X_N^T + X_N^T \\
- \sum_{i,j} \mu_i \beta_{ij} X_N + X_N^T + X_N^T
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

By Schur complement, LMI constraint of Eq. (19) renders $\Omega \leq 0$. Then $\Omega \leq 0$ and
\[
\dot{V}(x(t)) + x^T(t) Q \ddot{x}(t) - \gamma r^T(t) r(t) \leq 0
\]
The integral of Eq. (26) from \( t = 0 \) to \( t = T_f \) yields $J \leq J$, and this completes the proof.\[\square\]

Under the LMI constraint of Eq. (19), the system described by Eq. (17) leads to the reference closed-loop system
\[
\dot{x}_m(t) = \sum_{i,j} \mu_i X_j x_m(t) + \tilde{\mathbf{G}} r(t)
\]
where $x_m(t)$ is the reference state and $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is the time-varying Hurwitz matrix for any $z(t) \in \mathcal{K}_m$ which satisfies the satisfactory tracking performances of the desirable commands $y_d(t)$.

Remark 1. The LMI constraint Eq. (19) degrades to a common Lyapunov function based constraint if we set $X_i = X_j$ for any $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and $i \neq j$. Hence, the fuzzy baseline controller reduces the conservatism. Compared with Ref.\[29\], the computational complexity is reduced from $O(N^3)$ to $O(N^2)$. Where the function $O(t)$ represents the computational complexity with respect to the number of fuzzy rules.

3.2. Adaptive increment and stability analysis

Substituting the controller $u(t)$ with $u_i(t)$ restricted by Eq. (19), we get an uncertain closed-loop system
\[
\dot{x}(t) = \mathbf{A}_{m\alpha} \dot{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}_h \left[ (I_m + \tilde{A}^T(t)) u_A(t) + \dot{W}^T(t) \mathbf{r}(\psi(t)) + \tilde{A}^T(t) u_L(t) + , , + \tilde{A}^T(t) u_L(t) + \tilde{G}_r(t) \right]
\]

Define the fuzzy premise variables based state predictor (the reference closed-loop system) as
\[
\dot{x}(t) = \mathbf{A}_{m\alpha} \dot{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}_h \left[ (I_m + \tilde{A}^T(t)) u_A(t) + \dot{W}^T(t) \mathbf{r}(\psi(t)) + \tilde{A}^T(t) u_L(t) + \tilde{G}_r(t) \right]
\]

with $x(t)$ the predictor state, $\dot{W}(t), \dot{V}(t)$ and $\tilde{A}(t)$ the adaptive parametric estimates of $W, V$ and $A$.

Let the adaptive increment $u_A(t)$ be given by
\[
u_{u_A}(t) = - \left( I_m + \tilde{A}^T(t) \right) ^{-1}
\]
\[
\times \left[ \dot{W}^T(t) \mathbf{r}(\psi(t)) + \tilde{A}^T(t) u_L(t) \right]
\]

and the existence of $\left( I_m + \tilde{A}^T(t) \right) ^{-1}$ will be addressed latter. By subtracting Eq. (28) from Eq. (29) and using Taylor series expansion of SHLNN about $(W(t), V(t))$, we can obtain the predication error system
\[
\dot{x}(t) = \mathbf{A}_{m\alpha} \dot{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}_h \left[ \dot{W}^T(t) \mathbf{r}(\psi(t)) + \tilde{A}^T(t) u_L(t) + \tilde{G}_r(t) \right]
\]
\[
\quad + \dot{W}^T(t) \nabla \mathbf{r}(\psi(t)) \dot{V}^T(\psi(t)) + \tilde{A}^T(t) u(t) + \dot{\psi}(t) - \dot{\psi}(\psi(t))\right]
\]

where $\dot{x}(t) = \dot{x}(t) - \tilde{x}(t)$ is the predication error;
\[
\tilde{W}(t) = \dot{W}(t) - W; \tilde{V}(t) = \dot{V}(t) - V \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A}(t) = \dot{A}(t) - A
\]

are estimation errors of unknown $W, V$ and $A$, and
\[
\nu(\dot{V}(t), \psi(t)) = \sigma(\dot{V}(t) \psi(t))
\]
\[
= - \nabla \sigma(\dot{V}(t) \psi(t)) \dot{V}^T(t) \psi(t)
\]
\[
\dot{\psi}(t) = \tilde{W}^T(t) \nabla \sigma(\dot{V}(t) \psi(t)) \tilde{V}^T \psi(t)
\]

with $\nabla$ the Frobenius norm of the matrix. And $\| \|_F$ the Frobenius norm of the matrix. And $\sigma(\dot{V}(t) \psi(t))$ is the 2nd and higher order terms of the Taylor-series expansion, and $\| \dot{V}(t) \psi(t) \|_F$ and $\| \dot{V}(t) \psi(t) \|_F \to 0$ as $\| \dot{V}(t) \psi(t) \|_F \to 0, \nabla \sigma(\dot{V}(t) \psi(t)) \in R^{(i+1) \times l}$ is the Jacobian matrix as follows.
\frac{\nabla \sigma(V^T(t) \psi(t))}{\nabla V^T(t) \psi(t)} = \mathbf{0}

\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{\partial \sigma(\rho_i)}{\partial \rho_i} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial \sigma(\rho_i)}{\partial \rho_i}
\end{bmatrix}

(33)

where \( \rho_i = \hat{V}_i(t) \psi(t) \) with \( \hat{V}_i \) the estimate of \( V_i \) and \( \partial \sigma(\rho_i)/\partial \rho_i = a e^{-\alpha \rho_i}/(1 + e^{-\alpha \rho_i}) ^2 \), for any \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, l\} \).

The predicition error system of Eq. (31) can be represented in terms of descriptor system

\[ E \hat{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \hat{A}_i(t) \hat{x}(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \hat{B}_i(t) \]

\[ \times \left[ \hat{W}^T(t) u(\hat{V}(t), \psi(t)) + \hat{W}^2(t) \right] \nabla \sigma(V^T(t) \psi(t)) + \hat{A}_i(t) u(t) \]

\[ + \zeta(t) - e(\psi(t)) \]

(34)

with \( \hat{x}(t) = \left[ \hat{x}^T(t), \hat{u}^T(t) \right]^T, \hat{B}_i(t) = [\hat{B}^T_i(t), 0]^T \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \), and \( \hat{u}(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i \hat{K} \hat{x}(t) \).

**Theorem 2.** Consider the uncertain fuzzy T–S system Eq. (4) with \( u(t) \) given by Eq. (14), \( u_{ak}(t) \) given by Eq. (16) satisfying LMI constraint Eq. (19), \( u_{ak}(t) \) given by Eq. (30), the state predictor and prediction error system given by Eqs. (29) and (31) with \( \hat{W}(t), \hat{V}(t) \) and \( \hat{A}(t) \) governed by projection-based adaptation laws

\[ \hat{W}(t) = \Gamma \text{Proj}(\hat{W}(t), -u(F(t), \psi(t)) \xi(t)) \]

\[ \hat{V}(t) = F \text{Proj}(\hat{V}(t), -\psi(t) \xi(t)) \hat{W}^T(t) \nabla \sigma(V^T(t) \psi(t)) \]

(35)

\[ \hat{A}(t) = T \text{Proj}(\hat{A}(t), -u(t) \xi(t)) \]

where the filtered prediction error is

\[ \xi(t) = \hat{x}^T(t) P \hat{B}_h \]

(36)

with

\[ \hat{P}_s = \left[ \hat{P}^T_s, 0 \right] \hat{X}^{-1} \left[ \hat{P}^T_s, 0 \right] \]

(37)

and the adaptation matrices \( \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{(l+1) \times (l+1)}, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, \) and \( F \in \mathbb{R}^{n + K + 1, n + K + 1} \) are diagonal positive definite matrices.

Then, \( (\hat{x}(t), \hat{W}(t), \hat{V}(t), \hat{A}(t)) \) of the prediction error system (31) is uniformly ultimately bounded (UUB) for any \( (x(t), z(t)) \in \Omega_x \times \Omega_z \), with an ultimate bound \( \| \hat{x}(t) \| \leq \tilde{X}_b \).

\[ \tilde{X}_b = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_0 + \rho_1 + \rho_2}{\lambda_{\min}(\hat{P}_s)}^2 + \rho_2} \]

(38)

where \( \lambda_{\min}(\hat{P}_s) \)

\[ \rho_0 = \frac{\hat{\lambda}_{\max}(\hat{P}_s) \beta \left( \eta + \zeta \right)}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} \]

\[ \rho_1 = \frac{4 \beta \hat{d}_f}{\lambda_{\min}(T) \lambda_{\min}(Q)} \]

\[ \rho_2 = \frac{4 \beta^2}{\lambda_{\min}(T)} + \frac{4 \beta^2}{\lambda_{\min}(F)} + \frac{4 \beta^2}{\lambda_{\min}(T)} \]

(39)

\[ 0 \leq \mathbf{W} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{W}_i(t) \]

Hence, the controller guarantees a UUB close-loop system under undesirable uncertainties, and it constitutes the fuzzy adaptive tracking controller within the full envelope for the UAV as shown in Fig. 2.

**Proof.** Consider the following candidate fuzzy multiple Lyapunov-like function

\[ V(\hat{x}(t)) = \hat{x}^T(t) E^T P_s \hat{x}(t) + \text{tr} \left( \hat{W}^T(t) F^{-1} \hat{W}(t) \right) \]

\[ + \text{tr} \left( \hat{V}^T(t) F^{-1} \hat{V}(t) \right) + \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}^T(t) T^{-1} \hat{A}(t) \right) \]

(40)

with \( P_s \) restrained by Eq. (22) and \( \text{tr}(t) \) the trace operator. The time derivative of \( V(\hat{x}(t)) \) can be written as

\[ \dot{V}(\hat{x}(t)) = \hat{x}^T(t) \left( \hat{A}_i^T P_s + \hat{P}_s A_i + \hat{E}_s^T P_s \right) \hat{x}(t) \]

\[ + 2 \hat{x}^T(t) P_s \hat{B}_h \left[ \hat{W}^T(t) \text{Proj}(\hat{V}(t), \psi(t)) \right] \]

\[ + \hat{W}^T(t) \nabla \sigma(V^T(t) \psi(t)) \hat{V}(t) \psi(t) + \hat{A}_i^T(t) u(t) \]

\[ + \zeta(t) - e(\psi(t)) + 2 \text{tr} \left( \hat{V}^T(t) F^{-1} \hat{V}(t) \right) + 2 \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}_i^T(t) T^{-1} \hat{A}(t) \right) \]

\[ - 2 \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}_i^T(t) T^{-1} \hat{A}_i(t) \right) \]

(41)

with \( \hat{B}_h = \hat{A}_i^T P_s + \hat{P}_s A_i + \hat{E}_s^T P_s \).

Since the LMI constraint of Eq. (19) guarantees \( \Omega \subset \Omega_k \) as defined in Eq. (24), with Schur complement, we can get

\[ \hat{x}^T(t) \left( \hat{A}_i^T P_s + \hat{P}_s A_i + \hat{E}_s^T P_s \right) \hat{x}(t) \leq -\hat{x}^T(t) Q \hat{x}(t) \]

(42)

The constraint condition by Eq. (22) renders \( \xi(t) = \hat{x}^T(t) P_s \hat{B}_h = \hat{x}^T(t) P_s \hat{B}_h \). By Assumptions 1 and 2, we can obtain \( W \in \Omega_W = \{ W ||W||_p < \hat{W} \}, \quad \Omega_W = \{ W ||W||_p < \hat{V} \}, A \in \Omega_A = \{ A ||A||_p < \hat{F} \} \). The projection operators in Eq. (35) ensure \( \hat{W}(t) \in \Omega_W, \hat{V}(t) \in \Omega_V, \) and \( \hat{A}(t) \in \Omega_A \). Hence, the boundedness of \( \hat{W}(t), \hat{V}(t) \) and \( \hat{A}(t) \) can be guaranteed and there exists a constant \( \bar{\zeta} > 0 \) so that \( ||\zeta(\hat{t})|| \leq \bar{\zeta} \). Using \( a^T b = \text{tr}(b a^T) \), we get

\[ \dot{V}(\hat{x}(t)) \leq -\lambda_{\min}(\hat{Q}) ||\hat{x}(t)||^2 + 2 \bar{\zeta} ||\hat{x}(t)|| - e(\psi(t)) \]

\[ - 2 \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}_i^T(t) T^{-1} \hat{A}(t) \right) \]

\[ \leq \lambda_{\min}(\hat{Q}) \left[ -||\hat{x}(t)||^2 - \rho_0^2 + \rho_1 + \rho_2 \right] \]

(43)
of satisfactory tracking performances specified by the reference controller for the compensation of uncertainties within the full envelope. The fuzzy multiple Lyapunov function based adaptation laws improve the applicability of the adaptive increment of Eq. (30) is equivalent to the reference closed-loop solution, so that det(\( A + B \)) > 0 if and only if there exists \( \delta > 0 \) so that \( \lambda_{\max}(A) > \delta \) and \( \lambda_{\max}(B) \leq \delta \), where det(\( \cdot \)) denotes the determinant of a matrix.

**Remark 3.** Notice that \( \| A(t) \|_F < \tilde{F} < 1 \) renders \( \lambda_{\max}(A(t)) < \tilde{F} \). Hence, \( (\bar{I} + \tilde{A}^T) \) exists for any \( t > 0 \), which follows the fact that \( \det(\bar{I} + \tilde{A}^T) \neq 0 \) if and only if there exists \( \delta > 0 \) so that \( \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{A}) > \delta \). The fuzzy partition of the flight envelope with the brightness indicating the maximum membership degree \( \mu_{\max}(z) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 11} (\mu_i) \) for the operating point to the 11 fuzzy rules. The fuzzy partition reflects composition results of 11 overlapped ellipses for the flight envelope region. We can find that it is bright to certain degree near the boundary of the flight envelope, so the universe of discourse for Gaussian membership functions of all the fuzzy rules exceeds the flight envelope boundary and covers the entire flight envelope region sufficiently.

Following the Theorem 1 and 2, we can construct the FATT for the prototype UAV. The command filter is defined as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
A_c &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.533 & -1.285 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.423 & -1.14 \end{bmatrix} \\
B_c &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.533 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.423 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
C_c &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

**Table 1** Wing-platform and inertia parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m ) (kg)</td>
<td>12495</td>
<td>( S ) (m²)</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>( x_{cgR} )</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_e ) (kg·m²)</td>
<td>23516</td>
<td>( \phi ) (°)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>( z ) (°)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c ) (m)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>( c_g(m) )</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>( b ) (m)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let $\beta = [4.3, 4.6, 5.5, 6.7, 7.9, 9.1, 9.8, 9.2, 6.3]^T$, we get $\gamma^2 = 0.37$ with $Q = \text{diag}(10^{-4}I_6, 1.2I_2)$ and $R = \text{diag}(10^{-4}, 10^{-4})$ following Remark 2. Then, the control parameters $N_i, X_i, X_{j1}$, and $X_{j2}$ can be obtained ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, 11$), and we show $N_1$ and $X_1, X_2, X_{11}$ as examples in Appendix A. We design the SHLNN with 9 nodes in the input layer, 20 nodes in the hidden layer, and 2 nodes in the output layer. The parameters $a_i = 10^{6(2(i-1)/19)}$ (i = 1, 2, ..., 20) cover the range between 0.0001 and 0.01, and $I = 10I_{21}, F = 500I_9$, $T = 0.5I_6$. The column norm bounds of adaptive parametric estimates $\hat{W}(i), \hat{P}(i)$ and $\hat{A}(i)$ are as $\tilde{w}_i = 1.2$ ($i = 1, 2$), $\tilde{a}_k = 0.4(k = 1, 2)$, $\tilde{v}_j = 1.0$ ($j = 1, 2, \ldots, 20$). According to Theorem 1, we can realize the controller $u(t)$ given by Eq. (14), and $u_k(t)$ given by Eq. (16) satisfying LMI constraint of Eq. (19), $u_k(t)$ given by Eq. (30).

As the contrast of the FATC, a generalized fuzzy adaptive controller (GFAC) and a multi-model switching controller (MMSM) are constructed. The GFAC augments the common Lyapunov function based fuzzy baseline controller as Remark 1 with an L1 adaptive increment. The MMSM divides the flight envelope into 3 locally overlapped subsystems: P1: 0 km $\leq H < 5.5$ km; P2: 5 km $\leq H < 9$ km; P3: 8.5 km $\leq H < 12$ km. For any subsystem, $N = 6$ polytopic vertices are determined, and a local robust $H_{\infty}$ LPV controller is designed by employing the common Lyapunov function and considering maximum uncertainties $\Delta A_{ij} = 0.15A_{ij}, \Delta B_{ij} = 0.15B_{ij}$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6, s = 1, 2, 3$) and $A_{ij}$ and $B_{ij}$ are the local system matrices of the $i$th fuzzy rule in the $s$th subsystem. The local controllers switch using hysteresis switching logic.

Under the nonlinear kinetic model of the UAV given by Eq. (1), the tracking performances of desirable commands are compared by employing the FATC, the GFAC, and the MMSM, respectively in the following sections. Two simulation cases are considered:

(1) Step responses at test operating points covering the entire envelope;
(2) A continuous flight over the large flight envelope span.

### 4.1. Tracking performances at the test points

As shown in Fig. 4, 58 test points are determined to cover the entire flight envelope. We also select three navigation points ($A$, $B$ and $C$) to identify the flight trajectory over the large

![Fig. 3 Fuzzy partition of flight envelope.](image)

![Fig. 4 Flight test points and flight trajectory over large envelope span.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Aerodynamic derivatives with respect to Mach number.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Ma$</td>
<td>$C_{La}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 2](image)
envelope span. To verify the robustness at the 58 test points, we conduct the large perturbations of aerodynamic parameters referring to the nominal values as shown in Table 3. The perturbations create bad conditions involving increased lift, reduced drag, control efficiency failures, and deterioration of airspeed static stability. For any test point, the simulation is initialized at the equilibrium state, and the rising step commands of airspeed and altitude are implemented at 2 s to illustrate the tracking performance in the absence of uncertainties between 2 s and 10 s. The perturbations are injected at 10 s, and the attenuation performance for instantly imposed uncertainties can be shown during (10 s, 15 s). The falling step commands are conducted at 15 s to illustrate the tracking performance in the presence of uncertainties between 15 s and 25 s.

As an illustration, the step responses at a specific test point (\(Ma = 1.22, \ H = 9.8 \ km\)) with the three controllers are represented in Fig. 5. Where CMMD represents the airspeed and altitude command in Fig. 5(a) and (b), respectively.

From Fig. 5, we can find that for the tracking responses of the step commands during the time intervals (2 s, 10 s) and (15 s, 25 s), the MMSC and the FATC both provide better tracking performances for the desirable airspeed and altitude commands (CMMD) on transient and steady-state than the GFAC. The GFAC degrades the tracking performance due to the conservatism for the entire flight envelope. After the exertion of uncertainties at 15 s, the MMSC just generates relatively smaller adjustments of throttle setting and elevator deflection with slower response rates and it leads to largest tracking errors and longest adjustment time. Hence, the local LPV robust controller attenuates the imposed uncertainties at the cost of response performances. Though the GFAC reduces the tracking errors obviously via the quick compensation of the L1 adaptive increment, the convergence time is
longer than that of the FATC due to the poor responses of the fuzzy baseline controller. Benefiting from less conservatism and rapid compensation of the adaptive SHLNN increment without sacrificing the response quality, the FATC guarantees superior tracking performances with strong attenuation performances for the instantly imposed undesirable uncertainties. Hence, the proposed FATC improves response and robust performances simultaneously at the specific test point.

The responses of the closed-loop system with the three controllers for all the test points are represented in Figs. 6–8, respectively, in which symbol $D$ denotes the deviation value of the signal with respect to the trimmed value at the corresponding point.

The statistic results of the tracking errors are represented in Figs. 9 and 10. Fig. 9 focuses on the step responses during the time intervals (2 s, 10 s) and (15 s, 25 s), and subscripts R and F label the rising step and the falling step, respectively. $V_{Te}, H_{e}$ represent the maximum tracking errors of airspeed and altitude, while $T_{eV}, T_{eh}$ indicate the response time errors at the corresponding test point. Fig. 10 shows the attenuation performances after the exertion of uncertainties between (10 s, 15 s), providing the maximum induced tracking errors $V_{Te}, H_{e}$ and the required convergence times $T_{eV}, T_{eh}$ to 10% of the maximum induced errors at the corresponding test point.

From Figs. 6–8, we get that though all the three controllers guarantee stable responses throughout the entire flight envelope, the tracking performances and uncertainties attenuation performances are different, and this can be concluded according to the statistic results in Figs. 9 and 10. For the tracking responses of rising and failing step commands, the GFAC leads to the largest tracking errors and response time errors obviously, though the SMMC improves the tracking performances and the responses within the whole envelope are more dispersed compared with those of the FATC. The FATC

![Fig. 7 Step responses of the closed-loop system with MMSC for all test points.](image7)

![Fig. 8 Step responses of the closed-loop system with FATC for all test points.](image8)
restrains the airspeed errors within a small range (0.025, 0.034) m/s and the response time errors within (0.35 s, 0.48 s), and so as to the altitude. During (10 s, 15 s), the SMMC guarantees stability at the cost of response performances, so the imposed uncertainties render long adjustment times and large tracking errors, while the GFAC eliminates the airspeed errors quickly but the attenuation qualities of the altitude errors do not represent obvious advantage. The FATC attenuates the induced airspeed and altitude errors within 0.28 m/s and 0.26 m with the adjustment times less than 0.5 s and 1.42 s, and it shows the best uncertainties attenuation performance. Hence, the proposed FATC guarantees consistent and satisfactory tracking performances within the full envelope in spite of uncertainties, and it attenuates the influences of instant uncertainties without sacrificing the response performances.

4.2. Tracking performances under continuous flight over large envelope

As shown in Fig. 5, the flight trajectory over a large span is designed to verify the tracking performances under a continuous flight in the presence of uncertainties. We select three navigation points to identify the desirable command of the flight state. The trimmed states for three navigation points (A, B and C) in the absence of uncertainties are illustrated in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Trimmed states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>$H$ (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UAV is initiated at operating point A and switches to point B and C at 5 s and 200 s respectively through filter dynamic $G(s) = 0.0009/(s^2 + 0.057s + 0.0009)$ and then we can obtain the given inputs $V_{Tg}, H_g$:

$$ V_{Tg} = \begin{cases} V_{TA} & t < 5 \text{s} \\ V_{TB} + (1 - G(s))(V_{TA} - V_{TB}) & 5 \text{s} \leq t < 200 \text{s} \\ V_{TC} + (1 - G(s))(V_{TC} - V_{TB}) & 200 \text{s} \leq t \leq 400 \text{s} \end{cases} $$

$$ H_g = \begin{cases} H_A & t < 5 \text{s} \\ H_B + (1 - G(s))(H_A - H_B) & 5 \text{s} \leq t < 200 \text{s} \\ H_C + (1 - G(s))(H_C - H_B) & 200 \text{s} \leq t \leq 400 \text{s} \end{cases} $$

where $V_{TA}, V_{TB}, V_{TC}$ are the airspeeds at points A, B, and C, respectively and $H_A, H_B, H_C$ are the corresponding altitudes.

We introduce sine time-varying parametric perturbation uncertainties defined as $A_m \sin(2\pi(t - t_0)/T)$, where the amplitudes $A_m$ for $C_{Ls}, C_{Lh}, C_{D0}, C_{M0}, C_{Mr}, C_{QhR}, C_{aR}$ are determined as in Table 3, the imposed time $t_0 = 10$ s, and the periods $T$ are 30 s, 35 s, 40 s, 45 s, 50 s, 55 s, 60 s, and 80 s, respectively. The failures of 30% reduction of the thrust
and 30% reduction of the elevator effectiveness are imposed at 100 s and 300 s, respectively.

The responses under the continuous flight with the three controllers are shown in Figs. 11 and 12 provides the membership degrees of the UAV to 11 fuzzy rules during the flight process under the feedback control of the FACT.

From Fig. 11, we can conclude that the three controllers all realize stable tracking over the flight under the time-varying uncertainties. After 5 s, the quick decrease of the elevator deflection and the increase of the throttle setting cause the increases of airspeed and altitude. The elevator rises slowly at 8.2 s, and after 48.4 s, the throttle setting declines to relieve the change rates of altitude and airspeed, and then the UAV transforms from increasing to steady-state flight at point B. After 200 s, the quick increase of the elevator deflection and the decrease of the throttle setting lead to a quick decline of the UAV. Then the elevator deflection decreases and the throttle setting rises slowly to reduce the difference between the drag and the thrust, so that the UAV transforms from declining to steady-state flight at point C gradually. As the aerodynamic drag at point C is much larger, the throttle setting reaches a higher value to maintain the balance between the drag and the thrust finally with respect to point B. The quick injections of control efficiency failures at 100 s and 300 s cause fast regulations of the elevator and the throttle.

The variations of membership degrees to the 11 fuzzy rules shown in Fig. 12 illustrate the scheduling mechanism of the proposed controller. At any specific moment, the flight condition is subject to 11 fuzzy rules with different membership degrees, which reflect the weights of corresponding local gain matrices. The variations of Mach number and altitude accompanying with the flight over the large envelope span lead to the smooth transition of membership degrees, so the fuzzy multiple Lyapunov function synthesizes the 11 fuzzy Lyapunov matrices $X_j$ with the membership degrees to replace the common Lyapunov matrix $X_c$ and the smooth gain scheduling of the baseline controller of Eq. (15) and the adaptation laws of Eq. (36) can be realized. Therefore, the extra freedom degrees of control parameters are offered.

As shown in Fig. 11, though the three controllers all realize stable tracking, the GFAC embodies the largest tracking errors due to the conservatism compared with the other controllers. Though the MMSC reduces the tracking errors for a certain degree, the relevant tracking performances as shown in Fig. 9 could not be ensured due to the cost of response degradation under the time-varying uncertainties.

Fig. 11  Responses under continuous flight over a large envelope span.

Fig. 12  Membership degrees to 11 fuzzy rules.
and the maximum tracking errors of airspeed and altitude are 9.5 m/s and 23 m, which are obviously larger than 3.5 m/s and 3.3 m caused by the GFAC. Another drawback of the MMSC is also presented, which is the switching between different subsystems. As marked in the altitude curve, three switching processes $S_1$, $S_2$, and $S_3$ are conducted, and they lead to switching dynamics. Especially during $S_1$, the variation ranges of $\delta_{\alpha}$ and $\delta_e$ are 11.2% and 4.5°, and they cause the fluctuation of 3.6° for the pitch angle. The switching dynamics degrade the tracking performances and lead to underlying damages. With reduced conservatism and adaptive SHLNN compensation for uncertainties, the FATC ensures stable responses of flight states and guarantees the minimum tracking errors among the three controllers without introducing switching dynamics. Hence, the proposed FATC guarantees satisfactory tracking performances of the desirable commands with strong robustness to the uncertainties during the continuous flight over the large flight envelope.

5. Conclusions

A fuzzy adaptive tracking controller is proposed for the flight of a UAV over a large envelope span in the presence of undesirable uncertainties:

1. Benefiting from the relaxed conservatism of the fuzzy baseline controller and the adaptation laws, the controller guarantees satisfactory tracking performances of the desirable commands with strong robustness to the uncertainties for the entire flight envelope.
2. The parameters of the fuzzy baseline controller can be obtained conveniently by solving LMI with reduced computational complexity.
3. The controller is scheduled based on smooth transition of membership degrees, and the adaptive increment provides continuous compensating signals with bounded parametric eliminates, so the problems of switching dynamics, chattering, and parametric drift are avoided.
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Appendix A. The control parameters for the fuzzy baseline controller

\[ N_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -563.86 & 2.89 & -38.52 & 1.35 & -1.03 & 0.15 & 0.03 & -0.96 & 0.76 & 0.13 & -0.13 \\ -37.12 & 8.75 & 1590.8 & 9.89 & -143.9 & 0.21 & -3.68 & -21.3 & 25.14 & -14.70 & -9.76 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -511.31 & 1.45 & -37.49 & 0.30 & 1.67 & 0.07 & 0.12 & 0.72 & -1.17 & 0.15 & 0.03 \\ 0.18 & 14.39 & 2974.3 & 13.21 & -92.70 & -0.60 & -1.14 & -11.17 & 15.30 & -8.56 & -4.13 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -660.07 & 1.22 & -35.99 & 0.152 & 3.26 & 0.04 & 0.19 & 1.39 & -1.90 & 0.26 & 0.19 \\ 0.492 & 13.96 & 3965.1 & 11.58 & -80.43 & -0.37 & -0.79 & -7.68 & 10.68 & -7.48 & -2.90 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -768.52 & 1.29 & -30.64 & 0.19 & 3.82 & 0.041 & 0.22 & 1.64 & -2.22 & 0.28 & 0.22 \\ -2.71 & 15.15 & 4269.2 & 12.08 & -58.86 & -0.39 & 0.34 & 2.43 & -1.85 & -5.89 & -1.10 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_5 = \begin{bmatrix} -914.29 & 1.55 & -23.66 & 0.404 & 4.02 & 0.05 & 0.26 & 1.83 & -2.51 & 0.27 & 0.19 \\ -9.55 & 14.28 & 4049.8 & 11.19 & -30.06 & -0.44 & 1.64 & 15.05 & -17.20 & -3.81 & 1.54 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_6 = \begin{bmatrix} -1055.5 & 2.47 & -19.41 & 1.25 & 4.28 & 0.03 & 0.42 & 2.59 & -3.62 & 0.22 & 0.02 \\ -20.40 & 9.26 & 3146.5 & 7.14 & 2.74 & -0.34 & 2.70 & 27.46 & -31.96 & -1.30 & 5.24 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_7 = \begin{bmatrix} -1215.8 & 7.24 & 29.55 & 5.63 & 3.85 & -0.14 & 1.14 & 5.75 & -8.08 & -0.18 & -0.93 \\ -42.81 & -6.47 & 1111.8 & -5.46 & 39.10 & 0.01 & 3.14 & 38.19 & -44.26 & 2.12 & 10.58 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_8 = \begin{bmatrix} -1416.8 & 1.470 & -24.43 & 0.41 & 0.60 & 0.07 & 0.11 & 0.29 & -0.69 & 0.06 & -0.07 \\ -59.05 & -22.99 & 3401.8 & -21.62 & 0.08 & 0.72 & -0.97 & 11.99 & -9.96 & 0.79 & 11.50 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_9 = \begin{bmatrix} -1222.1 & 5.20 & -18.1 & 3.85 & -3.60 & -0.01 & 0.34 & 0.21 & -1.08 & -0.51 & -1.24 \\ -70.97 & -30.81 & 1742.3 & -27.24 & -40.23 & 0.605 & -3.66 & -6.15 & 14.31 & -1.35 & 10.15 \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ N_{1m} = \begin{bmatrix} -1401.5 & 3.28 & -58.88 & 2.085 & -3.98 & -0.02 & 0.10 & -0.87 & 0.58 & -0.40 & -0.88 \\ -73.32 & -37.4 & 3162.8 & -34.38 & -43.04 & 1.26 & -4.885 & -13.98 & 23.81 & -1.17 & 11.20 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ N_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} -1547.4 & 2.47 & -53.37 & 1.33 & -3.14 & 0.01 & 0.04 & -0.861 & 0.69 & -0.27 & -0.65 \\ -87.01 & -49.06 & 3462.4 & -45.18 & -27.96 & 1.84 & -5.43 & -12.50 & 22.79 & 0.85 & 15.20 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ X_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 66.86 & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\ 1.25 & 0.94 \\ 12.77 & -2.17 & 75.45 \\ 0.9100 & 0.86 & -2.53 & 0.80 \\ -86.78 & 0.65 & 7.20 & -0.63 & 579.76 & \vdots \\ 48.25 & -0.04 & -0.00 & -0.02 & -91.79 & 114.08 & \vdots \\ 5.618 & 0.17 & -0.96 & 0.12 & 20.30 & -92.77 & 170.58 \\ -101.69 & 0.91 & -8.39 & 0.47 & 507.32 & -106.42 & 57.99 & 660.96 \\ 9.521 & -1.27 & 11.38 & -0.74 & -89.23 & 19.62 & -89.73 & -332.51 & 606.3 \\ 4.427 & -0.07 & 2.04 & -0.12 & 2.52 & -29.01 & 33.92 & -3.67 & 3.14 & 19.38 & * \\ -1.118 & -0.21 & 0.74 & -0.27 & 14.40 & 3.34 & -7.55 & -49.62 & 62.67 & 2.17 & 30.55 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ X_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 66.86 & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\ 1.32 & 1.08 \\ 11.05 & -5.44 & 152.32 \\ 0.98 & 0.99 & -5.72 & 0.93 \\ -86.62 & 0.94 & 0.29 & -0.34 & 580.3 & \vdots \\ 48.25 & -0.05 & 0.19 & -0.03 & -91.80 & 114.04 & \vdots \\ 5.62 & 0.19 & -1.44 & 0.14 & 20.35 & -92.71 & 170.49 \\ -101.61 & 1.04 & -11.31 & 0.58 & 507.54 & -106.4 & 57.98 & 660.93 \\ 9.46 & -1.39 & 14.35 & -0.86 & -89.51 & 19.61 & -89.69 & -332.48 & 606.46 \\ 4.45 & -0.03 & 1.06 & -0.08 & 2.60 & -28.99 & 33.91 & -3.64 & 3.11 & 19.38 & * \\ -1.10 & -0.17 & -0.21 & -0.23 & 14.48 & 3.33 & -7.53 & -49.55 & 62.59 & 2.19 & 30.59 \end{bmatrix} \]
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