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Abstract For the terminal guidance problem of missiles intercepting maneuvering targets in the three-dimensional space, the design of guidance laws for non-decoupling three-dimensional engagement geometry is studied. Firstly, by introducing a finite time integral sliding mode manifold, a novel guidance law based on the integral sliding mode control is presented with the target acceleration as a known bounded external disturbance. Then, an improved adaptive guidance law based on the integral sliding mode control without the information of the upper bound on the target acceleration is developed, where the upper bound of the target acceleration is estimated online by a designed adaptive law. The both presented guidance laws can make sure that the elevation angular rate of the line-of-sight and the azimuth angular rate of the line-of-sight converge to zero in finite time. In the end, the results of the guidance performance for the proposed guidance laws are presented by numerical simulations. Although the designed guidance laws are developed for the constant speed missiles, the simulation results for the time-varying speed missiles are also shown to further confirm the designed guidance laws.

1. Introduction

The terminal guidance law design is the basis to realize the precise guidance of missile. The aim of a terminal guidance law is to allow missiles to intercept targets with minimum miss distances.\(^1\) Proportional navigation (PN) guidance law and its variants have been well-known guidance laws, thanks to its high efficiency and ease of implementation in a large variety of interception engagements. However, for the situation of intercepting the targets with a larger maneuverability, PN guidance laws are not able to intercept the targets under the required precision.\(^2\) In order to deal with the maneuverable targets effectively, many researchers have developed various modern robust guidance laws based on different nonlinear control methods, such as $H\_\infty$ control,\(^3\) $L\_2$ gain control,\(^4\) differential game,\(^5\) sliding mode control,\(^6-8\) etc.

So far, the sliding mode control (SMC) has been widely used to design controllers because of its good robustness to external disturbances and the uncertainty of the system parameters. The conventional sliding mode control\(^9-11\) whose sliding mode manifold is a linear function, can only finish the
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asympotic convergence in infinite time in the sliding phase. In order to achieve the finite time convergence in the sliding phase, one of the solutions is to apply the terminal sliding mode control (TSMC) whose sliding mode manifold is a nonlinear function. In addition, the TSMC can also guarantee that the convergence of the system states is faster, the convergence precision is higher and the system has a better disturbance rejection performance than the traditional linear sliding mode control (LSMC). Therefore, the TSMC has been widely applied to the missile guidance law design problem. Another good method is to finish the convergence in finite time by applying the integral sliding mode control (ISM). A finite time convergent ISMC was proposed by Ref. for a kind of higher order systems, and has been successfully used in the field about the design of the guidance law. 

In the implementation of the SMC, the switching gain selection is a difficult problem. Generally speaking, for completing the sliding mode reaching condition, we should choose the switching gain larger than the upper bound of external disturbance. So, a necessary assumption is that the disturbance has upper bound and that its upper bound needs to be known in Refs. However, in practical applications, the upper bound of external disturbance is hard to know. To resolve the above-mentioned problem, the adaptive sliding mode control has been studied in much literature. The advantage of the adaptive sliding mode control is that it adaptively tunes the switching gain by designing an adaptive law to estimate the value of the upper bound of the disturbance. So, we do not need to know the upper bound on the disturbance in advance.

In practice, the relative motion of target and missile takes place in the three-dimensional (3D) space, and the mathematical model that accurately describes the relation of relative motion of target and missile is complicated nonlinear strongly coupled equations. While designing the guidance law for the missile, the usual method is to decouple the 3D motion into two two-dimensional motions. There exist many researches that designed the guidance laws in the two-dimensional space. However, the method based on the traditional decoupling will lose the guidance information during decoupling and result in a negative effect on terminal guidance accuracy. So, it would be close to reality if the terminal 3D guidance law is developed under the condition of not neglecting the couple among the channels of nonlinear dynamics of target-missile relative movement in the 3D space.

At present, many 3D guidance laws have been developed. For example, a few 3D PN guidance laws were developed in Refs. . However, for intercepting a strong maneuvering target, the robustness of such guidance laws is not so well. Based on a geometric method, a 3D guidance law considering angle constraints was developed for the non-maneuvering targets in Ref. . In Refs., a 3D guidance law was proposed for maneuvering targets based on a nonlinear backstepping control approach. Note that in Refs., the guidance laws were designed for maneuvering targets, but the proposed guidance laws could not guarantee that the system states converge in finite time. Then, in Refs., the guidance law was designed for stationary targets. Although the guidance law was proposed for maneuvering targets in Ref., the information of the target acceleration bound needs to be known in advance. Hence, for the guidance problem in the terminal phase when the missiles intercept the high-speed maneuvering targets, to study the finite time convergent 3D guidance law without any information about the upper bound of the target acceleration is not only theoretically challenging but also practical requirement.

For the guidance problem in the terminal phase when the missiles intercept the high-speed maneuvering targets, the main contribution of this paper is to develop a non-decoupling and finite time convergent 3D guidance law and without the knowledge of the bound on the target acceleration in advance. First of all, based on the ISMC, a new 3D integral sliding mode (ISM) guidance law is put forward in the 3D environment, which can guarantee the finite time convergence of guidance system states. Then, a novel 3D adaptive integral sliding mode (AISM) guidance law with the finite time convergence is proposed by combination of the ISMC and adaptive control technique which is used to estimate the unknown upper bound of the target acceleration.

2. Formulation of guidance model

In this section, the target-missile relative motion equations for the 3D guidance system are presented. Fig. 1 shows the 3D interception geometry. T denotes the target, M the missile, Oxyz a inertial reference frame, Ox'y'z' a line-of-sight (LOS) frame and R the relative distance between the target and missile; q and q are the elevation and azimuth angles of the LOS, respectively.

Fig. 1 Three-dimensional interception geometry.
In many practical terminal guidance processes, there are no thrusts, and then the magnitude of the missile’s velocity is generally uncontrollable. Hence, we do not consider \(a_{MB} \) as the control variable, but the missile normal accelerations, \(a_{M} \) and \(a_{P} \), are regarded as control variables to change the direction of missile’s velocity. In designing guidance laws, we just need to make the LOS angular rates, \( \dot{\phi} \) and \( \dot{\psi} \), converge to zero by designing the control variables \(a_{M} \) and \(a_{P} \) when the relative velocity of the missile-target is less than zero. Therefore, in the design process of the guidance law, the objective is to make the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\phi} \) and \( \dot{\psi} \) converge to zero, and then Eq. (1) can be omitted.

Defining \( x_1 = q_x, \ x_2 = \dot{q}_x, \ x_3 = q_y, \ x_4 = \dot{q}_y \) and combining Eqs. (2) and (3) yield the three-dimensional guidance system described as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= -\frac{2R}{R} x_2 - x_2^2 \sin x_1 \cos x_1 - \frac{a_{M}}{R} + \frac{a_{P}}{R} \\
\dot{x}_3 &= x_4 \\
\dot{x}_4 &= -\frac{2R}{R} x_4 + 2x_2 x_4 \tan x_1 + \frac{a_{MP}}{R \cos x_1} - \frac{a_{PP}}{R \cos x_1} \\
\end{align*}
\]  

(4)

In practical applications, the target’s acceleration is viewed as external disturbance and it is not easy to obtain. But the target’s acceleration is usually bounded. Hence, we have the following assumption.

**Assumption 1.** Suppose that \( |a_{M}| \leq e_1 \) and \( |a_{P}| \leq e_2 \), where \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \) are positive constants.

### 3. Guidance law design

Before designing the guidance laws, we first give some lemmas which are used to verify the stability of the guidance system.

**Lemma 1 (Ref.36).** It supposes that \( \dot{V}(t) \leq -\mu_1 V(t) - \mu_2 V(t)^2 \) for \( V(t) \geq t_0 \), where \( \mu_1 > 0 \), \( \mu_2 > 0 \), \( 0 < \eta < 1 \), \( V(t) \) is a continuous positive definite function and \( t_0 \) is the initial time. Then, the system converges to the equilibrium point in finite time \( t_f \) provided by \( t_f \leq t_0 + \frac{1}{\mu_1 (1 - \eta)} \ln \frac{\mu_1 V(t_0)^{1-\eta} + \mu_2}{\mu_2} \).

\[
\dot{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{s}_1 \\ \dot{s}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{2R}{R} x_2 - x_2^2 \sin x_1 \cos x_1 - \frac{a_{M}}{R} + \frac{a_{P}}{R} + k_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_1) + k_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_2) \\
-\frac{2R}{R} x_4 + 2x_2 x_4 \tan x_1 + \frac{a_{MP}}{R \cos x_1} - \frac{a_{PP}}{R \cos x_1} + l_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_1) + l_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_4) \end{bmatrix}
\]

(5)

**Lemma 2 (Ref.37).** Let \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n > 0 \) satisfy the condition that the polynomial \( \lambda^n + a_{n-1} \lambda^{n-1} + \cdots + a_2 \lambda + a_1 \) is Hurwitz. Consider the following n-order system

\[
y_1 = y_2, \ y_2 = y_3, \ \ldots, \ y_{n-1} = y_n, \ y_n = u
\]

(6)

There exists \( \theta \in (0, 1) \) such that, for every \( \psi \in (1 - \theta, 1) \), the states of the system Eq. (5) can converge to its equilibrium point in finite time under the controller

\[
u = -a_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(y_1) - a_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(y_2) - \cdots - a_n \text{sgn}^{\psi}(y_n)
\]

(7)

where \( \text{sgn}^{\psi}(y_i) = |y_i|^\psi \text{sgn}(y_i) \) (\( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \)) and \( \psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_n \) satisfy \( \psi_{n+1} = \frac{\psi_{n+2}}{2} \) (\( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \)), \( \psi_n = \psi, \psi_{n+1} = 1 \).

**Lemma 3 (Ref.36).** For \( b_i \in R \) (\( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \)), \( 0 < q < 1 \) is a real number, then the following inequality is satisfied:

\[
\left( |b_1| + |b_2| + \cdots + |b_n| \right)^q \leq |b_1|^q + |b_2|^q + \cdots + |b_n|^q
\]

(8)

**Lemma 4 (Ref.36).** It supposes that \( b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n \) are all positive numbers and \( 0 < q < 2 \). Then, the following inequality is satisfied:

\[
(b_1^2 + b_2^2 + \cdots + b_n^2)^q - (b_1^q + b_2^q + \cdots + b_n^q)^2 - (b_1^2 + b_2^2 + \cdots + b_n^2)^q
\]

(9)

### 3.1. Integral sliding mode guidance law design

In this subsection, a novel nonlinear ISM guidance law is presented to ensure the disturbance rejection performance of the three-dimensional guidance system described by Eq. (4). A brief design process of the developed ISM guidance law is given as follows. Firstly, we design a nonlinear integral sliding surface vector. Secondly, on the basis of the nonlinear integral sliding surface vector, a nonlinear ISM guidance law is proposed. Then, it is obtained that under the developed guidance law, the LOS angular rates, \( \dot{\phi} \) and \( \dot{\psi} \), converge to zero in finite time in the presence of the external disturbances whose upper bound can be known.

Inspired by Ref.20, a sliding surface vector is chosen as

\[
s = \begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 + \int_0^t (k_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_1) + k_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_2)) dt \\ x_4 + \int_0^t (l_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_3) + l_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_4)) dt \end{bmatrix}
\]

(10)

where \( x_1 = \frac{x_2 x_3}{x_3 - x_2}, \ \beta_1 = \frac{\beta_2^2}{2 \beta_3}, x_3 = x_1 = 1, x_2 = \beta_2 = \varphi, \varphi \in (1 - \theta, 1), \ \theta \in (0, 1), \) and \( k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2 \in 0 \) ensure that \( \dot{x}_1 + k_2 \dot{x}_2 + k_1 \dot{x}_2 \) and \( \dot{x}_4 + l_2 \dot{x}_4 + l_1 \dot{x}_4 \) are Hurwitz.

The derivative of \( s \) can be written as

\[
\dot{s} = A + B \begin{bmatrix} a_{M} \\ a_{MP} \end{bmatrix} + C \begin{bmatrix} a_{E1} \\ a_{EP} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(11)

where

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{2R}{R} x_2 - x_2^2 \sin x_1 \cos x_1 + k_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_1) + k_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_2) \\ -\frac{2R}{R} x_4 + 2x_2 x_4 \tan x_1 + l_1 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_1) + l_2 \text{sgn}^{\psi}(x_4) \end{bmatrix}
\]

(12)
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Because the seeker has a minimum action distance $R_0$, we have $R \geq R_0$ during the guided flight process of the missile, thus $B$ is nonsingular provided $x_t$ remains small. Based on the integral sliding surface vector Eq. (9), we proposed the following ISM guidance law for the guidance system Eq. (4).

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{R} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{R \cos x_t} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{R \cos x_t} \end{bmatrix}$$

Theorem 1. For the guidance system Eq. (4) under Assumption 1 with the integral sliding surface vector Eq. (9), when the guidance law Eq. (12) is used for the guidance system Eq. (4), then the elevation angular rate $\dot{q}_1$ and the azimuth angular rate $\dot{q}_2$ of LOS converge to zero in finite time, respectively.

Proof. Choose the Lyapunov function as follows:

$$V_1 = \frac{1}{2} s^T s$$

Applying Eqs. (11) and (12) and according to Assumption 1, the derivative of $V_1$ is given by

$$\dot{V}_1 = s^T \left( A + B \left[ \frac{\partial \alpha_{\theta}}{\partial \alpha_{\theta}} \right] C \right)$$

$$= s^T \left( -\rho \theta + C \left[ \frac{\partial \alpha_{\theta}}{\partial \alpha_{\theta}} \right] \right)$$

$$= -\rho s^T s + s^T \left[ c_{11} \alpha_{\theta}^1 + c_{21} \alpha_{\theta}^2 \right] - \gamma_1 \text{sign}(s_1)$$

$$= -\rho s^T s + \left[ c_{21} \alpha_{\theta}^2 \right] s_1 - \gamma_1 |s_1|$$

$$\leq -\rho s^T s - c_{11} |s_1|$$

Let $\omega = \min\{c_{11}, c_{22}\}$, hence Eq. (14) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{V}_1 \leq -\rho s^T s - \omega (|s_1| + |s_2|)$$

By Lemma 3, we can obtain the following inequality:

$$\dot{V}_1 \leq -\rho s^T s - \omega (|s_1|^2 + |s_2|^2)$$

$$\dot{V}_1 \leq -2 \rho V_1 - \sqrt{2} \omega V_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Based on Lemma 1, the sliding surface vector converges to zero in finite time, i.e. $s_i(t_1) = 0 \ (i = 1, 2)$, where $t_1$ is the time of sliding surface vector converging to zero. Then, for all $t \geq t_1$, we have $s_i = 0 \ (i = 1, 2)$, which implies that $\dot{s}_i = 0 \ (i = 1, 2)$.

According to Lemma 2, $\dot{x}_2$ and $\dot{x}_4$ can converge to zero in finite time, i.e. $\dot{q}_1$ and $\dot{q}_2$ converge to zero in finite time, respectively. The proof of Theorem 1 is completed. □

Remark 1. As clearly seen in the designed guidance law Eq. (12), the implementation of the designed ISM guidance law depends on the upper bound of the target’s acceleration. However, in many practical situations, there is no accurate knowledge about the upper bounds of the target’s acceleration. To overcome the problem, the adaptive control scheme is a good choice. So, a new AISM guidance law will be developed in the following subsection.

3.2. Adaptive integral sliding mode guidance law design

In the subsection, an adaptive law is proposed which is used to estimate the upper bound of the target’s acceleration online. With the help of the adaptive law, a novel robust AISM guidance law is proposed for the 3D guidance system Eq. (4) which needs not to know the upper bound of the target’s acceleration in advance. The design method on the novel AISM guidance law is similar to that of the previously mentioned integral sliding mode guidance law. And the developed AISM guidance law can guarantee that the LOS angular rates $\dot{q}_1$ and $\dot{q}_2$ converge to zero in finite time without the information on the upper bound of the target’s acceleration. Then, the following theorem is obtained.

Theorem 2. For the guidance system Eq. (4) with the sliding surface vector Eq. (9), the LOS angular rates $\dot{q}_1$ and $\dot{q}_2$ will converge to zero in finite time under the following guidance law Eq. (19) and the designed adaptive laws Eq. (20).

$$\dot{x}_2 = -k_1 \text{sign}^*(x_1) - k_2 \text{sign}^*(x_2)$$

$$\dot{x}_4 = -l_1 \text{sign}^*(x_3) - l_2 \text{sign}^*(x_4)$$

where $k_1, k_2 > 0$, $l_1, l_2 > 0$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, $\eta_j > 1 \ (j = 1, 2)$ are designed constants and $\dot{\varepsilon}_i$ is the estimation of $\varepsilon_i$.

Proof. Let $\hat{\varepsilon}_j$ be the estimation error of the $\varepsilon_j$, i.e. $\hat{\varepsilon}_j = \varepsilon_j - \dot{\varepsilon}_j \ (j = 1, 2)$. Choose the following Lyapunov function

$$V_2 = \frac{1}{2} \dot{s}^T s + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \hat{\varepsilon}_j^2$$

Computing the first order derivative of $V_2$ along system Eq. (11) and using Eqs. (19) and (20), we have
Furthermore, consider another Lyapunov function

\[ V_2 = s^T s + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{\beta}_j = s^T \left( A + B \begin{bmatrix} a_{st} & a_{Sm} \\ a_{Ms} & a_{sp} \end{bmatrix} + C \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{te} \\ \alpha_{tp} \end{bmatrix} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{\beta}_j \]

\[ = s^T \left( -\rho s - \rho_2 \left[ |s_1| \text{sign}(s_1) \right] + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \right) \eta \hat{\beta}_j + C \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{te} \\ \alpha_{tp} \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{\beta}_j \]

\[ = -\rho s^T s - \rho_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j|^{\gamma+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \eta \hat{\beta}_j + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \eta \hat{\beta}_j \]

\[ = -\rho s^T s - \rho_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j|^{\gamma+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \eta \hat{\beta}_j \]

\[ \leq -\rho s^T s - \rho_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j|^{\gamma+1} \leq 0 \quad (22) \]

From the inequality (22), we can obtain \( V_2(t) \leq V_2(0) \), which implies that \( V_2(t) \) is bounded. Hence, it can be concluded that \( s \) and \( \hat{\beta}_j \) \((j = 1, 2)\) are all bounded.

Furthermore, consider another Lyapunov function

\[ V_3 = \frac{1}{2} s^T s \quad (23) \]

Applying Eqs. (19) and (20), the derivative of \( V_3 \) can be written as

\[ \dot{V}_3 = s^T s = s^T \left( A + B \begin{bmatrix} a_{st} & a_{Sm} \\ a_{Ms} & a_{sp} \end{bmatrix} + C \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{te} \\ \alpha_{tp} \end{bmatrix} \right) \]

\[ = s^T \left( -\rho s - \rho_2 \left[ |s_1| \text{sign}(s_1) \right] + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \right) \eta \hat{\beta}_j + C \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{te} \\ \alpha_{tp} \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{\beta}_j \]

\[ = -\rho s^T s - \rho_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j|^{\gamma+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \eta \hat{\beta}_j + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ c_j |s_j| \right] \eta \hat{\beta}_j \]

\[ \leq -\rho s^T s - \rho_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j|^{\gamma+1} \leq 0 \quad (24) \]

Since \( \hat{\beta}_j(0) > 0 \) and \( \hat{\beta}_j = \eta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |c_j| |s_i| \right) \geq 0 \), there is \( \hat{\beta}_j(t) \geq \hat{\beta}_j(0) \) \((t \geq 0)\). Choose \( \hat{\beta}_j \) large enough and \( \eta \) satisfying \( \eta \geq \sqrt{\hat{\beta}_j^2(0) + \hat{\beta}_j^2(0)} / \hat{\beta}_j(0) \).

Combining with \( \hat{\beta}_j(t) \geq \hat{\beta}_j(0) > 0 \), one can obtain that

\[ e_j - \eta \hat{\beta}_j \leq e_j - \sqrt{\hat{\beta}_j^2(0) + \hat{\beta}_j^2(0)} \]

\[ = \hat{\beta}_j(0) - \sqrt{\hat{\beta}_j^2(0) + \hat{\beta}_j^2(0)} \]

\[ \leq \sqrt{\hat{\beta}_j^2(0) - \sqrt{\hat{\beta}_j^2(0) + \hat{\beta}_j^2(0)} \leq 0 \quad (25) \]

From Eq. (25), Eq. (24) can be expressed as

\[ \dot{V}_3 \leq -\rho s^T s - \rho_2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j|^{\gamma+1} \quad (26) \]

According to Lemma 4, we have \( (|s_1|^{\gamma+1} + |s_2|^{\gamma+1}) \geq (|s_1|^2 + |s_2|^2)^{\gamma+1} \), that is to say, the following inequality (27) holds.

\[ |s_1|^{\gamma+1} + |s_2|^{\gamma+1} \geq (|s_1|^2 + |s_2|^2)^{\gamma+1} = 2^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}} |s_1|^2 \quad (27) \]

Therefore, Eq. (26) can be rewritten as

\[ \dot{V}_3 \leq -2\rho_1 V_3 - 2^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}} \rho_1 |s_1|^2 \quad (28) \]

Based on Lemma 1, the sliding surface vector converges to zero in finite time. The remaining steps of the proof are similar to those of Theorem 1. Hence, the remaining steps are omitted here. So, conclusions can be easily obtained that the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\theta}_s \) and \( \dot{\phi}_s \) converge to zero in finite time, respectively. The proof of Theorem 2 is completed. □

Remark 2. Compared with Theorem 1, an adaptive estimation term is introduced into the guidance law Eq. (19) in Theorem 2. From the guidance law Eq. (19), it is easy to see that the proposed AISM guidance law Eq. (19) does not contain the information on the upper bounds of the target's acceleration. Instead, the upper bound is provided by applying the adaptive law Eq. (20) to estimate the bound. Thus, the AISM guidance law Eq. (19) successfully resolves the mentioned problem existing in the ISM guidance law Eq. (12).

Note that the ISM guidance law Eq. (12) and the AISM guidance law Eq. (19) are discontinuous controller because of the existing of signum function which can bring about the undesirable chattering problem. To alleviate the chattering, a continuous saturation function sat(y) given in Eq. (29), which is used to approximate the signum function, takes place of the signum function.

\[ \text{sat}(y) = \begin{cases} 
1 & y > h \\
y/h & |y| \leq h \\
-1 & y < -h 
\end{cases} \quad (29) \]

where \( h \) is a small positive constant. If \( h \) is given smaller enough, then better approximating effect will be obtained.
So, the corresponding ISM guidance law in Eq. (12) and the AISM guidance law in Eq. (19) can be modified as

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial M_t}{\partial \Psi_t} &= B^{-1} \left( -A - \rho s - \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 \text{sat}(s_1) \\ \gamma_2 \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
\frac{\partial M_f}{\partial \nu_f} &= B^{-1} \left( -A - \rho_1 s - \rho_2 \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 \text{sat}(s_1) \\ \gamma_2 \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} \\
&- \sum_{j=1}^{2} \begin{bmatrix} c_{1j} \text{sat}(s_1) \\ c_{2j} \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} \eta_j \dot{\nu}_j \right)
\end{align*}
\] (30)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial M_t}{\partial \Psi_t} &= B^{-1} \left( -A - \rho s - \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 \text{sat}(s_1) \\ \gamma_2 \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
\frac{\partial M_f}{\partial \nu_f} &= B^{-1} \left( -A - \rho_1 s - \rho_2 \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 \text{sat}(s_1) \\ \gamma_2 \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} \\
&- \sum_{j=1}^{2} \begin{bmatrix} c_{1j} \text{sat}(s_1) \\ c_{2j} \text{sat}(s_2) \end{bmatrix} \eta_j \dot{\nu}_j \right)
\end{align*}
\] (31)

4. Simulation

To illustrate the effectiveness of the designed guidance laws Eqs. (30) and (31) in the above section, this section shows the numerical simulations for the missiles air-intercepting the maneuvering targets at constant speed and time-varying speed.

The simulation parameters are missile parameters and target parameters. The missile parameters are given by: (1) initial position coordinates: \( x_M(0) = 0 \text{ m} \), \( y_M(0) = 0 \text{ m} \) and \( z_M(0) = 0 \text{ m} \); (2) velocity: \( V_M = 1000 \text{ m/s} \); (3) initial flight path angle and heading angle: \( \theta_M(0) = 45^\circ \) and \( \phi_M(0) = 0^\circ \). The target parameters are given by: (1) initial position coordinates: \( x_T(0) = 11136 \text{ m} \), \( y_T(0) = 8603.6 \text{ m} \) and \( z_T(0) = 5192.8 \text{ m} \); (2) velocity: \( V_T = 800 \text{ m/s} \); (3) initial flight path angle and heading angle: \( \theta_T(0) = -30^\circ \) and \( \phi_T(0) = 120^\circ \).

The parameters of the ISM guidance law Eq. (30) are given as follows: \( k_1 = l_1 = 0.006 \), \( k_2 = l_2 = 0.4 \), \( \gamma_1 = \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \), \( \gamma_2 = \beta_2 = \frac{1}{4} \), \( \rho = 0.05 \), \( \gamma_1 = \omega + \epsilon_1 |c_{11}| + \epsilon_2 |c_{12}| \), \( \gamma_2 = \omega + \epsilon_1 |c_{21}| + \epsilon_2 |c_{22}| \), \( \omega = \omega_0 \), \( \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 70 \), \( h = 0.002 \). The parameters of the AISM guidance law Eqs. (31) are chosen as: \( k_1 = 0.006 \), \( k_2 = 0.4 \), \( \gamma_1 = \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \), \( \gamma_2 = \beta_2 = \frac{1}{2} \), \( \rho_1 = 0.6 \), \( \rho_2 = 0.6 \), \( \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.5 \), \( \eta_1 = \eta_2 = 10 \), \( h = 0.002 \). The maximum normal accelerations that missile can provide perpendicular to the LOS are assumed to be 25g respectively, and \( g \) is the acceleration of gravity (\( g = 9.8 \text{ m/s}^2 \)).

4.1. Constant speed missiles

In the subsection, for the constant speed missiles intercepting three different kinds of targets, the simulation examples are provided to illustrate the guidance performance of both designed guidance laws.

For performance comparison, the augmented proportional navigation (APN) guidance law is also simulated under the same initial conditions. The APN guidance law is chosen as

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial M_t}{\partial \Psi_t} &= -N R \dot{\theta} + \alpha_{T} \\
\frac{\partial M_f}{\partial \nu_f} &= N \dot{\nu} + \alpha_{T}
\end{align*}
\] (32)

where the parameter \( N \) is set to be 4.

To verify the effectiveness of the designed guidance laws, the following three cases for the different target acceleration are selected as follows:

Case 1. \( \alpha_{T} = 7g \sin t \) and \( \alpha_{T} = 7g \cos t \).
Case 2. \( \alpha_{T} = 7g \) and \( \alpha_{T} = 7g \).
Case 3. \( \alpha_{T} \) and \( \alpha_{T} \) are squares with an amplitude of \( 7g \), a period of 4 s and a phase delay of 0.1 s.

With the given initial conditions and data, simulations are performed for the three cases under all the three guidance laws. For the three cases, Figs. 2–4 show the simulation results. Each figure includes the response of the elevation angular rate of the LOS \( \dot{\theta} \), the azimuth angular rate of the LOS \( \dot{\theta} \), the sliding mode manifolds \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \), the missile acceleration in the elevation loop \( \alpha_{M_t} \), the missile acceleration in the azimuth loop \( \alpha_{M_f} \), the estimation error of the upper bound of target acceleration \( \dot{e}_j (j = 1, 2) \), and the relative movement curve of the missiles-target for all the three guidance laws, which are given in Figs. 2(a)–(h), 3(a)–(h), 4(a)–(h), respectively. The abbreviations in Figs. 2–4 and Table 1, i.e. ISMGL, AISMGL and APNGL, denote the proposed integral sliding mode guidance law Eq. (30), adaptive integral sliding mode guidance law Eq. (31) and the augmented PN guidance law Eq. (32), respectively. Table 1 presents the miss distances and interception times.

From the Figs. 2(a), 2(a), 4(a) and 2(b), 3(b), 4(b), it can be obtained that both proposed guidance laws can ensure that the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\theta} \) and \( \dot{\theta} \) converge to zero in finite time for the target acceleration profiles of Cases 1–3. However, the convergence property of the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\theta} \) and \( \dot{\theta} \) under the APNGL is not the same for the three cases. For Case 1 and Case 2, the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\theta} \) and \( \dot{\theta} \) do not converge to zero. For Case 3, if the target is a square maneuvering, the APNGL can guarantee that the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\theta} \) and \( \dot{\theta} \) converge to zero, but the LOS angular rates \( \dot{\theta} \) and \( \dot{\theta} \) diverge at an early time which leads to a large miss distance. As shown in Figs. 2(c), 3(c), 4(c) and 2(d), 3(d), 4(d), it can also be seen that both variables of the sliding surface variable vector converge to zero rapidly in finite time under both proposed guidance laws for the three cases. From these figures, we can also observe that the sliding surface variable curves are smooth and stable even for the case of square maneuvering target. As presented in Figs. 2(e), 3(e), 4(e) and 2(f), 3(f), 4(f), the missile accelerations in the two loops under both proposed guidance laws are within the reasonable bounds and there are problems of acceleration saturations in the initial phase of the terminal guidance process for all target acceleration cases. And, the missile accelerations produced by the APNGL are much smaller than those under the ISMGL and AISMGL. But, the larger missile acceleration taken by the proposed ISMGL and AISMGL can make the LOS angular rate preferably converge to zero in finite time and large acceleration decreases correspondingly as the LOS angular rates come close to zero. In addition, we can see that with the convergence properties of the LOS angular rates, the missile acceleration commands under the proposed guidance laws converge to the similar curve with the target’s acceleration for each case after a while. From Figs. 2(g), 3(g), 4(g), we can observe that the estimation error of the upper bound of the target’s acceleration rapidly converge to zero under the proposed AISMGL for the three cases, which indicates that the designed adaptive law can effectively estimate the upper bound of the target’s acceleration. It can be clearly observed from Figs. 2(h), 3(h), 4(h) that with the implementation of both developed ISMGL and AISMGL, the missile can intercept the target successfully for all the target acceleration profiles of Cases 1–3. The relative movement curves of the missile-target under the proposed AISMGL are similar to that under APNGL for any case. And the proposed ISMGL makes the missiles have slightly longer trajectories than those of the other guidance laws for the three cases.
Fig. 2  Response curves under three guidance laws of Case 1.
Fig. 3  Response curves under three guidance laws of Case 2.
Fig. 4  Response curves under three guidance laws of Case 3.
From Table 1, it can be observed that the interception time under both designed guidance laws is similar to that under the APNGL for the Cases 1–3. But, by comparing the miss distance for all the target cases, the miss distances achieved by the proposed ISMGL and the AISMGL are much less than the APNGL. So, the APNGL cannot ensure the guidance accuracy, while the proposed ISMGL and AISMGL can ensure that the missile intercepts the target successfully and have a high guidance precision even in the case of existing strong target maneuver.

4.2. Varying speed missiles

In Section 4.1, only the simulation results for the constant speed missiles are shown. Nonetheless, as we all know, the speed of the missile for a realistic missile model is variable, hence the following simulation results are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the above designed guidance laws for missiles with varying speed which is as good as that for the constant speed missiles. This is due to the inherently strong robustness of the designed guidance laws. The equations of motion of a missile, which is regarded as a point-mass flying over a flat, non-rotating Earth, are described as follows:

\[
\dot{x}_M = V_M \cos \theta_M \cos \varphi_M \\
\dot{y}_M = V_M \sin \theta_M \\
\dot{z}_M = -V_M \cos \theta_M \sin \varphi_M \\
\dot{V}_M = \frac{T - D}{m} - g \sin \theta_M \\
\dot{\theta}_M = -\frac{a_y - g \cos \theta_M}{V_M} \\
\dot{\varphi}_M = -\frac{a_z}{V_M \cos \theta_M}
\]

where \(x_M, y_M, z_M\) denote the position of the missile; \(m, \theta_M\) and \(\varphi_M\) represent the mass, the flight path angle and the heading angle of the missile, respectively; \(T\) and \(D\) denote the thrust and the drag of the missile, respectively; \(a_y\) and \(a_z\) are the horizontal projection and vertical projection of the missile normal acceleration.

For the realistic missile model, the expression of the aerodynamic drag \(D\) in Eq. (36) is given as

\[
D = D_0 + D_t
\]

with

\[
D_0 = C_{D0} Q s, \quad D_t = \frac{km^2 (a_x^2 + a_y^2)}{Q s} \\
K = \frac{1}{\pi A_e e}, \quad Q = \frac{1}{2} \rho V_M^2
\]

where \(D_0\) and \(D_t\) are the zero-lift drag and induced drag; \(C_{D0}\) and \(K\) denote the coefficient of the zero-lift drag and the coefficient of the induced drag; \(Q, A_e, e\) and \(\rho\) represent the dynamic pressure, the aspect ratio, the efficiency factor and the atmosphere density, respectively; and \(s\) is the reference area and assumed to be 1 m². For the guidance problem, \(C_{D0}\) and \(K\) are given as

\[
C_{D0} = \begin{cases} 
0.02 & Ma < 0.93 \\
0.02 + 0.2(Ma - 0.93) & Ma < 1.03 \\
0.04 + 0.06(Ma - 1.03) & Ma < 1.10 \\
0.0442 - 0.007(Ma - 1.10) & Ma \geq 1.10 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
K = \begin{cases} 
0.2 & Ma < 1.15 \\
0.2 + 0.246(Ma - 1.15) & Ma \geq 1.15 
\end{cases}
\]

where \(Ma\) is the Mach number and given by

\[
Ma = \frac{V_M}{\sqrt{1.4 R_C T_p}}
\]

where \(T_p\) is the temperature at the height \(y_M\) above sea level and is given by

\[
T_p = \begin{cases} 
288.16 - 0.006 y_M & y_M < 11000 \\
216.66 & y_M \geq 11000 
\end{cases}
\]

The thrust \(T\) of the missile can be calculated as

\[
T = \begin{cases} 
33000 & 0 \leq t \leq 1.5 \\
7500 & 1.5 < t \leq 8.5 \\
0 & t \geq 8.5 
\end{cases}
\]

The mass of the missile \(m\) is given as

\[
m = \begin{cases} 
135 - 14.53 t & 0 \leq t \leq 1.5 \\
113.205 - 3.31 (t - 1.5) & 1.5 < t \leq 8.5 \\
90.035 & t \geq 8.5 
\end{cases}
\]

where \(t\) is time in seconds. The atmosphere density is given by

\[
\rho = 1.15579 - 1.058 \times 10^{-4} y_M + 3.725 \times 10^{-9} y_M^2 - 6 \times 10^{-14} y_M^3
\]

The simulation conditions are the same as the previous simulation and the target acceleration is chosen as \(a_{tg} = 7g \sin t, a_{tg} = 7g \cos t\) which is the same as Case 1. The missile’s initial speed and the target’s initial speed are 1000 m/s and 800 m/s, respectively. With the implement of the proposed ISMGL and AISMGL, the LOS angular rates \(\dot{\eta}_i\) and \(\dot{\eta}_j\), the sliding mode manifold \(s_1\) and \(s_2\), the missile acceleration in the elevation loop \(a_{m1}\), the missile acceleration in the azimuth loop \(a_{m2}\), the estimation error of the upper bound of target acceleration \(\tilde{a}_j\) (\(j = 1, 2\)), the relative movement curve of the missile-target, and the variation of the missile speed are given in Figs. 5 and 6. In addition, we can also obtain that under the ISMGL and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance law</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss distance (m)</td>
<td>Interception time (s)</td>
<td>Miss distance (m)</td>
<td>Interception time (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNGL</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>9.085</td>
<td>2.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISMGL</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>9.110</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISMGL</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>9.090</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Miss distances and interception times for three cases.
Fig. 5  Response curves with the proposed ISMGL and AISMGL.
In this paper, we research the finite-time guidance law design; however we did not consider the input saturation problem. At present, only a few papers focus on the finite-time guidance law design problem under input saturation. Under the input saturation, how to develop the finite-time guidance law which can produce higher guidance precision and better robustness is a challenging task, which is also our research direction.
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