

Adaptive Synchronization of Uncertain Underactuated Euler-Lagrange Agents

Tao, Tian; Roy, Spandan; De Schutter, Bart; Baldi, Simone

DOI

[10.1109/TAC.2023.3349099](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2023.3349099)

Publication date

2024

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control

Citation (APA)

Tao, T., Roy, S., De Schutter, B., & Baldi, S. (2024). Adaptive Synchronization of Uncertain Underactuated Euler-Lagrange Agents. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 69(6), 3912-3927.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2023.3349099>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

Adaptive Synchronization of Uncertain Underactuated Euler–Lagrange Agents

Tian Tao , Spandan Roy , Bart De Schutter , *Fellow, IEEE*, and Simone Baldi , *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This article proposes a framework for adaptive synchronization of uncertain underactuated Euler–Lagrange (EL) agents. The designed distributed controller can handle both state-dependent uncertain system dynamics terms and state-dependent uncertain interconnection terms among neighboring agents. No structural knowledge of such terms is required other than the standard properties of EL systems (positive definite mass matrix, bounded gravity, velocity-dependent friction bound, etc.). The study of stability relies on a suitable analysis of the nonactuated and the actuated synchronization errors, resulting in stable error dynamics perturbed by parametrized state-dependent uncertainty. This uncertainty is tackled via appropriate adaptation laws, giving stability in the uniform ultimate boundedness sense, in line with available literature on state-dependent uncertain system dynamics and/or state-dependent uncertain interconnections. An example with a network of boom cranes is used to validate the proposed approach.

Index Terms—Adaptive synchronization, distributed control, Euler–Lagrange (EL) dynamics, underactuated systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

UNDERACTUATED systems have fewer control inputs than degrees of freedom. Lower cost or more tolerance to faults can make underactuated robots [1], underactuated cranes [2], [3], underactuated vehicles [4], [5], etc. preferable to their fully actuated versions. Although approaches to control underactuated systems span from feedback linearization [6], [7], [8], passivity [9], [10], [11], and optimal control [12], [13]; the inevitable *system uncertainties* put most of these approaches at stake and call for appropriate adaptive designs [14]. One such class of designs relies on extending sliding mode control [15],

[16], [17], [18] in an adaptive sense, giving adaptive-robust methods originally developed for fully actuated systems [19], [20], [21]. These methods only require the knowledge of an uncertainty bound around a nominal mass matrix, while all other system terms (Coriolis, gravity, friction) can be unknown [22], [23].

A. Challenges and Related Works

Nowadays, adaptive-robust methods constitute a mature and general framework for fully actuated systems. Unfortunately, such maturity and generality are missing for underactuated systems, where it is common to consider special classes of dynamics [24], specific applications [25], [26], or ad-hoc structural assumptions on the system terms [7], [8], [9], [17], [18], [27]. The most adopted of these structural assumptions requires the mass matrix to depend on the actuated states only [18], or on the nonactuated states only [9], [27]. This assumption turns out to be falsified in several scenarios, such as biped robots [1], boom cranes [3], surface vessels [5], [26], among others.

When considering interconnected dynamics as in multiagent systems literature, an additional source of uncertainty arises from the *interconnection terms* among the agents, which may take a *state-dependent form* analogous to the state-dependent system terms. Power systems are a representative example, where power flows across different areas create state-dependent uncertain interconnections that might result in interarea oscillations or other problems [28], [29], [30], [31]. When designing distributed approaches to synchronization/consensus, the presence of these uncertain interconnection terms is traditionally overlooked. In most approaches, the interconnection is only the result of the synchronization/consensus protocol, i.e., no intrinsic interconnection is considered before such protocol is designed [32], [33], [34]. Notable exceptions appear in fully actuated dynamics controlled in a decentralized fashion, i.e., without communication among the agents: here, state-dependent and possibly uncertain interconnection terms have been considered [35], [36]. For underactuated dynamics, distributed control was considered in [5] without uncertainty on the system dynamics and on the interconnection terms, whereas the adaptive method in [37] and the nonadaptive ones in [9], [10], and [11] are for single agents, i.e., the issue of uncertain interconnections does not arise. These works on underactuated systems still rely on the aforementioned structural assumptions on the system terms.

Manuscript received 13 October 2022; revised 21 September 2023; accepted 22 December 2023. Date of publication 1 January 2024; date of current version 30 May 2024. This work was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant 2022YFE0198700, and in part by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62150610499 and Grant 62073074. Recommended by Associate Editor X. Chen. (*Corresponding author: Simone Baldi.*)

Tian Tao and Bart De Schutter are with the Delft Center for Systems & Control, TU Delft, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands (e-mail: t.tao-1@tudelft.nl; b.deschutter@tudelft.nl).

Spandan Roy is with the Robotics Research Centre, International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad, Hyderabad, Telangana 500032, India (e-mail: sroy002@gmail.com).

Simone Baldi is with the School of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing 210018, China (e-mail: s.baldi@tudelft.nl).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2023.3349099

B. Contributions of This Work

The overview above shows that distributed approaches for underactuated dynamics impose crucial structural assumptions, e.g., on the mass matrix and on the existence of interconnections. The design of a general underactuated adaptive-robust framework with reduced structural assumptions is still an open problem in the field. This motivates a research on new distributed approaches for underactuated systems with limited knowledge of the system dynamics and of the interconnection terms. The main contributions of this work are as follows.

- 1) A distributed adaptive protocol for synchronization of underactuated Euler–Lagrange (EL) systems is designed in the presence of uncertain system terms.
- 2) No structural assumptions are imposed other than the standard properties of EL systems (positive definite mass matrix, bounded gravity, velocity-dependent friction bound, etc.). We do not impose the mass matrix to depend on the actuated states only, or on the nonactuated states only. We just require the mass matrix to satisfy the strong inertial coupling [8] (see Assumption 2), a well-known condition for controllability.
- 3) State-dependent uncertain interconnections among the underactuated agents are considered to exist before the control design, instead of only being a result of coupling caused by the control. Recall that, even for fully actuated systems, literature has shown that state-dependent uncertainties prevent asymptotic tracking [29], [30], [31], [36], [38], seeking stability as uniform ultimate boundedness, which is the approach we also follow.

The proposed approach provides a convenient underactuated extension of adaptive-robust methods, with the following distinguishing contributions that make this extension possible.

- 1) Suitable dynamics are derived for the actuated and the nonactuated errors so as to fit the adaptive control goal (cf. the parametrized state-dependent perturbations in Section IV-B). As state-dependent uncertainties appear in both the actuated and the nonactuated part, a dedicated uncertainty analysis is carried out in Section V-A.
- 2) A novel stability analysis is presented that, in addition to handling state-dependent uncertainties, can handle distributed information and the different state space regions arising from the control law (cf. the proof of Theorem 1 in the Appendix).
- 3) The proposed adaptive laws in Section V-B depart from standard adaptive-robust laws, as they are not designed using a standard leakage, but based on an appropriate state-dependent leakage (cf. the discussion in Remark 6).

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section II gives the basic notation, followed by the problem formulation in Section III. Section IV gives key steps about the distributed control law and the error dynamics, leading to the uncertainty analysis and stability result in Section V. Using a network of boom cranes as a numerical case study, simulations and comparisons with the state of the art are given in Section VI. Finally, Section VII concludes this article.

II. NOTATION AND BASIC GRAPH THEORY

We adopt a standard notation, with \mathbb{R}^+ for the set of positive real numbers, \otimes for the Kronecker product, I_N for the identity matrix of dimension N , 1_N for the N -dimensional vector of ones, $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ for the minimum and maximum singular value of a matrix, and $\|\cdot\|$ for the Euclidean norm.

We use graphs to represent a network of nodes (or agents). A directed graph \mathcal{G} is described by the pair $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, comprising the node set $\mathcal{V} \triangleq \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$ and the edge set $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$. An edge is a pair of nodes $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ representing that agent i has access to the information from agent j , i.e., agent j is a neighbor of agent i (not necessarily vice versa). The neighbor set of agent i is denoted by \mathcal{N}_i . Weighted edges in \mathcal{E} are described by the adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, where $a_{ij} > 0$ if $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L} = [l_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ associated with \mathcal{G} is defined as $l_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}$ and $l_{ij} = -a_{ij}$, $i \neq j$.

The node set \mathcal{V} does not include the leader node v_0 : for those agents i that can receive information from v_0 , we have an edge with $b_i > 0$; otherwise, $b_i = 0$. The following assumption is standard in multiagent systems literature [32], [33]:

Assumption 1: The directed augmented graph comprising \mathcal{G} and edges from the leader node contains a spanning tree with the root being the leader node.

Remark 1: Assumption 1 implies that there exists a communication path from the leader to any follower node: it is a condition to make synchronization over a network feasible, cf. Remark 4 and Lemma 1 later on.

III. SYNCHRONIZATION PROBLEM

Consider the following network of underactuated EL agents ($i = 1, \dots, N$):

$$M_i(q_i)\ddot{q}_i + C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\dot{q}_i + G_i(q_i) + F_i(\dot{q}_i) + H_i(e_i, \dot{e}_i) + d_i = [0_{(n-m)}^T \tau_i^T]^T \quad (1)$$

where $q_i, \dot{q}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the generalized coordinates and their derivatives, $d_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an external bounded disturbance with $\|d_i\| \leq \bar{d}_i$ (\bar{d}_i an unknown constant), $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $n - m \leq m < n$ is the control input. The system dynamics (1) comprises the mass matrix $M_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the Coriolis matrix $C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the gravity term $G_i(q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the friction term $F_i(\dot{q}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the interconnection term $H_i(e_i, \dot{e}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which depends on the local synchronization error and its derivative. For convenience of analysis, arrange the generalized coordinates according to nonactuated and actuated dynamics as $q_i = [q_{ui}^T q_{ai}^T]^T$ with $q_{ui} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$ and $q_{ai} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Accordingly, the local synchronization error e_i can be decomposed as $e_i = [e_{ui}^T e_{ai}^T]^T$, resulting in

$$e_{ui}(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} [q_{ui}(t) - q_{uj}(t)] + b_i [q_{ui}(t) - q_{u0}] \quad (2a)$$

$$e_{ai}(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} [q_{ai}(t) - q_{aj}(t)] + b_i (q_{ai}(t) - q_{a0}) \quad (2b)$$

and analogously for $\dot{e}_i = [\dot{e}_{ui}^T \dot{e}_{ai}^T]^T$

$$\dot{e}_{ui}(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} [\dot{q}_{ui}(t) - \dot{q}_{uj}(t)] + b_i \dot{q}_{ui}(t) \quad (3a)$$

$$\dot{e}_{ai}(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} [\dot{q}_{ai}(t) - \dot{q}_{aj}(t)] + b_i \dot{q}_{ai}(t). \quad (3b)$$

In principle, one could consider time-varying leader trajectories ([22], [23], [36], [38] for fully actuated and [24] for a class of underactuated EL systems); however, this poses the challenging problem of how to define a feasible trajectory for a general underactuated system. Because this problem goes beyond the scope of this work, we consider a fixed-point leader position $q_0 = [q_{u0}^T q_{a0}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in (2a)–(2b), as common in literature ([7], [10], [11], [15], [16], [17], [27], [37]). In line with standard EL literature [19], [39], [40], the following system properties are assumed.

Property 1: There exist constants $\bar{c}_i, \bar{g}_i, \bar{f}_i, \bar{h}_{1i}, \bar{h}_{2i}, \bar{h}_{3i}, \bar{h}_{4i}, \bar{h}_{5i} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that the following upper bound structures hold $\|C_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i)\| \leq \bar{c}_i \|\dot{q}_i\|$, $\|G_i(q_i)\| \leq \bar{g}_i$, $\|F_i(\dot{q}_i)\| \leq \bar{f}_i \|\dot{q}_i\|$, $\|H_i(e_i, \dot{e}_i)\| \leq \bar{h}_{1i} + \bar{h}_{2i} \|e_i\| + \bar{h}_{3i} \|\dot{e}_i\| + \bar{h}_{4i} \|e_i\|^2 + \bar{h}_{5i} \|\dot{e}_i\|^2$.

Property 2: The mass matrix $M_i(q_i)$ is symmetric, positive definite and there exist positive constants \underline{m} and \bar{m} such that $0 \leq \underline{m}I_n \leq M_i(q_i) \leq \bar{m}I_n \quad \forall q_i \quad \forall i$.

Remark 2: The interconnection term H_i represents the uncertain interaction between agents, existent before the design of the synchronization protocol. Literature on multiagent systems typically neglects this term [32], [33], [34]: its presence requires a novel synchronization protocol.

The upper bounds of C_i, G_i, F_i, H_i , and d_i in Property 1 will be taken to be unknown, i.e., not used in the control design. The upper bound structure of H_i is taken to be quadratic in accordance with the quadratic effect of the term $C_i \dot{q}_i$ in (1). Note that, although some terms (e.g., d_i and G_i) can reasonably be assumed to be bounded a priori by constants, other terms (e.g., C_i, F_i and H_i) are state-dependent. Indeed, the constants $\bar{c}_i, \bar{f}_i, \bar{h}_{1i}, \bar{h}_{2i}, \bar{h}_{3i}, \bar{h}_{4i}, \bar{h}_{5i}$ in Property 1 multiply state-dependent terms, so that one cannot assume a priori boundedness of these uncertain terms.

For brevity, let us omit the dependence of the system dynamics terms on the state variables, and let us organize the system dynamics terms as

$$M_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} M_{uii} & M_{aui} \\ M_{uai} & M_{aai} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4a)$$

$$E_i \triangleq C_i \dot{q}_i + G_i + F_i + H_i + d_i = [E_{ui}^T E_{ai}^T]^T \quad (4b)$$

where $M_{uii} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m) \times (n-m)}$, $M_{aui} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m) \times m}$, $M_{aai} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $E_{ui} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$, and $E_{ai} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Therefore, the dynamics (1) for each agent can be represented as

$$\ddot{q}_{ui} = -M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} \ddot{q}_{ai} - R_{ui} \quad (5a)$$

$$\ddot{q}_{ai} = M_{si}^{-1} \tau_i + R_{ai} \quad (5b)$$

with

$$R_{ui} \triangleq M_{uii}^{-1} E_{ui}$$

$$R_{ai} \triangleq M_{si}^{-1} (M_{uai} M_{uii}^{-1} E_{ui} - E_{ai})$$

$$M_{si} \triangleq M_{aai} - M_{uai} M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui}.$$

As M_i in (4a) is positive definite, M_{si} and M_{uii} are positive definite (thus invertible). The following assumption, known as strong inertial coupling, ensures controllability of underactuated EL dynamics in line with standard literature [6], [7], [8].

Assumption 2: (Strong Inertial Coupling [6], [7], [8]) The following rank condition holds:

$$\text{rank}(M_{aui}(q_i)) = n - m \leq m \quad \forall q_i \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (6)$$

Remark 3: The name “strong inertial coupling” comes from the coupling created by M_{aui} between the actuated and the nonactuated states. As the nonactuated states cannot be directly controlled, (6) ensures controllability as it allows to design a virtual control for the nonactuated states. This condition appears in most works about underactuated EL systems (also [40], [41], and [42]) and has been mostly used in the framework of backstepping.

Due to the block structure in (4a), the uncertainty in the mass matrix M_i is addressed in a different way from the other dynamic terms. It is assumed that $M_{si} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ can be decomposed as $M_{si} = \hat{M}_{si} + \Delta M_{si}$, where \hat{M}_{si} is the nominal part (used for control design) and ΔM_{si} is the unknown part satisfying the following bound conditions.

Assumption 3: Define the matrix $T_i = M_{si}^{-1} \hat{M}_{si} - I_m$. Then, there exists a known scalar $\bar{T} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\|T_i\| \leq \bar{T} < 1. \quad (7)$$

Assumption 3 implies that an upper bound on the uncertainty of M_{si} is known. It is often adopted in literature to describe uncertainty in mass matrix [19], [20], [21].

Let $B = \text{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. From (2), we obtain

$$e_u = -(\mathcal{L} + B) \otimes (q_u - q_{u0}) = -(\mathcal{L} + B) \otimes \delta_u$$

$$e_a = -(\mathcal{L} + B) \otimes (q_a - q_{a0}) = -(\mathcal{L} + B) \otimes \delta_a$$

where $e_u = [e_{u1}^T, \dots, e_{uN}^T]^T$, $e_a = [e_{a1}^T, \dots, e_{aN}^T]^T$, $q_u = [q_{u1}^T, \dots, q_{uN}^T]^T$, $q_a = [q_{a1}^T, \dots, q_{aN}^T]^T$, $q_{a0} = 1_N \otimes q_{a0}$, $q_{u0} = 1_N \otimes q_{u0}$. The errors $\delta_a = (q_a - q_{a0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$, $\delta_u = (q_u - q_{u0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$ represent the global synchronization error with the leader in actuated and nonactuated states, respectively.

Remark 4: In a distributed control setting, the leader's state contained in δ_a, δ_u is not directly accessible to all followers. The existence of a directed spanning tree, as in Assumption 1, allows even those agents without direct access to the leader's information to track the leader's state by synchronizing e_a and e_u with the neighbors with which they can communicate.

The directed spanning tree property implies the following.

Lemma 1: [32] Under Assumption 1, the local and global synchronization errors are related by

$$\|\delta_u\| \leq \frac{\|e_u\|}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{L} + B)} \quad (9a)$$

$$\|\delta_a\| \leq \frac{\|e_a\|}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{L} + B)} \quad (9b)$$

with $\lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{L} + B)$ the minimum singular value of $\mathcal{L} + B$.

Due to the presence of state-dependent uncertainties, it has been shown in literature that asymptotic tracking is hard to achieve even for fully actuated system. Therefore, stability is sought as uniform ultimate boundedness, which is in line with existing literature [29], [30], [31], [36].

Definition 1. (Uniform Ultimate Boundedness (UUB) [43]): A signal is uniformly ultimately bounded if there exists a convex and compact set \mathcal{C} such that for $\forall \delta(0) = \delta_0$, there exists a finite time $T(\delta_0)$ such that $\delta \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $t > T(\delta_0)$.

Problem Formulation: Let $\delta_i = [\delta_{ui}^T \delta_{ai}^T]^T$. Design a distributed adaptive mechanism (i.e., using state information from neighboring agents) for the network of underactuated systems (1) guaranteeing that the global synchronization error $\delta = [\delta_1^T, \dots, \delta_N^T]^T$ is uniformly ultimately bounded.

IV. PRELIMINARY DESIGN STEPS

We give the distributed control law (Section IV-A) and the dynamics of the synchronization error (Section IV-B). These steps are useful to derive the proposed adaptation in Section V.

A. Distributed Control Law

Define a tracking error variable

$$r_i = \Theta_{ai} \dot{e}_{ai} + \Xi_{ai} e_{ai} + \Theta_{ui} \dot{e}_{ui} + \Xi_{ui} e_{ui} \quad (10)$$

where $\Theta_{ai}, \Xi_{ai} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are user-defined positive definite matrices, and $\Theta_{ui}, \Xi_{ui} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-m)}$ are user-defined full rank matrices. The distributed controller is designed as

$$\tau_i = \frac{\hat{M}_{si}}{\hat{\alpha}_i} (-r_i - \bar{\tau}_i), \quad \bar{\tau}_i = \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \quad (11)$$

where $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) = \begin{cases} \frac{S_i}{\|S_i\|}, & \|S_i\| \geq \varphi \\ \frac{S_i}{\varphi}, & \|S_i\| < \varphi \end{cases}$ is a saturation term

with $S_i = B_1^T P_{ai} \omega_{ai}$, $B_1 = [0 \ I_m]^T$, $\omega_{ai} = [e_{ai}^T \dot{e}_{ai}^T]^T$, $\varphi > 0$ a user-defined scalar, and $P_{ai} > 0$ the solution to the Lyapunov equation $A_{ai}^T P_{ai} + P_{ai} A_{ai} = -Q_{ai}$, where $A_{ai} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_m \\ -\Xi_{ai} & -\Theta_{ai} \end{bmatrix}$ is Hurwitz by design, and $Q_{ai} > 0$ is user-designed; ρ_i will be defined later in Section V-B to deal with the uncertainty in the system dynamics.

B. Synchronization Error Dynamics

Using (3b) and (5b), we obtain the synchronization error dynamics in the actuated dynamics as

$$\ddot{e}_{ai} = \ddot{\alpha}_i (M_{si}^{-1} \tau_i + R_{ai}) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} (M_{sj}^{-1} \tau_j + R_{aj}) \quad (12)$$

where $\ddot{\alpha}_i = b_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}$. Substituting (11) into (12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{e}_{ai} = & (M_{si}^{-1} \hat{M}_{si} - I_m) (-r_i - \bar{\tau}_i) - (r_i + \bar{\tau}_i) + \ddot{\alpha}_i R_{ai} \\ & - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \left[(M_{sj}^{-1} \hat{M}_{sj} - I_m) (-r_j - \bar{\tau}_j) \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. - (r_j + \bar{\tau}_j) \right] - a_{ij} R_{aj} \\ = & -r_i - (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j + \phi_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\bar{a}_{ij} = \frac{a_{ij}}{\bar{a}_j}$ and $\phi_{ij} = -T_i r_i + \ddot{\alpha}_i R_{ai} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} [\bar{a}_{ij} (I_m + T_j) r_j - a_{ij} R_{aj}]$. According to (10), (13) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{e}_{ai} = & -\Theta_{ai} \dot{e}_{ai} - \Xi_{ai} e_{ai} - (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i \\ & + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j + \psi_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with $\psi_{ij} = \phi_{ij} - (\Theta_{ui} \dot{e}_{ui} + \Xi_{ui} e_{ui})$. Using (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\omega}_{ai} = & A_{ai} \omega_{ai} + B_1 \left[- (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i + \psi_{ij} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Similarly, using (3a) and (5a), the synchronization error in the nonactuated dynamics turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{e}_{ui} = & -\ddot{\alpha}_i (M_{ui}^{-1} M_{aui} \ddot{q}_{ai} + R_{ui}) \\ & + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} (M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} \ddot{q}_{aj} + R_{uj}) \\ = & -\ddot{\alpha}_i [M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} (M_{si}^{-1} \tau_i + R_{ai}) + R_{ui}] \\ & + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} [M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} (M_{sj}^{-1} \tau_j + R_{aj}) + R_{uj}]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Similar to (13), substituting (11) into (16), gives

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{e}_{ui} = & -M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} \left[(M_{si}^{-1} \hat{M}_{si} - I_m) (-r_i - \bar{\tau}_i) - (r_i + \bar{\tau}_i) \right] \\ & + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} \left[(M_{sj}^{-1} \hat{M}_{sj} - I_m) (-r_j - \bar{\tau}_j) \right. \\ & \left. - (r_j + \bar{\tau}_j) \right] + \ddot{\alpha}_i (M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} R_{ai} + R_{ui}) \\ & + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} (M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} R_{aj} + R_{uj}) \\ = & M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i + \phi'_{ij} \\ & - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'_{ij} = & M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} (I_m + T_i) r_i \\ & - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) r_j \\ & - \ddot{\alpha}_i (M_{uii}^{-1} M_{aui} R_{ai} + R_{ui}) \\ & + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} (M_{uij}^{-1} M_{auj} R_{aj} + R_{uj}). \end{aligned}$$

Design a full-rank matrix $\Gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m) \times m}$ such that $\Lambda_{1i} = \Gamma_i \Theta_{ui} > 0$, $\Lambda_{2i} = \Gamma_i \Xi_{ui} > 0$. Add and subtract $\Gamma_i r_i$ to (17),

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{e}_{ui} &= M_{uu}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i \\ &\quad - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{uu}^{-1} M_{uj} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j \\ &\quad + \phi'_{ij} - \Gamma_i (\Theta_{ai} \dot{e}_{ai} + \Xi_{ai} e_{ai} + \Theta_{ui} \dot{e}_{ui} + \Xi_{ui} e_{ui}) + \Gamma_i r_i \\ &= -\Gamma_i \Theta_{ui} \dot{e}_{ui} - \Gamma_i \Xi_{ui} e_{ui} + M_{uu}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i \\ &\quad - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{uu}^{-1} M_{uj} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j + \psi'_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\psi'_{ij} = \phi'_{ij} - (\Theta_{ai} \dot{e}_{ai} + \Xi_{ai} e_{ai}) + \Gamma_i r_i$. Arrange the non-actuated state error as $\omega_{ui} = [e_{ui}^T \dot{e}_{ui}^T]^T$. Using (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\omega}_{ui} &= A_{ui} \omega_{ui} + B_2 \left[M_{uu}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{uu}^{-1} M_{uj} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j + \psi'_{ij} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we have defined $A_{ui} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{(n-m)} \\ -\Lambda_{1i} & -\Lambda_{2i} \end{bmatrix}$, which is Hurwitz by design, and $B_2 = [0 \ I_{(n-m)}]^T$.

Remark 5: The analysis of the error dynamics has led to (15) and (19), which are stable dynamics (due to the Hurwitz state matrices A_{ai} and A_{ui}) perturbed by state-dependent terms.

The state-dependent terms in Property 1 make the perturbations in (15) and (19) also state-dependent, so that they cannot be bounded a priori by a constant. In the rest of the analysis, the idea is to find an upper bound for such perturbations and define an appropriate ρ_i for stabilizing the error dynamics.

V. DESIGN OF THE ADAPTIVE PROTOCOL

In the following, we provide the uncertainty analysis (Section V-A), leading to the adaptive synchronization laws (Section V-B).

A. Uncertainty Analysis

Define $\xi_i = [e_i^T \dot{e}_i^T q_i^T \dot{q}_i^T]^T$, $\xi = [\xi_1^T, \dots, \xi_N^T]^T$. Therefore, $\|e_{ai}\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$, $\|e_{ui}\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$, $\|\dot{e}_{ai}\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$, $\|\dot{e}_{ui}\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$. According to (10), we have

$$\|r_i\| \leq \vartheta_i \|\xi_i\| \quad (20)$$

with $\vartheta_i = \|\Theta_{ai}\| + \|\Xi_{ai}\| + \|\Theta_{ui}\| + \|\Xi_{ui}\|$. Using Assumption 3 and (14), the following bound for ψ_{ij} in (15) can be obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_{ij}\| &\leq \|T_i r_i\| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|T_j r_j\| + \check{a}_i \|R_{ai}\| \\ &\quad + a_{ij} \|R_{aj}\| + \|\Theta_{ui} \dot{e}_{ui}\| + \|\Xi_{ui} e_{ui}\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \bar{T} \vartheta_i \|\xi_i\| + \bar{T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \vartheta_j \|\xi_j\| + \check{a}_i \|M_{si}^{-1}\| (\|E_{ai}\| \\ &\quad + \|M_{uai} M_{uu}^{-1}\| \|E_{ui}\|) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|M_{sj}^{-1}\| (\|E_{aj}\| \\ &\quad + \|M_{uaj} M_{uu}^{-1}\| \|E_{uj}\|) + \|\Theta_{ui} \dot{e}_{ui}\| + \|\Xi_{ui} e_{ui}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

According to the definition of ξ_i , $\|q_i\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$ can be obtained. Using Property 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_i(q_i, \dot{q}_i, e_i, \dot{e}_i)\| &\leq (\bar{g}_i + d_i + \bar{h}_{1i}) + \bar{f}_i \|\dot{q}_i\| + \bar{c}_i \|\dot{q}_i\|^2 \\ &\quad + \bar{h}_{2i} \|e_i\| + \bar{h}_{3i} \|\dot{e}_i\| + \bar{h}_{4i} \|e_i\|^2 \\ &\quad + \bar{h}_{5i} \|\dot{e}_i\|^2 \\ &\leq (\bar{g}_i + \bar{d}_i + \bar{h}_{1i}) + (\bar{f}_i + \bar{h}_{2i} + \bar{h}_{3i}) \|\xi_i\| \\ &\quad + (\bar{c}_i + \bar{h}_{4i} + \bar{h}_{5i}) \|\xi_i\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

From (4b), $\|E_{ai}\| \leq \|E_i\|$, $\|E_{ui}\| \leq \|E_i\|$. Then, (21) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{ai} B_1\| \|\psi_{ij}\| &\leq \|P_{ai} B_1\| \left[\bar{T} \vartheta_i \|\xi_i\| + \bar{T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \vartheta_j \|\xi_j\| \right. \\ &\quad + \check{a}_i \|M_{si}^{-1}\| (1 + \|M_{uai} M_{uu}^{-1}\|) \|E_i\| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|M_{sj}^{-1}\| (1 \\ &\quad + \|M_{uaj} M_{uu}^{-1}\|) \|E_j\| + (\|\Theta_{ui}\| + \|\Xi_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\| \left. \right] \\ &\leq \theta_{0i} + \theta_{1i} \|\xi_i\| + \theta_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (\varphi_{1j} \|\xi_j\| + \varphi_{2j} \|\xi_j\|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{0i} &= \|P_{ai} B_1\| \left[\mu_i (\bar{g}_i + \bar{d}_i + \bar{h}_{1i}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{\mu}_{ij} (\bar{g}_j + \bar{d}_j + \bar{h}_{1j}) \right] \\ \theta_{1i} &= \|P_{ai} B_1\| [\mu_i (\bar{f}_i + \bar{h}_{2i} + \bar{h}_{3i}) \\ &\quad + \bar{T} \vartheta_i + (\|\Theta_{ui}\| + \|\Xi_{ui}\|)] \\ \theta_{2i} &= \|P_{ai} B_1\| \mu_i (\bar{c}_i + \bar{h}_{4i} + \bar{h}_{5i}) \\ \varphi_{1j} &= \|P_{ai} B_1\| [\bar{\mu}_{ij} (\bar{f}_j + \bar{h}_{2j} + \bar{h}_{3j}) + \bar{T} \bar{a}_{ij} \vartheta_j] \\ \varphi_{2j} &= \|P_{ai} B_1\| \bar{\mu}_{ij} (\bar{c}_j + \bar{h}_{4j} + \bar{h}_{5j}) \\ \mu_i &= \check{a}_i \|M_{si}^{-1}\| (1 + \|M_{uai} M_{uu}^{-1}\|) \\ \bar{\mu}_{ij} &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|M_{sj}^{-1}\| (1 + \|M_{uaj} M_{uu}^{-1}\|). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (21), the upper bound on ψ'_{ij} from (19) is obtained

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\psi'_{ij}\| \\
& \leq \|\phi'_{ij}\| + \|\Theta_{ai}\dot{e}_{ai}\| + \|\Xi_{ai}e_{ai}\| + \|\Gamma_i r_i\| \\
& \leq [(1 + \bar{T}) \|M_{uui}^{-1} M_{auu}\| + 1] \vartheta_i \|\xi_i\| + \check{\alpha}_i \|M_{uui}^{-1}\| \|E_{ui}\| \\
& \quad + \check{\alpha}_i \|M_{uui}^{-1} M_{auu}\| \|M_{si}^{-1}\| (\|E_{ai}\| + \|M_{uai} M_{uui}^{-1}\| \|E_{ui}\|) \\
& \quad + (1 + \bar{T}) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \vartheta_j \|M_{uuj}^{-1} M_{auj}\| \|\xi_j\| \\
& \quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|M_{uuj}^{-1} M_{auj}\| \|M_{sj}^{-1}\| (\|E_{aj}\| \\
& \quad + \|M_{uaj} M_{uuj}^{-1}\| \|E_{uj}\|) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|M_{uuj}^{-1}\| \|E_{uj}\| \\
& \quad + \|\Theta_{ai}\dot{e}_{ai}\| + \|\Xi_{ai}e_{ai}\|. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $P_{ui} > 0$ be the solution to the Lyapunov equation $A_{ui}^T P_{ui} + P_{ui} A_{ui} = -Q_{ui}$, with Q_{ui} a user-designed positive definite matrix. Then, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|P_{ui} B_2\| \|\psi'_{ij}\| \leq \|P_{ui} B_2\| \left\{ [(1 + \bar{T}) \|M_{uui}^{-1} M_{auu}\| \right. \\
& \quad + 1] \vartheta_i \|\xi_i\| + \check{\alpha}_i \|M_{uui}^{-1}\| [\|M_{auu}\| \|M_{si}^{-1}\| \\
& \quad \times (1 + \|M_{uai} M_{uui}^{-1}\|) \\
& \quad + 1] \|E_i\| + (1 + \bar{T}) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \vartheta_j \|M_{uuj}^{-1} M_{auj}\| \|\xi_j\| \\
& \quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \|M_{uuj}^{-1}\| [\|M_{auj}\| \|M_{sj}^{-1}\| (1 + \|M_{uaj} M_{uuj}^{-1}\|) \\
& \quad \left. + 1] \|E_j\| + (\|\Theta_{ai}\| + \|\Xi_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\| \right\} \\
& \leq \theta'_{0i} + \theta'_{1i} \|\xi_i\| + \theta'_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} (\varphi'_{1j} \|\xi_j\| + \varphi'_{2j} \|\xi_j\|^2) \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta'_{0i} &= \|P_{ui} B_2\| \left[\mu'_i (\bar{g}_i + \bar{d}_i + \bar{h}_{1i}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{\mu}'_{ij} (\bar{g}_j + \bar{d}_j + \bar{h}_{1j}) \right] \\
\theta'_{1i} &= \|P_{ui} B_2\| [\mu'_i (\bar{f}_i + \bar{h}_{2i} + \bar{h}_{3i}) + (\|\Theta_{ui}\| + \|\Xi_{ui}\|)] \\
& \quad + [(1 + \bar{T}) \|M_{uui}^{-1} M_{auu}\| + 1] \vartheta_i \\
\theta'_{2i} &= \|P_{ui} B_2\| \mu'_i (\bar{c}_i + \bar{h}_{4i} + \bar{h}_{5i}) \\
\varphi'_{1j} &= \|P_{ui} B_2\| [\bar{\mu}'_{ij} (\bar{f}_j + \bar{h}_{2j} + \bar{h}_{3j}) \\
& \quad + (1 + \bar{T}) \bar{a}_{ij} \vartheta_j \|M_{uuj}^{-1} M_{auj}\|]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi'_{2j} &= \|P_{ui} B_2\| \bar{\mu}'_{ij} (\bar{c}_j + \bar{h}_{4j} + \bar{h}_{5j}) \\
\mu'_i &= \check{\alpha}_i \|M_{uui}^{-1}\| [\|M_{auu}\| \|M_{si}^{-1}\| (1 + \|M_{uai} M_{uui}^{-1}\|) + 1] \\
\bar{\mu}'_{ij} &= \bar{\alpha}_{ij} \|M_{uuj}^{-1}\| [\|M_{auj}\| \|M_{sj}^{-1}\| (1 + \|M_{uaj} M_{uuj}^{-1}\|) + 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Let us stress that the structures of the uncertainty bounds in (23) and (25) are not imposed as per assumption, but a consequence of Property 1. As Property 1 is generally valid for EL dynamics, the upper bounds in (23) and (25) hold. These upper bounds put us in the position to design an appropriate ρ_i in (11), as explained later.

B. Adaptive Synchronization Laws

According to the structure of the upper bounds of ψ_{ij} in (23) and ψ'_{ij} in (25), ρ_i is designed as

$$\rho_i = \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{T})} \left(\hat{\theta}_{0i} + \hat{\theta}_{1i} \|\xi_i\| + \hat{\theta}_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^2 + \gamma_i \right) \tag{26}$$

with the adaptive laws ($l = 0, 1, 2$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\hat{\theta}}_{li} &= \chi_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
& \quad - \alpha_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \hat{\theta}_{li} \tag{27a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\gamma}_i &= \epsilon_0 (\|S_i\| + \|\xi_i\|) + \beta_i \\
& \quad - [\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) + \epsilon_2 \|\xi_i\|] \gamma_i \tag{27b}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } \hat{\theta}_{0i}(0) > 0, \hat{\theta}_{1i}(0) > 0, \hat{\theta}_{2i}(0) > 0, \gamma_i(0) > 0 \tag{27c}$$

$$\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \chi_{li}, \alpha_{li}, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ \tag{27d}$$

$$\text{with } \epsilon_2 \geq \epsilon_1. \tag{27e}$$

Remark 6: The proposed adaptive law uses a leakage dependent on the synchronization error. This is useful in the Lyapunov analysis of the derivative of $(\hat{\theta}_{li} - \bar{\theta}_{li})^2$, as the common factor $(\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l$ can be extracted to construct negative square terms of $\hat{\theta}_{li}$, (39)–(40) in the Appendix. The parameters in (27), namely, $\chi_{li}, \alpha_{li}, \epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \beta_i$, determine the rate of variation of the gains. For example, α_{li}/χ_{li} represents the ratio between the decreasing effect of leakage and the increasing effect of the first part of the adaptive law. Compared to standard leakage in literature ([31], [36], [44, Ch. 8]), the proposed leakage leads to a more concise UUB condition for ω_{ai} and ω_{ui} in (47), (52), and (54).

Theorem 1: Under Properties 1–2 and Assumptions 1–3, the closed-loop trajectories of (1) employing the distributed control law (11) with adaptive law (27) are uniformly ultimately bounded.

Proof: See the Appendix. \square

Remark 7: Although the proposed framework shares some points with sliding mode control [e.g., the saturation in (11)], crucial features make it depart from such methods: sliding mode control of underactuated EL dynamics imposes structural restrictions on the variables the mass matrix depends on ([7, Def. 1] used in most of the work) and structural restrictions on the uncertainties (cf. [16, Assump. 4–8] imposing invertibility).




Fig. 1. System used for simulations. (a) Schematic boom crane on ship. (b) Network.

In the proposed framework, none of these structural restrictions are imposed.

Remark 8: The uncertainties considered in this work create another crucial difference with available sliding mode methods for underactuated EL dynamics. There, uncertainties are typically a priori bounded, where the constant bound can be unknown a priori in adaptive sliding mode literature. The adaptive laws involve either monotonically increasing gains, or increasing–decreasing rules [20], [21]. Our method involves neither a priori bounded uncertainties [state-dependent perturbations in (23) and (25) cannot be bounded a priori], nor increasing gains/increasing–decreasing rules (cf. the discussion about leakage in Remark 6). These aspects require a dedicated stability analysis (cf. Appendix) departing significantly from analyses available in sliding mode literature.

Remark 9: The Appendix provides estimates for the uniform ultimate bounds, which can be tuned as follows. Larger β_i and ϵ_1 lead to more negative $-\gamma_i^2 \bar{\epsilon}_1$, which is the fifth degree coefficient of the polynomials $Z_1(\|\xi\|)$, $Z_2(\|\xi\|)$, $Z_3(\|\xi\|)$ in (46), (51), and (53). Making this coefficient more negative makes the roots η_1 , η_2 , and η_3 closer to zero, which in turn contributes to reducing the ultimate bound on the error. Larger χ_{li} and smaller ζ , which can be obtained from larger P_{ui} , P_{ai} , result in ι_1 , ι_2 , ι_3 being closer to zero. A larger ϵ_2 leads to a smaller ι_4 . This also contributes to reducing the ultimate bound on the error. Let us mention that a smaller error might require a larger input: this is a standard tradeoff, which might be seen from the fact that larger χ_{li} and β_i leads to larger ρ_i .

VI. SIMULATION EXAMPLE

A network of underactuated systems is considered, where each system has boom crane dynamics, as in [3]: the network can be thought as an abstraction of a cooperative lifting scenario where the boom cranes are mounted on one or more ships (Fig. 1). In addition to the sensors, actuators, and microcontrollers for crane control, a distributed implementation of such a control scenario would require to put in place a communication network among the cranes, e.g., via wireless nodes. Let us consider a graph, as in Fig. 1(b), where the directed spanning tree property in Assumption 1 holds.

For the system in Fig. 1, q_{1i} is the payload swing with respect to Y_s , ϑ_i is the ship roll angle caused by sea waves, μ_i is the

luffing angle of the boom, and L denotes the length of the rope. The length, mass, and moment of inertia of the boom are P_L , m , and J , respectively. The distance between the barycenter of the boom and the origin is denoted by d_s . The states of the crane system are $q_{1i} = \varrho_i - \vartheta_i$, $q_{2i} = \mu_i - \vartheta_i$, and $q_{3i} = L$ (q_{1i} is the nonactuated state, and q_{2i} and q_{3i} are the actuated states), leading to the dynamics as (1) with $n = 3$, $m = 2$, and

$$M_i = \begin{bmatrix} m_{pi} q_{3i}^2 & -m_{pi} P_L q_{3i} S_{21,i} & 0 \\ -m_{pi} P_L q_{3i} S_{21,i} & J_i + m_{pi} P_L^2 & -m_{pi} P_L C_{21,i} \\ 0 & -m_{pi} P_L C_{21,i} & m_{pi} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$C_i = \begin{bmatrix} m_{pi} q_{3i} \dot{q}_{3i} & -m_{pi} P_L q_{3i} C_{21,i} \dot{q}_{2i} & m_{pi} q_{3i} \dot{q}_{1i} \\ U_{3i} & 0 & -m_{pi} P_L S_{21,i} \dot{q}_{1i} \\ -m_{pi} q_{3i} \dot{q}_{1i} & m_{pi} P_L S_{21,i} \dot{q}_{2i} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$U_{3i} = -m_P P_L (S_{21,i} \dot{q}_{3i} - C_{21,i} q_{3i} \dot{q}_{1i}), \quad \tau_i = [\tau_{1i} \quad \tau_{2i}]$$

$$G_i = \begin{bmatrix} m_{pi} g a q_{2i} \sin(q_{1i}) \\ (m_{pi} P_L + m_i d_{si}) g a \cos(q_{2i}) \\ -m_{pi} g a \cos(q_{1i}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad q_i = \begin{bmatrix} q_{1i} \\ q_{2i} \\ q_{3i} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$H_i = \sum_{j=0}^N s_{ij} (q_i - q_j) + \sum_{j=0}^N \delta_{ij} (\dot{q}_i - \dot{q}_j)$$

with $S_{21,i} \triangleq \sin(q_{2i} - q_{1i})$, $C_{21,i} \triangleq \cos(q_{2i} - q_{1i})$, and $F_i = [F_{i1} \ F_{i2} \ F_{i3}]^T$, where $F_{i1}(\dot{q}_{1i}) \triangleq f_{i1} \tanh(f_{i2} \dot{q}_{1i}) - \tanh(f_{i3} \dot{q}_{1i}) + f_{i4} \tanh(f_{i5} \dot{q}_{1i}) + f_{i6} \dot{q}_{1i}$, $F_{i2}(\dot{q}_{2i}) \triangleq f_{i1} \tanh(f_{i2} \dot{q}_{2i}) - \tanh(f_{i3} \dot{q}_{2i}) + f_{i4} \tanh(f_{i5} \dot{q}_{2i}) + f_{i6} \dot{q}_{2i}$, $F_{i3}(\dot{q}_{3i}) \triangleq f_{i1} \tanh(f_{i2} \dot{q}_{3i}) - \tanh(f_{i3} \dot{q}_{3i}) + f_{i4} \tanh(f_{i5} \dot{q}_{3i}) + f_{i6} \dot{q}_{3i}$. The friction term F_i is taken in nonlinear-in-the-parameters form according to [45], whereas the interconnection term H_i follows a standard spring-damper model where s_{ij} is the stiffness parameter, and δ_{ij} is the damping factor (this can represent some interconnection among the cranes via the crane wires due to the load).

It is possible to verify [3] that Properties 1 and 2 hold for the system dynamics terms reported above. In addition, the strong inertial coupling condition, as in Assumption 2, is verified as the term $M_{aui} = [0 \quad -m_{pi} P_L C_{21,i}]$ does not lose rank in the operating range of interest (note that $\cos(\mu_i - \varrho_i) = 0$ never occurs for luffing angles and swing angles of interest). The goal is to bring the payload to a desired position defined by $q_{01} = 0$, $q_{02} = \arccos(a_L/P_L)$, $q_{03} = \sqrt{P_L^2 - a_L^2} - b_L$.

A. System Parameters (Uncertain) and Design Parameters

The following system parameters are only used for simulation purpose, but they are unknown for control design. The vector of (unknown) parameters in friction term is compactly represented as $\Theta_i = [f_{i1} \ f_{i2} \ f_{i3} \ f_{i4} \ f_{i5} \ f_{i6}]^T$, where

$$\Theta_1 = [0.5 \ 0.8 \ 0.9 \ 1.2 \ 0.5 \ 0.4]^T$$

$$\Theta_2 = [0.5 \ 0.7 \ 0.9 \ 1.0 \ 0.5 \ 0.4]^T$$

$$\Theta_3 = [0.3 \ 0.7 \ 0.7 \ 1.0 \ 0.7 \ 0.3]^T$$

$$\Theta_4 = [0.5 \ 0.9 \ 0.7 \ 1.2 \ 0.4 \ 0.5]^T$$




Fig. 2. Performance with proposed adaptive method. (a) States q_{1i}, q_{2i}, q_{3i} . (b) Synchronization errors e_{1i}, e_{2i}, e_{3i} . (c) Control inputs τ_{1i} and τ_{2i} . (d) Adaptive gains $\hat{\theta}_{li}$, $l = 0, 1, 2$.

$$\Theta_5 = [0.5 \ 0.8 \ 0.6 \ 1.3 \ 0.5 \ 0.6]^T$$

$$\Theta_6 = [0.6 \ 1.0 \ 0.9 \ 1.5 \ 0.2 \ 0.5]^T$$

$$\Theta_7 = [0.4 \ 1.0 \ 0.8 \ 1.2 \ 0.4 \ 0.8]^T.$$

According to interconnection network in Fig. 1(b), the spring-damper parameters are chosen as $s_{16} = s_{61} = 0.37$, $s_{46} = s_{64} = 0.29$ and $\delta_{16} = \delta_{61} = 25$, $\delta_{46} = \delta_{64} = 9$. The disturbance is $d_i(t) = 0.1 \sin(0.001it)[1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$.

To test the effect of heterogeneity in the agents, the physical parameters are chosen to be different for different agents

$$[m_1 \ m_2 \ m_3 \ m_4 \ m_5 \ m_6 \ m_7] = [20 \ 18 \ 15 \ 22 \ 17 \ 19 \ 16]$$

$$[m_{p1} \ m_{p2} \ m_{p3} \ m_{p4} \ m_{p5} \ m_{p6} \ m_{p7}] = [0.5 \ 0.6 \ 0.8 \ 0.6 \\ 0.4 \ 0.3 \ 0.5]$$

$$[J_1 \ J_2 \ J_3 \ J_4 \ J_5 \ J_6 \ J_7] = [6.5 \ 7.8 \ 5.3 \ 6.2 \ 7.2 \ 6.8 \ 6.6]$$

$$[d_{s1} \ d_{s2} \ d_{s3} \ d_{s4} \ d_{s5} \ d_{s6} \ d_{s7}] = [0.4 \ 0.6 \ 0.3 \ 0.1 \ 0.5 \ 0.2 \ 0.4].$$

The parameters $a_L = 0.4$ m, $b_L = 0.2$ m, and $P_L = 0.8$ m give the desired position $q_{01} = 0$, $q_{02} = 1.05$, $q_{03} = 0.5$.

The nominal parameters (used for control design of \hat{M}_s) are selected as $[\hat{m}_{p1} \ \hat{m}_{p2} \ \hat{m}_{p3} \ \hat{m}_{p4} \ \hat{m}_{p5} \ \hat{m}_{p6} \ \hat{m}_{p7}] = [0.45 \ 0.55 \ 0.75 \ 0.55 \ 0.35 \ 0.25 \ 0.45]$, $[\hat{J}_1 \ \hat{J}_2 \ \hat{J}_3 \ \hat{J}_4 \ \hat{J}_5 \ \hat{J}_6 \ \hat{J}_7] = [6 \ 7 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 6 \ 8]$. It can be verified that these nominal parameters make Assumption 3 hold with $\bar{T} = 0.5$. The control design parameters are $\Theta_{ai} = 335I_2$, $\Xi_{ai} = 0.003I_2$, $\Theta_{ui} = 0.03[1 \ 1]^T$, $\Xi_{ui} = 0.01[1 \ 1]^T$, $\Gamma_i = 0.01[1 \ 1]^T$, $Q_{ai} = 0.015I_2$, $Q_{ui} = 560I_2$, α_{li}

$$= 3.15, \chi_{li} = 0.01, \epsilon_0 = 0.001, \epsilon_1 = 0.003, \epsilon_2 = 0.015, \beta_i = 3150.$$

B. Simulation Results and Sensitivity Analysis

To validate the robustness of the proposed method in a statistical way, Fig. 2 provides the evolution of the closed-loop signals, averaged over 20 runs with random initial states $q_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.175^2)$, $q_{2i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.2^2)$, $q_{3i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.01^2)$. The states (with the angles reported in degrees for better understanding) and the corresponding synchronization errors are shown in Fig. 2(a) and (b), from which it can be seen that the errors converge to a neighborhood of zero for all runs. The control inputs are in Fig. 2(c), with the adaptive gains $\hat{\theta}_{li}$, $l = 0, 1, 2$ in Fig. 2(d). The control inputs converge to different values for different systems, due to the heterogeneity of the systems in terms of mass, inertia, friction, etc.

To validate the effect of choosing different parameters as in Remark 6, let us choose different ratios for α_{li}/χ_{li} in the adaptive law. Fig. 3 shows that the gains θ_{li} tend to grow larger as the ratio α_{li}/χ_{li} decreases (i.e., as the leakage decreases).

We then perform a sensitivity analysis with different disturbances d_i , namely, sinusoidal disturbances with different frequencies and Gaussian disturbances with different variances (with 100 realizations of the disturbances). For sinusoidal disturbances, Table I shows minor differences in terms of error and state norm. For Gaussian disturbances, Table II shows a




Fig. 3. Evolution of adaptive gains for different ratios of α_{li}/χ_{li} . (a) $\alpha_{li}/\chi_{li} = 50$. (b) $\alpha_{li}/\chi_{li} = 300$. (c) $\alpha_{li}/\chi_{li} = 500$.




Fig. 4. Performance with state-of-the-art sliding mode method. (a) States q_{1i}, q_{2i}, q_{3i} . (b) Synchronization errors e_{1i}, e_{2i}, e_{3i} . (c) Control inputs τ_{1i} and τ_{2i} . (d) Fixed gains $\hat{\theta}_{li}$, $l = 0, 1, 2$.

slight increase in the error norm as the variance increases. This validates the robustness of the proposed approach.

C. Comparisons With State-of-the-Art Methods

To validate the discussions in Remarks 7 and 8, we provide comparisons with state-of-the-art sliding mode control and adaptive sliding mode control. The former is obtained by fixing the gains $\hat{\theta}_{li}$ to be constant, whereas the latter is obtained by

removing the leakage from the adaptive law, so as to have monotonically increasing gains. Similar to the simulation results of the proposed method, Figs. 4 and 5 provide the evolution of the closed-loop signals, averaged over 20 runs with random initial states $q_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.175^2)$, $q_{2i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0.2, 0.2^2)$, $q_{3i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.01^2)$. Fig. 4(c) shows that sliding mode control requires unrealistically large control effort (10^{195}), while still getting large synchronization errors in Fig. 4(b) (except for the visible shading error in this plot, there are some agents whose




Fig. 5. Performance with state-of-the-art adaptive sliding mode method. (a) States q_{1i}, q_{2i}, q_{3i} . (b) Synchronization errors e_{1i}, e_{2i}, e_{3i} . (c) Control inputs τ_{1i} and τ_{2i} . (d) Adaptive gains $\hat{\theta}_{li}$, $l = 0, 1, 2$.

TABLE I

TRACKING ERROR L_2 NORM AND INPUT L_2 NORM FOR DIFFERENT SINUSOIDAL DISTURBANCES

Disturbance	Norm of error	Norm of input
$d_i(t) = 0.1 \sin(0.001it)$	82.73	2.56×10^4
$d_i(t) = 0.1 \sin(it)$	82.60	2.56×10^4
$d_i(t) = 0.1 \sin(100it)$	82.72	2.56×10^4

TABLE II

TRACKING ERROR L_2 NORM AND INPUT L_2 NORM FOR DIFFERENT GAUSSIAN DISTURBANCES

Disturbance	Norm of error	Norm of input
$d_i(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.03)$	82.73	2.56×10^4
$d_i(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.9)$	82.82	2.56×10^4
$d_i(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 10)$	83.22	2.56×10^4

error is too large to be seen due to out of scale in the plot). That is, the sliding mode control fails to achieve stability with reasonable control input.

Meanwhile, differently from the proposed method that is stable for every run, the state-of-the-art adaptive sliding mode control results in many unstable runs, so that we report only the stable runs. Thus, the errors reported in Fig. 5(b) are selected from the stable runs, showing that the performance of these selected runs is still not better than the proposed method. Most importantly, the state-of-the-art adaptive sliding mode control requires large inputs, Fig. 5(c), and the increasing adaptive gains $\hat{\theta}_{li}$ in Fig. 5(d). Thus, we conclude that the proposed method

overcomes state-of-the-art sliding mode and adaptive sliding mode methods in dealing with the problem at hand.

VII. CONCLUSION

This work has proposed for the first time an adaptive distributed protocol for synchronization of uncertain underactuated EL systems. The protocol can tackle not only unknown system terms but also uncertain state-dependent interconnections among agents. Handling all these aspects required a new stability analysis and a new design approach departing from state-of-the-art results not considering unknown parameters, unstructured uncertainty in the mass matrix, in the system terms and in the interconnections. In future work, it is of interest to further improve the method by considering nonholonomic constraints or by tackling more uncertainties in the mass matrix and in the network topology.

APPENDIX A STABILITY ANALYSIS

Proof: Construct a Lyapunov function

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \omega_{ai}^T(t) P_{ai} \omega_{ai}(t) + \omega_{ui}^T(t) P_{ui} \omega_{ui}(t) \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{1}{\chi_{li}} (\hat{\theta}_{li}(t) - \bar{\theta}_{li})^2 + \frac{\gamma_i^2(t)}{\epsilon_0} \right\} \quad (28)$$

where $\bar{\theta}_{li} = \max\{\theta_{li}, \theta'_{li}\}$, $l = 0, 1, 2$.

The proof is organized in three steps as follows.

- 1) The bound of uncertainty for the overall network is calculated.
- 2) Based on such overall uncertainty bound, we calculate the time derivative of the Lyapunov function.
- 3) Based on different regions of saturation function $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi)$, we study the behavior of the Lyapunov function for three possible scenarios.

Combining all the results, we finally obtain a uniform ultimate bound on the actuated error ω_{ai} and on the nonactuated error ω_{ui} .

1) *Overall Uncertainty Term:*

According to (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} \dot{\omega}_{ai} &= \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} \left\{ A_{ai} \omega_{ai} + B_1 \left[-(I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j + \psi_{ij} \right] \right\} \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \omega_{ai}^T Q_{ai} \omega_{ai} + \|\omega_{ai}^T\| \|P_{ai} B_1\| \|\psi_{ij}\| \\ &\quad - \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Analogously, according to (19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} \dot{\omega}_{ui} &= \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} \left\{ A_{ui} \omega_{ui} + B_2 \left[M_{ui}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \bar{\tau}_i \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} M_{ui}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) \bar{\tau}_j + \psi'_{ij} \right] \right\} \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \omega_{ui}^T Q_{ui} \omega_{ui} + \|\omega_{ui}^T\| \|P_{ui} B_2\| \|\psi'_{ij}\| \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \\ &\quad + \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Adding (29) and (30), combined with (23)–(25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} \dot{\omega}_{ai} + \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} \dot{\omega}_{ui} &\leq -\lambda_{mi} [\|\omega_{ai}\|^2 + \|\omega_{ui}\|^2] + \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} [\bar{\varphi}_{1j} \|\xi_j\| + \bar{\varphi}_{2j} \|\xi_j\|^2] (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \\ &\quad - \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \\ &\quad + \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \\ &+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\lambda_{mi} = \min\{\lambda_{\min}(Q_{ai})/2, \lambda_{\min}(Q_{ui})/2\}$, $\bar{\varphi}_{1j} = \max\{\varphi_{1j}, \varphi'_{1j}\}$, $\bar{\varphi}_{2j} = \max\{\varphi_{2j}, \varphi'_{2j}\}$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.

Next, we will analyze the last three terms in (31) by using the inequality $\|\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi)\| \leq 1$. From the input–output property of the adaptive law in (27), it can be verified that

$$\hat{\theta}_{li} \leq \bar{\theta}_{li} + \check{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \quad (32a)$$

$$\gamma \leq \check{\gamma}_i + \check{\gamma}_i (\|S_i\| + \|\xi_i\|). \quad (32b)$$

with $\check{\theta}_{li}, \check{\gamma}_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $l = 0, 1, 2$.

Using (32), together with $\|\omega_{ai}\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$ and $\|\omega_{ui}\| \leq \|\xi_i\|$, the following can be obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \\ &\leq \bar{T}_{1i} \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \right] \|\omega_{ui}^T\| \\ &\leq \bar{T}_{1i} \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^2 \check{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^{l+1} + \check{\theta}_{li} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\|^{2l+2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \check{\gamma}_i \|\xi_i\| + \check{\gamma}_i (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\|^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\bar{T}_{1i} = \frac{(1+\bar{T})\|P_{ui} B_2\| \|M_{ui}^{-1} M_{au}\|}{(1-\bar{T})}$.

In an analogous way, the following can be obtained

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{T}_{2j} \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{lj} \|\xi_j\|^l + \gamma_j \right] \|\omega_{ui}^T\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{T}_{2j} \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^2 \check{\theta}_{lj} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^l + \check{\gamma}_j (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \check{\gamma}_j \|\xi_i\| + \check{\theta}_{lj} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^{2l+1} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\bar{T}_{2j} = \frac{\bar{a}_{ij}(1+\bar{T})\|P_{ui} B_2\| \|M_{ui}^{-1} M_{auj}\|}{(1-\bar{T})}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{T}_{3j} \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{lj} \|\xi_j\|^l + \gamma_j \right] \|\omega_{ai}^T\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{T}_{3j} \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^2 \check{\theta}_{lj} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^l + \check{\gamma}_j (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \check{\gamma}_j \|\xi_i\| + \check{\theta}_{lj} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^{2l+1} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $\bar{T}_{3j} = \frac{(1+\bar{T})\|P_{ai}B_1\|}{(1-\bar{T})}$. Using (33)–(35), the following aggregate term Ψ_{ij} can be defined from (31)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Psi_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} [\bar{\varphi}_{1j} \|\xi_j\| + \bar{\varphi}_{2j} \|\xi_j\|^2] (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \\
& + \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{au} (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \\
& + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ui}^T P_{ui} B_2 M_{ui}^{-1} M_{auj} (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \\
& + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \bar{a}_{ij} \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_j) \rho_j \text{sat}(S_j, \varphi) \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \check{\theta}_{2j} (\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j}) (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^5 \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_{1i} \check{\theta}_{2i} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\|^6 \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \check{\theta}_{1j} (\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j}) (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^3 \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{T}_{1i} \check{\theta}_{1i} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \|\xi_i\|^4 + \bar{T}_{1i} \check{\theta}_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^3 \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \left[2\bar{\varphi}_{2j} + (\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j}) \check{\theta}_{2j} \right] \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^2 \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \left\{ 2\bar{\varphi}_{1j} + (\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j}) [\check{\theta}_{0j} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \right. \\
& \left. + \check{\theta}_{1j}] \right\} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\| + \left\{ \bar{T}_{1i} [\check{\theta}_{0i} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) + \check{\theta}_{1i}] \right. \\
& \left. + \check{\gamma}_i (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) + \check{\gamma}_j (\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j}) (1 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \right\} \|\xi_i\|^2 \\
& + [\bar{T}_{1i} (\check{\theta}_{0i} + \check{\gamma}_i) + (\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j}) (\check{\gamma}_j + \check{\theta}_{0j})] \|\xi_i\|. \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

2) Time Derivative of the Lyapunov Function Based on Uncertainty Bound:

Up to now, we have calculated the time derivative of the first line in (28). We will proceed with the time derivative of the other terms. Using the adaptive laws (27a)–(27c), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{1}{\chi_{li}} (\hat{\theta}_{li} - \bar{\theta}_{li}) \dot{\hat{\theta}}_{li} = \sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{1}{\chi_{li}} (\hat{\theta}_{li} - \bar{\theta}_{li}) \left[\chi_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| \right. \\
& \left. + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l - \alpha_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \hat{\theta}_{li} \right] \\
& = \sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
& - \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
& + \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li} \bar{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_{li} = \alpha_{li}/\chi_{li}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\gamma_i \dot{\gamma}_i}{\epsilon_0} &= \frac{\gamma_i}{\epsilon_0} \left\{ -[\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) + \epsilon_2 \|\xi_i\|] \gamma_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \epsilon_0 (\|S_i\| + \|\xi_i\|) + \beta_i \right\} \\
&= -\gamma_i^2 \left[1 + \bar{\epsilon}_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) + \bar{\epsilon}_2 \|\xi_i\| \right] \\
&\quad + \gamma_i (\|S_i\| + \|\xi_i\|) + \gamma_i \bar{\beta}_i \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\epsilon}_1 = \frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_0}$, $\bar{\epsilon}_2 = \frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_0}$, $\bar{\beta}_i = \frac{\beta_i}{\epsilon_0}$. Using (31), (36), and (37)–(38), the time derivative of V satisfies &

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} &\leq - \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_{mi} [\|\omega_{ai}\|^2 + \|\omega_{ui}\|^2] + \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \\
&\quad - \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Psi_{ij} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\| + \|S_i\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l + \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i (\|S_i\| + \|\xi_i\|) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li} \bar{\theta}_{li} (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \bar{\beta}_i \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \left[1 + \bar{\epsilon}_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) + \bar{\epsilon}_2 \|\xi_i\| \right] \\
&\leq - \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_{mi} [\|\omega_{ai}\|^2 + \|\omega_{ui}\|^2] - \gamma_i^2 \bar{\epsilon}_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) \\
&\quad - \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Psi_{ij} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \left[\hat{\theta}_{li} - \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li} \bar{\theta}_{li} \right] (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \bar{\theta}_{li} \|S_i\| \|\xi_i\|^l + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \right] \|S_i\| \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\gamma_i \bar{\beta}_i - \gamma_i^2 (1 + \bar{\epsilon}_2 \|\xi_i\|) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \|\xi_i\|. \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

The following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=0}^2 \left[\hat{\theta}_{li} - \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \bar{\alpha}_{li} \hat{\theta}_{li} \bar{\theta}_{li} \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{l=0}^2 -\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 - \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \left(\hat{\theta}_{li} + \frac{3}{2\bar{\alpha}_{li}} \right)^2 - \frac{3}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}^2} \right] \\
& \quad - \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \left(\hat{\theta}_{li} - \frac{3}{2\bar{\alpha}_{li}} \bar{\theta}_{li} \right)^2 - \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{li}^2}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}^2} \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{l=0}^2 \left[-\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \frac{3}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{li}^2}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} \right]. \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^N -\gamma_i^2 (1 + \bar{\epsilon}_2 \|\xi_i\|) + \gamma_i \bar{\beta}_i + \gamma_i \|\xi_i\| \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^N -\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| \gamma_i^2 - \left\{ \left[\gamma_i - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\beta}_i \right]^2 - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\beta}_i^2 \right\} \\
& \quad - \frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| \left\{ \left[\gamma_i - \frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}_2} \right]^2 - \frac{1}{2\bar{\epsilon}_2^2} \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left[-\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| \gamma_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\beta}_i^2 + \frac{1}{4\bar{\epsilon}_2} \|\xi_i\| \right]. \quad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the adaptive law (27b), there exist $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\gamma_i > \gamma_i^*$. Substituting (40)–(41) into (39), yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \dot{V} \\
& \leq - \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_{mi} [\|\omega_{ai}\|^2 + \|\omega_{ui}\|^2] - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \bar{\epsilon}_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \left[-\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \frac{3}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{li}^2}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} \right] (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[-\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| \gamma_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\beta}_i^2 + \frac{1}{4\bar{\epsilon}_2} \|\xi_i\| \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Psi_{ij} \\
& \quad - \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1 (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \right] \|S_i\|. \quad (42)
\end{aligned}$$

3) Behavior of the Lyapunov Function on Saturation Regions:

Based on the saturation $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi)$, we study the behavior of the Lyapunov function along three scenarios similar to [33].

- *Scenario 1:* $\|S_i\| \geq \varphi, i = 1, \dots, N$.

In this scenario, we have $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) = \frac{S_i}{\|S_i\|}$. According to (26), we obtain the following as $S_i^T = \omega_{ai}^T P_{ai} B_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& -S_i^T (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \leq - \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - \bar{T}) \frac{S_i^T S_i}{\|S_i\|} \rho_i \\
& \leq - \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \right] \|S_i\|. \quad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

Using (43), the time derivative (42) is simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} & \leq - \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_{mi} [\|\omega_{ai}\|^2 + \|\omega_{ui}\|^2] \\
& \quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \bar{\epsilon}_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \left[-\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \frac{3}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{li}^2}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} \right] \\
& \quad \times (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[-\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| \gamma_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\beta}_i^2 + \frac{1}{4\bar{\epsilon}_2} \|\xi_i\| \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Psi_{ij}. \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

The definition of the Lyapunov function (28) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
V & \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_{Mi} (\|\omega_{ai}\|^2 + \|\omega_{ui}\|^2) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{1}{\chi_{li}} \left(\hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \bar{\theta}_{li}^2 \right) + \frac{\gamma_i^2}{\epsilon_0} \right] \quad (45)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{Mi} = \max\{\lambda_{\max}(P_{ai})/2, \lambda_{\max}(P_{ui})/2\}$. Define $\zeta = \frac{\min_i \{\lambda_{Mi}\}}{\max_i \{\lambda_{Mi}\}}$. Substituting (45) into (44) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} & \leq -\zeta V + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{\zeta}{\chi_{li}} \left(\hat{\theta}_{li}^2 + \bar{\theta}_{li}^2 \right) + \frac{\zeta \gamma_i^2}{\epsilon_0} \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \left\{ -\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 (\|\omega_{ai}\|^{l+1} + \|\omega_{ui}\|^{l+1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(\frac{3}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{li}^2}{4\bar{\alpha}_{li}} \right) (\|\omega_{ai}\| + \|\omega_{ui}\|) \|\xi_i\|^l \right\} \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[-\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| \gamma_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} \bar{\beta}_i^2 + \frac{1}{4\bar{\epsilon}_2} \|\xi_i\| \right] \\
& \quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \bar{\epsilon}_1 (\|\xi_i\|^7 - \|\xi_i\|^5) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \Psi_{ij} \\
& \leq -\zeta V - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} (\|\omega_{ai}\|^{l+1} + \|\omega_{ui}\|^{l+1}) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{\zeta}{\chi_{li}}] - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| - \frac{\zeta}{\epsilon_0} \right] + Z_1(\|\xi\|). \quad (46)$$

According to (36),

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1(\|\xi\|) \triangleq & \sum_{i=1}^N -\bar{\epsilon}_1 \gamma_i^2 \|\xi_i\|^7 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_{11} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^5 + \sum_{i=1}^N c_6 \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N c_{12} \|\xi_i\|^6 + \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\epsilon}_1 \gamma_i^2 \|\xi_i\|^5 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_{21} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^3 \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N c_{22} \|\xi_i\|^4 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_{31} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N c_{32} \|\xi_i\|^3 \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_{41} \|\xi_i\| \|\xi_j\| + \sum_{i=1}^N c_{42} \|\xi_i\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N c_5 \|\xi_i\| \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11} &= \bar{\theta}_{2j} \left(\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j} \right) (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \\ c_{12} &= \bar{T}_{1i} \bar{\theta}_{2i} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|), \quad c_6 = \frac{1}{4} \bar{\beta}_i^2 + \zeta \bar{\theta}_{li}^2 \\ c_{21} &= \bar{\theta}_{1j} \left(\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j} \right) (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) \\ c_{22} &= \bar{T}_{1i} \bar{\theta}_{1i} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \\ c_{31} &= 2\bar{\varphi}_{2j} + \left(\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j} \right) \bar{\theta}_{2j} \\ c_{32} &= 2 \left(\frac{3}{4\alpha_{2i}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{2i}^2}{4\alpha_{2i}} \right) + \bar{T}_{1i} \bar{\theta}_{2i} \\ c_{41} &= 2\bar{\varphi}_{1j} + \left(\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j} \right) \left[\bar{\theta}_{0j} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{aj}\|) + \bar{\theta}_{1j} \right] \\ c_{42} &= 2 \left(\frac{3}{4\alpha_{1i}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{1i}^2}{4\alpha_{1i}} \right) + \bar{T}_{1i} \left[\bar{\theta}_{0i} (2 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) + \bar{\theta}_{1i} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \bar{\gamma}_i (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \bar{\gamma}_j \left(\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j} \right) (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \right] \\ c_5 &= \bar{T}_{1i} \left(\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \bar{\gamma}_i \right) + \left(\bar{T}_{2j} + \bar{T}_{3j} \right) \left(\bar{\gamma}_j + \bar{\theta}_{0j} \right) \\ & \quad + 2 \left(\frac{3}{4\alpha_{0i}} + \frac{3\bar{\theta}_{0i}^2}{4\alpha_{0i}} \right) + \frac{1}{4\bar{\varphi}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Descartes' rules of sign change and Bolzano's Theorem [46], the polynomial Z_1 has exactly one positive real root $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The coefficient of the highest degree of Z_1 is negative as $-\gamma_i^2 \bar{\epsilon}_1$. Therefore, $Z_1(\|\xi\|) \leq 0$ when $\|\xi\| \geq \eta_1$, where $\xi = [\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N]^T$. Define $\iota_1 = \frac{3\zeta}{2\chi_{0i}\bar{\alpha}_{0i}}$, $\iota_2 = \sqrt{\frac{3\zeta}{2\chi_{1i}\bar{\alpha}_{1i}}}$, $\iota_3 = \left(\frac{3\zeta}{2\chi_{2i}\bar{\alpha}_{2i}} \right)^{1/3}$, and $\iota_4 = \frac{2\zeta}{\bar{\epsilon}_2}$. According to (46), $\dot{V} \leq -\zeta V$ when

$$\min\{\|\omega_{ai}\|, \|\omega_{ui}\|, \|\xi_i\|\} \geq \max\{\eta_1, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\}$$

$$\Rightarrow \min\{\|\omega_{ai}\|, \|\omega_{ui}\|\} \geq \max\{\eta_1, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\}. \quad (47)$$

- **Scenario 2:** $\|S_i\| < \varphi$, $i = 1, \dots, N$.
In this scenario, $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) = \frac{S_i}{\varphi}$. Using (26), we have

$$-\sum_{i=1}^N S_i^T (I_m + T_i) \rho_i \text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) \leq 0. \quad (48)$$

Substituting (48) into (42) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} \leq & -\zeta V - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} (\|\omega_{ai}\|^{l+1} \right. \\ & \left. + \|\omega_{ui}\|^{l+1}) - \frac{\zeta}{\chi_{li}} \right] \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| - \frac{\zeta}{\epsilon_0} \right] + Z_1(\|\xi\|) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \right] \|S_i\|. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

According to (32), together with $\|S_i\| < \varphi$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li} \|\xi_i\|^l + \gamma_i \right] \|S_i\| \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \varphi \bar{\theta}_{0i} + \varphi \bar{\gamma}_i \right) + \bar{\gamma}_i (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \varphi \\ & + \left(2\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \bar{\theta}_{1i} \right) \|\xi_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\varphi \bar{\theta}_{1i} + \bar{\theta}_{1i} \right] \|\xi_i\|^2 \\ & + 2\bar{\theta}_{1i} \|\xi_i\|^3 + \varphi \bar{\theta}_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^4 + \sum_{i=1}^N 2\bar{\theta}_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^5. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Substituting (50) into (49) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} \leq & -\zeta V - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} (\|\omega_{ai}\|^{l+1} \right. \\ & \left. + \|\omega_{ui}\|^{l+1}) - \frac{\zeta}{\chi_{li}} \right] \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| - \frac{\zeta}{\epsilon_0} \right] + Z_2(\|\xi\|) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

with $Z_2(\|\xi\|) = Z_1(\|\xi\|) + \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \varphi \bar{\theta}_{0i} + \varphi \bar{\gamma}_i) + \bar{\gamma}_i (1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|) \varphi + (2\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \bar{\theta}_{1i}) \|\xi_i\| + \sum_{i=1}^N [\varphi \bar{\theta}_{1i} + \bar{\theta}_{1i}] \|\xi_i\|^2 + 2\bar{\theta}_{1i} \|\xi_i\|^3 + \varphi \bar{\theta}_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^4 + \sum_{i=1}^N 2\bar{\theta}_{2i} \|\xi_i\|^5$.

Analogously to Scenario 1, $\dot{V} \leq -\zeta V$ when

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{\|\omega_{ai}\|, \|\omega_{ui}\|, \|\xi_i\|\} & \geq \max\{\eta_2, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\} \\ \Rightarrow \min\{\|\omega_{ai}\|, \|\omega_{ui}\|\} & \geq \max\{\eta_2, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where η_2 is the positive real root of Z_2 such that $Z_2(\|\xi\|) \leq 0$ when $\|\xi\| \geq \eta_2$.

- **Scenario 3:** Without loss of generality, consider $\|S_i\| \geq \varphi$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $\|S_i\| < \varphi$ for $i = k+1, \dots, N$,

where $1 \leq k \leq N-1$. For $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) = \frac{S_i}{\|S_i\|}$. For $i = k+1, \dots, N$, $\text{sat}(S_i, \varphi) = \frac{S_i}{\varphi}$. Similarly to Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} \leq & -\zeta V - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^2 \hat{\theta}_{li}^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{li}}{3} (\|\omega_{ai}\|^{l+1} \right. \\ & \left. + \|\omega_{ui}\|^{l+1}) - \frac{\zeta}{\chi_{li}} \right] \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^2 \left[\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_2}{2} \|\xi_i\| - \frac{\zeta}{\epsilon_0} \right] + Z_3(\|\xi\|) \quad (53) \end{aligned}$$

with $Z_3(\|\xi\|) = Z_1(\|\xi\|) + \sum_{i=k+1}^N (\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \varphi \bar{\theta}_{0i} + \varphi \bar{\gamma}_i) + \bar{\gamma}_i(1 + \|B_1^T P_{ai}\|)\varphi + (2\bar{\theta}_{0i} + \bar{\theta}_{1i})\|\xi_i\| + \sum_{i=k+1}^N [\varphi \bar{\theta}_{1i} + \bar{\theta}_{1i}]\|\xi_i\|^2 + 2\bar{\theta}_{1i}\|\xi_i\|^3 + \varphi \bar{\theta}_{2i}\|\xi_i\|^4 + \sum_{i=k+1}^N 2\bar{\theta}_{2i}\|\xi_i\|^5$. Analogously to Scenario 1, $\dot{V} \leq -\zeta V$ when

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{\|\omega_{ai}\|, \|\omega_{ui}\|, \|\xi_i\|\} & \geq \max\{\eta_3, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\} \\ \Rightarrow \min\{\|\omega_{ai}\|, \|\omega_{ui}\|\} & \geq \max\{\eta_3, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\} \quad (54) \end{aligned}$$

where η_3 is the positive real root of Z_3 such that $Z_3(\|\xi\|) \leq 0$ when $\|\xi\| \geq \eta_3$.

Finally, combining (47) in Scenario 1 with (52) in Scenario 2 and (54) in Scenario 3, we obtain $\omega_{ui}, \omega_{ai} \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$ when $\|\xi\| \geq \max\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \iota_1, \iota_2, \iota_3, \iota_4\}$, which leads to $e_u, e_a \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Both the local actuated synchronization error and local nonactuated synchronization error are thus proved to reach UUB. According to (9) in Lemma 1, the global synchronization errors δ_u, δ_a are also uniformly ultimately bounded. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. W. Grizzle, G. Abba, and F. Plestan, "Asymptotically stable walking for biped robots: Analysis via systems with impulse effects," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 51–64, Jan. 2001.
- [2] N. Sun, Y. Fang, and X. Zhang, "Energy coupling output feedback control of 4-DOF underactuated cranes with saturated inputs," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 1318–1325, 2013.
- [3] B. Lu, Y. Fang, N. Sun, and X. Wang, "Antiswing control of offshore boom cranes with ship roll disturbances," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 740–747, Mar. 2018.
- [4] F. Valentini, A. Donaire, and T. Perez, "Energy-based guidance of an underactuated unmanned underwater vehicle on a helical trajectory," *Control Eng. Pract.*, vol. 44, pp. 138–156, 2015.
- [5] A. Abdessameud, I. G. Polushin, and A. Tayebi, "Motion coordination of thrust-propelled underactuated vehicles with intermittent and delayed communications," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 79, pp. 15–22, 2015.
- [6] A. Shkolnik and R. Tedrake, "High-dimensional underactuated motion planning via task space control," in *Proc. IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intell. Robots Syst.*, 2008, pp. 3762–3768.
- [7] R. Olfati-Saber, "Normal forms for underactuated mechanical systems with symmetry," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 305–308, Feb. 2002.
- [8] M. W. Spong, "Partial feedback linearization of underactuated mechanical systems," in *Proc. IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intell. Robots Syst.*, 1994, pp. 314–321.
- [9] J. A. Acosta, R. Ortega, A. Astolfi, and A. D. Mahindrakar, "Interconnection and damping assignment passivity-based control of mechanical systems with underactuation degree one," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 1936–1955, Dec. 2005.
- [10] R. Ortega, M. W. Spong, F. Gómez-Estern, and G. Blankenstein, "Stabilization of a class of underactuated mechanical systems via interconnection and damping assignment," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1218–1233, Aug. 2002.
- [11] G. Hu, C. Makkar, and W. E. Dixon, "Energy-based nonlinear control of underactuated Euler–Lagrange systems subject to impacts," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1742–1748, Sep. 2007.
- [12] D. N. Cardoso, S. Esteban, and G. V. Raffo, "A robust optimal control approach in the weighted Sobolev space for underactuated mechanical systems," *Automatica*, vol. 125, 2021, Art. no. 109474.
- [13] A. R. Ansari and T. D. Murphey, "Sequential action control: Closed-form optimal control for nonlinear and nonsmooth systems," *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 1196–1214, Oct. 2016.
- [14] A. Kimmel, A. Sintov, J. Tan, B. Wen, A. Boularias, and K. E. Bekris, "Belief-space planning using learned models with application to underactuated hands," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Robot. Res.*, T. Asfour, E. Yoshida, J. Park, H. Christensen, and O. Khatib, Eds. Cham: Springer, 2022, pp. 642–659.
- [15] H. Ashrafiuon and R. S. Erwin, "Sliding mode control of underactuated multibody systems and its application to shape change control," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 81, no. 12, pp. 1849–1858, 2008.
- [16] R. Xu and Ü. Özgüner, "Sliding mode control of a class of underactuated systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 233–241, 2008.
- [17] B. Lu, Y. Fang, and N. Sun, "Continuous sliding mode control strategy for a class of nonlinear underactuated systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 3471–3478, Oct. 2018.
- [18] J. Huang, S. Ri, T. Fukuda, and Y. Wang, "A disturbance observer based sliding mode control for a class of underactuated robotic system with mismatched uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 2480–2487, Jun. 2019.
- [19] M. W. Spong, S. Hutchinson, and M. Vidyasagar, *Robot Modeling and Control*, vol. 3. New York, NY, USA: Wiley, 2006.
- [20] Y. Shtessel, M. Taleb, and F. Plestan, "A novel adaptive-gain supertwisting sliding mode controller: Methodology and application," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 759–769, 2012.
- [21] F. Plestan, Y. Shtessel, V. Bregeault, and A. Poznyak, "New methodologies for adaptive sliding mode control," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 83, no. 9, pp. 1907–1919, 2010.
- [22] J. Mei, W. Ren, and G. Ma, "Distributed coordinated tracking with a dynamic leader for multiple Euler–Lagrange systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 1415–1421, Jun. 2011.
- [23] M. Lu, L. Liu, and G. Feng, "Adaptive tracking control of uncertain Euler–Lagrange systems subject to external disturbances," *Automatica*, vol. 104, pp. 207–219, 2019.
- [24] M. Gnucci and R. Marino, "Adaptive tracking control for underactuated mechanical systems with relative degree two," *Automatica*, vol. 129, 2021, Art. no. 109633.
- [25] Y. Fang, B. Ma, P. Wang, and X. Zhang, "A motion planning-based adaptive control method for an underactuated crane system," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 241–248, Jan. 2012.
- [26] B. S. Park, J.-W. Kwon, and H. Kim, "Neural network-based output feedback control for reference tracking of underactuated surface vessels," *Automatica*, vol. 77, pp. 353–359, 2017.
- [27] O. Kolesnichenko and A. S. Shiriaev, "Partial stabilization of underactuated Euler–Lagrange systems via a class of feedback transformations," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 121–132, 2002.
- [28] J. W. Simpson-Porco, F. Dörfler, and F. Bullo, "Synchronization and power sharing for droop-controlled inverters in islanded microgrids," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2603–2611, 2013.
- [29] T. Tao, S. Roy, and S. Baldi, "Stable adaptation in multi-area load frequency control under dynamically-changing topologies," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 2946–2956, Jul. 2021.
- [30] L. Zhu and D. J. Hill, "Synchronization of Kuramoto oscillators: A regional stability framework," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 5070–5082, Dec. 2020.
- [31] D. Chowdhury and H. K. Khalil, "Practical synchronization in networks of nonlinear heterogeneous agents with application to power systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 184–198, Jan. 2021.
- [32] H. Zhang and F. L. Lewis, "Adaptive cooperative tracking control of higher-order nonlinear systems with unknown dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 1432–1439, 2012.
- [33] Z. Li, Z. Duan, and F. L. Lewis, "Distributed robust consensus control of multi-agent systems with heterogeneous matching uncertainties," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 883–889, 2014.

- [34] J. Huang, W. Wang, C. Wen, J. Zhou, and G. Li, "Distributed adaptive leader-follower and leaderless consensus control of a class of strict-feedback nonlinear systems: A unified approach," *Automatica*, vol. 118, 2020, Art. no. 109021.
- [35] B. C. Gruenewald, E. Arabi, T. Yucelen, A. Chakravarthy, and D. McNeely, "Decentralised adaptive architectures for control of large-scale active-passive modular systems with stability and performance guarantees," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 93, no. 3, pp. 490–504, 2020.
- [36] Y. Tang, M. Tomizuka, G. Guerrero, and G. Montemayor, "Decentralized robust control of mechanical systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 771–776, Apr. 2000.
- [37] B. Lu and Y. Fang, "Gain-adapting coupling control for a class of underactuated mechanical systems," *Automatica*, vol. 125, 2021, Art. no. 109461.
- [38] S. Roy, S. Baldi, and L. M. Fridman, "On adaptive sliding mode control without a priori bounded uncertainty," *Automatica*, vol. 111, 2020, Art. no. 108650.
- [39] F. L. Lewis, D. Dawson, and C. T. Abdallah, *Control of Robot Manipulators*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- [40] R. Ortega, J. A. L. Perez, P. J. Nicklasson, and H. J. Sira-Ramirez, *Passivity-Based Control of Euler-Lagrange Systems: Mechanical, Electrical and Electromechanical Applications*. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 2013.
- [41] J. G. Romero, A. Donaire, R. Ortega, and P. Borja, "Global stabilisation of underactuated mechanical systems via PID passivity-based control," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 178–185, 2018.
- [42] M. W. Spong, "Underactuated mechanical systems," in *Control Problems in Robotics and Automation*. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 1998, pp. 135–150.
- [43] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [44] P. A. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust Adaptive Control*. Chelmsford, MA, USA: Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [45] C. Makkar, G. Hu, W. G. Sawyer, and W. E. Dixon, "Lyapunov-based tracking control in the presence of uncertain nonlinear parameterizable friction," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 1988–1994, Oct. 2007.
- [46] S. Russ, "A translation of Bolzano's paper on the intermediate value theorem," *Historia Mathematica*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 156–185, 1980.



Tian Tao received the B.S. degree in electrical engineering and automation from Wuhan Polytechnic University, Wuhan, China in 2013, the M.S. degree in automation engineering from the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China, in 2018, and the Ph.D. degree in systems and control from the Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands, in 2023.

Her research interests include adaptive switched control with applications in networked systems.



Spandan Roy received the B.Tech. degree in electronics and communication engineering from Techno India (Salt Lake), West Bengal University of Technology, Kolkata, West Bengal, India, in 2011, the M.Tech. degree in mechatronics from the Academy of Scientific and Innovative Research, New Delhi, Delhi, India, in 2013, and the Ph.D. degree in control and automation from the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, New Delhi, Delhi, India, in 2018.

In 2018–2019, he was a Postdoc with Delft Center for System and Control, TU Delft, Delft, The Netherlands. He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Robotics Research Center, International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad, Hyderabad, Telangana, India. His research interests include artificial delay control, adaptive-robust control, switched systems, Euler–Lagrange systems.



Bart De Schutter (Fellow, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in applied sciences (summa cum laude with congratulations of the examination jury) from KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, in 1996.

He is currently a Full Professor and head of department with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands. His research interests include multilevel and distributed control, control of discrete-event and hybrid systems, intelligent transportation systems and smart infrastructure networks.

Dr. Schutter is a Senior Editor for IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS and an Associate Editor for IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON AUTOMATIC CONTROL.



Simone Baldi (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. degree in electrical engineering, the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in automatic control engineering from the University of Florence, Florence, Italy, in 2005, 2007, and 2011.

In 2014–2019, he was an Assistant Professor with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, TU Delft, Delft, The Netherlands. Since 2019, he has been a Professor with the School of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing, China. His research interests include adaptive

and learning systems with applications in unmanned vehicles and smart energy systems.

Dr. Baldi was the recipient of the outstanding reviewer award for *Automatica* in 2017. He is a Subject Editor for *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, Technical Editor for IEEE/ASME TRANSACTIONS ON MECHATRONICS, Associate Editor for *IEEE Control Systems Letters* and *Journal of the Franklin Institute*.