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This project surveys nonlinear analysis and control methods for a specific two-degree-of-freedom analytical delta wing model. Linearization, phase plane analysis and existence theorems are used to describe the overall system behavior without solving the differential equations. A describing function is developed for the nonlinear system and favorably compares to the actual limit cycle amplitudes and frequencies. Linear pole placement and Ricatti control methods and nonlinear sliding mode and Lyapunov control laws are developed for stabilization and tracking.

Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Roll Moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_L$</td>
<td>Roll Moment Coefficient (L/Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q$</td>
<td>Moment Non-Dimensionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>Pitch Angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Roll Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>Pitch Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>Yaw Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Angle of Attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Sideslip Angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Wing Span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>Chord Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_0$</td>
<td>Body Axis Moment Of Inertia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

Delta wing at high pitch angles exhibit nonlinear roll behavior. The nonlinear behavior comes from nonlinear aerodynamics resulting from axial vortical flow. The typical symptom found by an aircraft designer is wing rock, an undesirable limit cycle in roll.

This project numerically analyzes a two degree of freedom delta wing model. Aircraft equations of motion are reviewed to compare the selected model with actual physics and aerodynamics. The objective is to select an analytical governing equation for the rolling motion and analyze the model with tools available in the phase plane. A control section will evaluate linear and nonlinear control schemes for roll stabilization and tracking.

Aircraft Equations of Motion

The governing aircraft equations of motion are Newton’s Second Law in a body fixed reference frame.7 Adding the body fixed reference frame frees the analysis from time-varying body properties at the expense of nonlinear equations of motion. Conversion between the body fixed and inertial reference frame is through Euler angles—three order-dependent successive rotations. For this paper, only the roll degree of freedom is considered. The general aircraft equation of motion in the roll axis is:1

$$I_0 \ddot{\phi} - I_{12} \dot{\theta} - (I_x - I_y) q r - I_{23} p q = L$$

The yaw and pitch rates are fixed at zero. Substituting the Euler roll angle, $\Phi = p \dot{\phi}$, yields a single second order differential equation for roll angle.

$$I_0 \ddot{\phi} = L \tag{1}$$

The aerodynamics enter the motion through the moment $L$. $L$ is a complicated function of the body fixed orientation with respect to the freestream velocity vector. For a general derivation, the Euler Angles are converted into the body fixed reference frame. The body fixed velocity vector orientation with respect to the Euler orientation angles is:

$$\alpha = \arctan(\tan \theta_0 \cos \phi)$$

$$\beta = \arcsin(\sin \theta_0 \sin \phi)$$

$$\beta = \phi(\sin \theta_0 \sin \phi) / \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi}$$

Knowing the freestream velocity vector allows for computing the roll moment $L$ while preserving the body fixed reference frame.

Delta Wing Aerodynamics

Delta wing aerodynamics at high angles of attack are primarily dominated by axial vortices emanating off the leading edge. Experiments2 and theoretical reviews3 explain some of the aerodynamic mechanisms responsible for the nonlinear behavior.

General Aerodynamic Model

A general aerodynamic model is complicated. Conceptually, the aerodynamic roll moment depends on the freestream velocity vector in the body fixed frame. The conceptual roll moment is probably of the form:

$$L/Q = C_L = f(\alpha, \beta)$$

Any physically consistent model will need these terms. From the previous section, it is seen that the relationship between the freestream orientation and the Euler angles is complicated. Incompressible aerodynamic theory predicts that aerodynamic forces result from motion terms up to acceleration, so the Euler angle relationships up to acceleration will be required.

Selected Aerodynamic Model

The difficulties of state space modeling becomes finding an appropriate roll moment function. Because the focus of this project is to survey many nonlinear analysis techniques, an analytical roll moment function is desired. The specific roll moment model used for this paper is from Nayfeh, Elzeba and Mook.4 The aerodynamic model was developed by fitting unsteady aerodynamic data to a function of the form:

$$C_L = a_1 \phi + a_2 \dot{\phi} + a_3 \phi^3 + a_4 \phi^2 \ddot{\phi} + a_5 \ddot{\phi}^2 \tag{2}$$

Nayfeh, Elzeba and Mook claim “virtually perfect agreement” between the model and the actual aerodynamic data. No limitations on motion inputs were reported. From their paper, the model appears tuned to motion inside the limit cycles. The model is defined with tabulated coefficients for four angles of attack. These coefficients are tabulated in Table 1.

In hindsight, the limitations and over-simplification of this model are evident. In particular, this model is not harmonic with roll angle as physics demands. However, finding an analytic model with pleasant properties is difficult. This particular model was selected as the best among several alternative models—one alternative was especially tempting.5
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State Space Model

Combining the aircraft equations of motion with the aero-dynamic roll moment model produces a governing equation for the delta wing’s rolling motion Eq. (3).

\[ \ddot{\phi}/Q = a_1\dot{\phi} + a_2\phi + a_3\dot{\phi}^3 + a_4\phi^2\dot{\phi} + a_5\phi\dot{\phi}^2 \]  

(3)

The state space representation is:

\[ \begin{align*}
  \dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\
  \dot{x}_2 &= Q(a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_1^3 + a_4x_1^2x_2 + a_5x_1x_2^2) 
\end{align*} \]

(4)

The roll moment non-dimensionalization parameter Q is taken as 0.354 as given by Nayfeh, Elzebda and Mook. Incidentally, time is scaled by \( t^* = U_0/L_0t \). For this particular model the non-dimensionalization constant is approximately 140. So 140 seconds of non-dimensional time is approximately 1 actual second.

Equilibrium Points and Nullclines

Analysis of equilibrium points and nullclines provide insights into the solutions of differential equations without requiring trajectory solutions.

Equilibrium points

Equilibrium points are where the system response is unchanged. This occurs when the state vector is zero. Solving the first state equation for a zero state vector yields:

\[ \dot{x}_1 = 0 = x_2 \]

So, all equilibrium points lie on the x axis \( (x_2 = 0) \). Substituting into the second state equation yields:

\[ \dot{x}_2 = 0 = a_1x_1 + a_3x_1^3 + f(x_2) \]

Solving shows either \( x_1 = 0 \) or \( x_1 = \pm \sqrt{-a_1/a_3} \). For this particular delta wing model, three equilibrium points are possible. The equilibrium points are:

\[ \begin{align*}
  x_1 &= \{0, \pm \sqrt{-a_1/a_3}\} \\
  x_2 &= 0 
\end{align*} \]

At 25 degrees, the equilibrium points are at \( x_2 = 0 \) with \( x_1 = 0 \) and \( x_1 \approx \pm 0.88 \). Only the origin is an equilibrium point at 15 degrees pitch angle.

Nullclines

Nullclines are the set of locations where the solution trajectories are either horizontal or vertical. A nullcline is the set of all points where one state equation is zero. The vertical nullcline occurs when \( x_1 = 0 \). For this particular model, the vertical nullcline occurs when:

\[ x_2 = 0 \]

The horizontal nullcline occurs when \( x_2 = 0 \). Solving the second state space equation in Eq. (5) for \( x_2 \) yields:

\[ x_2 = \frac{-a_2 - a_3 x_1^2}{2a_3 x_1} \pm \frac{\sqrt{a_3^2 + 2a_2 a_3 x_1 + a_2 a_3 x_1^3 - 4a_2 a_1 x_1^2 x_2 - 4a_2 a_1 x_1 x_2^2 + 8a_1}}{2a_3 x_1} \]

The vertical and horizontal nullclines are plotted in the phase plane in Figs. 1 and 2 for four pitch angles. The nullclines for \( \theta = \{21.5 - 25^\circ\} \) are given in Fig. 1. Equilibrium points exist at nullcline crossings. A positive slope for the horizontal nullcline indicates an unstable equilibrium point. The type — saddle or node — can be deduced from the relative locations of equilibrium points and the phase plane vector field. All three equilibrium points for the three angles of attack are unstable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>( a_1 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_3 )</th>
<th>( a_4 )</th>
<th>( a_5 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-0.01026</td>
<td>-0.02117</td>
<td>-0.14181</td>
<td>0.99753</td>
<td>-0.83478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>-0.04207</td>
<td>0.01456</td>
<td>0.04714</td>
<td>-0.18583</td>
<td>0.24234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>-0.04681</td>
<td>0.01966</td>
<td>0.05671</td>
<td>-0.22691</td>
<td>0.59065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-0.05686</td>
<td>0.03254</td>
<td>0.07334</td>
<td>-0.35970</td>
<td>1.46810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Model Coefficients for Eq. (2)

The nullclines for \( \theta = 15^\circ \) are given in Fig. 2. This angle of attack only has one equilibrium point — the origin — and that equilibrium point is stable.

Linearization

This section linearizes the equations of motion. The nonlinear state space representation is given in Eq. (5). The objective is to express the system as a linear system. The following linear system form is used:

\[ \dot{x} = Ax + Bu \]

The A matrix is determined by computing the Jacobian — \( \partial f_i/\partial x_j \) at \( x_0 \) — for each state variable. For the delta wing model, the Jacobian is:

\[ J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q(a_1 + 3a_3 x_1^2 + 2a_4 x_1 x_2 + a_5 x_2^2) & Q(a_2 + a_4 x_2^2 + 2a_5 x_1 x_2) \end{bmatrix} \]

The equivalent linear system at the origin is the most desirable. The equilibrium points at \( x_1 \approx \pm 0.88 \) correspond
to saddle points. The behavior around the saddle points is usually not particularly critical. Substituting in the origin’s state vector yields the following plant matrix:

\[ A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ Qa_1 & Qa_2 \end{bmatrix} \]

The eigenvalues are:

\[ \lambda_{1,2} = Qa_2/2 \pm 1/2 \sqrt{Q^2a_2^2 + 4Qa_1} \]

The eigenvalues are given for each pitch angle \( \theta \) in Table 2. The system is stable for the 15 degree pitch angle but unsta-

Table 2 Linear System Eigenvalues at Four Pitch Angles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Imag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-0.0037</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.1417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ble for 21.5, 22.5 and 25 degrees. The oscillation frequency decreases with decreasing pitch angles.

**Limit Cycle Existence**

The objective of this section is to evaluate the possible locations and trajectories of possible limit cycles. The analysis methods will establish where limit cycles can and can not exist.

**Poincaré Theorem**

The Poincaré theorem establishes the possible limit cycle trajectories based on equilibrium points. Poincaré’s theorem from Khalil\(^6\) is:

Inside any period orbit \( \gamma \), there must be at least one equilibrium point. ... if \( N \) is the number of nodes and foci and \( S \) is the number of saddles, it must be that \( N-S=1 \).

The equilibrium points for all four pitch angles contain a node or focus at the origin. For pitch angles of \( \{21.5, 22.5, 25^\circ\} \), saddle points exist at \( x_1 = \pm \sqrt{-a_1/a_3} \). The only \( N \) contribution comes from the origin’s equilibrium point. All limit cycles must enclose the origin but not the saddles. Figure 3 shows the phase plane with a conceptual possible limit cycle trajectory \( \gamma \). For harmonic

**Bendixson Theorem**

The Bendixson Theorem tests for the existence of limit cycles within a region of the phase plane. The Bendixson Theorem from Khalil\(^6\) is:

If, on a simply connected region \( D \) of the plane, the expression \( \partial f_1/\partial x_1 + \partial f_2/\partial x_2 \) is not identically zero and does not change sign, then the system has no periodic orbits lying entirely in \( D \).

The Bendixson theorem is applied to the delta wing governing equation Eq. (5) to rule out phase plane regions where limit cycles are not possible. Computing the partials and substituting into the Bendixson test yields:

\[ B = 0 + a_2 + a_4x_1^2 + 2a_5x_1x_2 \]

The objective is to determine phase plane locations where the sign of \( B \) changes. Setting \( B \) equal to zero and solving for \( x_2 \) gives the following:

\[ x_2 = -a_2 - a_4x_1^2 \]

\[ 2a_5x_1 \]

Figure 4 shows the \( B = 0 \) graphs for two angles of attack (15 and 25 degrees). The curves represent the \( B = 0 \) locations; any limit cycle must cross the curves. The 15 degree

![Fig. 3 Poincaré Theorem: Nodes and Saddles](image)

and mostly circular limit cycles, the amplitude must be less than than the \( x \) location of the saddle points. Effectively, any possible limit cycle is restricted to \( |x_1| < \sqrt{-a_1/a_3} \).

![Fig. 4 Bendixson Existence](image)
Phase Plane

The objective of this section is to evaluate the system dynamics and properties in the phase plane. The phase plane is established as a plot of the state vector. Roll angle, $x_1$, is plotted on the x axis; the roll rate, $x_2$, is plotted on the y axis.

Pitch Angle of 25 degrees

The system a pitch angle of 25 degrees contains an unstable origin but a stable limit cycle. The vector field is given in Fig. 6. A circular structure appears around the origin. The non-harmonic form with respect to roll angle appears as a diverging vector field for large magnitudes of roll angle. For small roll angles magnitudes between the saddle points, the model appears similar to the vector field of the harmonic pendulum. Clearly, the model breaks down for large roll angle magnitudes.

Typical trajectories are plotted in Fig. 7. Immediately a limit cycle is spotted with a displacement amplitude of approximately 0.6. Trajectories beginning inside the limit cycle amplitude spiral out to the limit cycle as seen in Fig. 8. At 25 degrees, the limit cycle angular frequency from Fig. 8 is 0.11 rad/s. The roll angle amplitude is 0.629.

Pitch Angle of 15 degrees

At a pitch angle of 15 degrees, the behavior has significantly changed. The origin is stable, but the limit cycle is unstable. A stable trajectory showing the stable origin is plotted in Fig. 9. The unstable behavior outside the limit cycle is shown in Fig. 10. The behavior outside the limit cycle does not match physical intuition. Again, the model appears tuned for small roll angle predictions.

Generalization of Model Parameters

For analysis between the given pitch angles, the coefficients need to be functions of the pitch angle $\theta$. Curves are fit to the model coefficients. The coefficient expressions are given below:

\[
\begin{align*}
    a_1 &= -0.0472\theta + 0.060 \\
    a_2 &= -0.0000337\theta^2 + 0.0067\theta - 0.1143 \\
    a_3 &= 0.00018\theta^3 - 0.013\theta^2 + 0.326\theta - 2.70 \\
    a_4 &= -0.00226\theta^3 + 0.156\theta^2 - 3.41\theta + 25.9 \\
    a_5 &= 0.0177\theta^2 - 0.48\theta + 2.32
\end{align*}
\]
The describing function approach indicates that the ampli-
dication is assumed to be sinusoidal. The nonlinear terms in Eq.

This form resembles the traditional second order form

Substituting into Eq. (3), switching to the frequency do-

This form resembles the traditional second order form

The describing function approach is simple and provides

definition of the describing function estimate for amplitude appears to reflect the switch between stable and

Controls Guidelines

The fundamental constraint for controls is stability. The
goal is to make the system uniformly asymptotically stable
in the large. The wing rock limit cycle should be removed
with no exceptions. A control law that minimizes or elim-

Pole Placement

Pole placement is a linear control method. The objective
is to stabilize the motion at the origin. The linear system
corresponding to the origin is:

A control scheme of the following form is input into the
control u.

O’Neill
Combining the linear system with the control scheme yields:

\[ \dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} Qa_1 + K_1 & 1 \\ Qa_2 + K_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x \]

The eigenvalues of this combined linear system are:

\[ \lambda_{1,2} = \frac{-Qa_2 + K_2 \pm \sqrt{(Qa_2 + K_2)^2 + 4Qa_1 + 4K_1}}{2} \]

Placing the poles at -0.1 and -1.0 and solving yields gains of

\[ K_1 = -0.08 \text{ and } K_2 = -1.11 \]

The control scheme is:

\[ u = -0.08x_1 - 1.11x_2 \]

A schematic for the system and control scheme is given below. The phase plane with the control input is given below. Notice that the domain of attraction is extended to almost \( x_1 = \pm 2 \). The trajectories appear to move along an inverted-sine-wave-like surface.

The displacement response is given in Fig. 14. Notice that the linear control scheme drives the displacement to zero for small initial displacements, but fails for large initial displacements.

Unfortunately, the linear control scheme drives the motion to the origin — an equilibrium point. For reasonable gains, the control law provides sufficient damping using \( x_2 \) to eliminate the limit cycle. As expected, control laws feeding back only displacement can eliminate the limit cycle.

Next, pole placement for a tracking problem. The tracking motion consists of a step input starting at \( t=20 \) with a displacement of 0.1. The control scheme does not track well. The displacement converges before reaching the desired tracking motion. As expected, the control input converges to a non-zero value. Intuition suggests that the error will never converge to zero for these linear control laws. Adding an integral control on tracking error is a possible solution. This is a spectacular — but expected — failure!

**Ricatti**

The Ricatti LQR control law synthesis method creates a robust linear system control law. The required inputs are the linear system’s plant matrix and two weighting matrices for the state and control vectors. Matlab solved the corresponding Ricatti equation. The state vector weighting matrix \( Q \) was selected with diagonal terms corresponding to the limit cycle amplitude. The control weighting matrix \( R \) corresponds to the maximum control power available. Using Matlab, the LQR control law is:

\[ u = -0.559x_1 - 1.22x_2 \]

The first evaluation testcase is the Ricatti control law with an initial displacement condition. Figure 16 shows the Ricatti control law’s performance. The control law stabilizes the system with a smooth control input.

Next, the Ricatti control law is tested with noise in Fig. 17. The noise introduces a small input induced oscillation about the origin. Otherwise, the control law’s performance is good.

The Ricatti control law is tested for tracking performance. A step input is shown in Fig. 18. The control law tracks excellently even with noise. This excellent performance is
surprising given both the nonlinear system and the input noise. The Ricatti control law converges to the tracking signal when the pole placement does not. This is disturbing.

![Ricatti Control](image)

Fig. 16 Ricatti Control

![Ricatti Control with Noise](image)

Fig. 17 Ricatti Control with Noise

Finally, the Ricatti control law is tested for tracking performance with a linear frequency swept chirp. The system response is given in Fig. 19. For this tracking problem, the Ricatti control law increasingly becomes in error as the chirp frequency increases.

![Ricatti Chirp Tracking](image)

Fig. 19 Ricatti Chirp Tracking

### Sliding Mode

Sliding mode control is used for stability and tracking control of the delta wing model. The state space representation is repeated below with unknown noise $w$ added. A scalar $b$ is pre-multiplies the control input.

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= QC_L + bu + w
\end{align*}
\]

For later robustness, nominal models are used.

### Control Law Derivation

Tracking is established with a tracking vector, $\tilde{x}$ as the difference between the state vector, $x$, and the desired motion, $x_d$.

$$\tilde{x} = x - x_d$$

Select a sliding surface $S$.

$$S = \dot{x} + \lambda \tilde{x} = (\dot{x} - \dot{x}_d) + \lambda (x - x_d)$$

Ensure the resulting system is Lyapunov stable by introducing a sign($S$) function. For the Lyapunov function $V = 1/2S^2$, $\dot{V}$ is negative — and the system is stable — with the following:

$$\dot{V} = SS = -\eta |S|$$

This reduces to

$$\dot{S} = \dot{x} - \dot{x}_d + \lambda (x - x_d) = -K \text{sign}(S)$$

Rearranging the terms yields:

$$QC_L + bu - \dot{x}_d + \lambda (x - x_d) + K \text{sign}(S)$$

Solving for the control $u$ yields the following:

$$u = -\frac{1}{b} (QC_L - \dot{x}_d + \lambda x - \lambda x_d + K \text{sign}(S))$$

The wing rock angular frequency is approximately 0.1 radian per second. This is a period of 50. A sliding time constant of 10 was chosen, $\lambda = 1/10 = 0.1$. The reaching time constant of 5 gives $\eta = 0.06$.

The robustness is assured through the selection of a large enough gain $K$. The primary difficulty is establishing the magnitudes of $C_L$. The difficulty concerns the maximum values of the state vectors. Evaluating the absolute magnitude $|C_L|$ at $x_1=1.5$ and $x_2 = 0.2$ yields $C_L \approx 0.2$. Also, a harmonic trajectory was created at the maximum expected values of the state vectors. This simulation approach gave a maximum $C_L \approx 0.2$. The noise input is bounded by $|w| \leq 0.02$. The control input is assumed to be bounded by $b_{\text{max}} = 1.1$ and $b_{\text{min}} = 0.8$ so that $\beta = 1.17$. For robustness, the gain $K$ is:

$$K \geq \beta(|w| + \eta) + (\beta - 1)|C_L| \approx 0.11$$
Sliding Mode Results

The sliding mode control was implemented in Matlab. The schematic is shown in Fig. 20.

![Fig. 20 Sliding Mode Control: Matlab Schematic](image)

The initial simple testcase is used to establish the stability performance of the control law. Figure 21 shows the system response to an initial displacement of 1 unit. This initial condition is outside the limit cycle’s domain of attraction. The sliding mode control works as expected. The initial reaching phase occurs within about 1 non-dimensional second. The sliding phase requires approximately 25 seconds to reach 90 percent of the steady state displacement. The phase plane plot in Fig. 21 shows both the reaching and sliding portions of the stabilization.

The next testcase evaluates the stability performance with the presence of noise. Random noise with maximum amplitude of 0.02 is input directly into the $C_L$ moment. Figure 22 shows the system response to an initial displacement of 1 unit with noise. Again, the sliding mode control provides excellent stabilization.

The next testcase evaluates the tracking ability of the control law. Two tracking signals are tested. First, a step tracking signal is shown in Fig. 23. The step intrinsically contains infinite derivatives, so the control law attempts to provide as much control power as possible. Otherwise, the tracking performance is good. Again, the motion follows the sliding surface as seen in the phase plane plot. Tracking with noise is shown in Fig. 24. Again, the control system tracks the desired signal well.

Second, a frequency swept chirp is shown in Fig. 25. The desired track and the actual system response lie almost together. The actual system is slightly out of phase with the desired signal, but otherwise the tracking is excellent. Interestingly, the chirp displacement is 1.0. This is almost twice the limit cycle’s amplitude. Chirp tracking with noise is shown in Fig. 26. Again, the sliding mode control tracks the desired signal nicely.

For comparison, Fig. 27 shows the controls-off system with noise starting from the origin. The noise magnitude was decreased to 0.005, otherwise the system exits the limit cycle region and diverges. When the noise level remains at 0.02, the system goes unstable within 2 actual seconds. The sliding mode control allows the system to track a desired signal well outside the open-loop stability region with 4 times more
The objective is to design a control law that automatically satisfies a candidate Lyapunov function. The state space representation of the equations of motion are:

$$\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= Q (a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_1^2 + a_4 x_2^2 + a_5 x_1 x_2^2) + Qu
\end{align*}$$

Concentrate on $\dot{x}_2$ and evaluate the individual terms for their contribution to stability. Assume that the angle of attack is over 15 degrees which gives consistent coefficient signs for $a_i$.

$$|a_1| < 0, \quad |a_2| > 0, \quad |a_3| > 0, \quad |a_4| < 0, \quad |a_5| > 0$$

Evaluate individual terms to establish if the term is stable or unstable. The objective is to keep the stable terms and cancel only the unstable terms. $x_1$ and $x_2$ terms correspond to restoring forces and are stabilizing if negative. $x_2$ terms correspond to damping forces and are stabilizing if negative. The $x_1^2 x_2$ term is tricky. However, $x_1^2$ is always positive, so the term acts as a nonlinear damping. Again, a negative term is stabilizing. For the same reasons, $x_1 x_2^2$ is stabilizing with a negative term.

$$\dot{x}_2/Q = a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_1^2 + a_4 x_2^2 + a_5 x_1 x_2^2 + u$$

The objective is to synthesize a control law that cancels the bad terms. Further inspection shows that the resulting system—including the new control law—has no explicit linear damping term from $x_2$. Adding this damping term yields the following control law:

$$u = - (a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_1^2 + a_5 x_1 x_2^2) - \zeta x_2$$

The combined system with the control law is:

$$\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= Q (a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 - \zeta x_2)
\end{align*}$$

From inspection with a simple Lyapunov Function ($V = 1/2x_1^2 + 1/2x_2^2$), the new system is UASIL. The critical assumption for stability concerns the control power available. The control law depends on the cube of roll angle. Large unwanted roll angles will require large control inputs.

The CLF control law is implemented in Matlab as given in Fig. 28. The overall control law is simple and easy to implement.

**Control Lyapunov Function**

The objective is to analyze and control a simple analytical roll model.
The first difficulty is finding a good system model for the aerodynamics. Comparison between a physically consistent roll moment model and the selected model indicates possible restrictions on the selected model’s operating range.

The traditional phase plane analysis techniques and existence methods indicated the overall system properties without solving the second order differential equation for roll. The phase plane plots showed the entire system behavior in a particular region.

The describing function approach for finding limit cycle amplitudes and frequencies gave accurate predictions. The limit cycles were almost perfectly circular, so the describing function approach works well for this particular problem.

Linear control laws allowed for good stabilization but not good tracking. The linear control laws give smooth control inputs unlike the nonlinear control laws. Nonlinear control laws gave good stabilization and tracking performance. In particular, the sliding model control allowed for robust performance.
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