Finite-Time Altitude and Attitude Tracking of a Tri-Rotor UAV using Modified Super-Twisting Second Order Sliding Mode
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Abstract: This paper presents the problem of robust altitude and attitude trajectory tracking of a tri-rotor Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) based on a finite-time second order sliding mode control algorithm. The chosen algorithm is a modified super-twisting control with double closed-loop feedback regulation that provides fast finite-time convergence even when the system trajectories are far from the sliding surface, robustness against a wide class of uncertainties and disturbances. Moreover, this algorithm eliminates the major disadvantage of the classical sliding mode, the well-known chattering phenomenon. The stability analysis of the closed-loop system and the convergence time are given based on a strong Lyapunov function. To show the effectiveness of the used method, simulation results of different scenarios are presented for the considered tri-rotor UAV.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, control of aerial robots have become a coveted field of research. In fact, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are increasingly used in numerous applications such as construction, visual inspection, exploration, transportation and others (Nex and Remondino, 2014; Sankaran et al., 2015; Segales et al., 2016; Singh and Frazier, 2018). Apart from the fact that UAVs are highly underactuated systems, as all nonlinear systems, they are suffering from uncertainties due to the variation of the inertia and mass (Yang and Xian, 2017) (e.g.: the case of transportation) and external disturbances due to environmental variations as wind (Pflimlin et al., 2004; Ceccarelli et al., 2007) (e.g.: the case of outdoor scenarios).

In literature, several nonlinear controllers have been designed for the problem of tracking and/or stabilization of UAVs such as feedback linearization (Voos, 2009; Zhou et al., 2010), backstepping (Ahmed et al., 2006; Lee et al., 2013), Sliding Mode Control (SMC) (Runcharoon and Srichatratnuk, 2013) and others. Among these controllers, the best promising one is SMC which is famous for its insensitivity to a wide class of uncertainties and disturbances, its simplicity of design and its finite-time convergence property (Utkin et al., 1999). SMC uses discontinuous control inputs to force the system trajectories to converge to the user-chosen sliding surface. Nevertheless, to ensure all these good features, the discontinuous signals must be high which cause the chattering phenomenon (Fridman, 2001; Boiko and Fridman, 2005). This phenomenon is considered the major drawback of which SMC suffers from. Consequently, the desired performances might be reduced and the system actuators cannot deal with the chattering frequency and might be degraded.

To solve this problem, many works have been developed and published (Lee et al., 2009; Tseng and Chen, 2010; Besnard et al., 2012; Kali et al., 2015). The most popular one for second order systems is the Second Order Sliding Mode (SOSM) introduced in (Levant, 2003). The concept of SOSM is to make the discontinuous signal acting on the derivative of the control input signal, hence, the control input becomes continuous (Kali et al., 2017b; Kali et al., 2017c). SOSM has been extensively used for UAVs (Benallegue et al., 2008; Zheng et al., 2014; Davila and Salazar, 2017; Munoz et al., 2017a; Munoz et al., 2017b). However, this method requires some informations (e.g.: first time derivative of the sliding surface) that are often not available for measurements.
As a solution to this limitation, the Super-Twisting Algorithm (STA) has been proposed (Guzmán and Moreno, 2015; González-Hernández et al., 2017a; Ibarra and Castillejo, 2017; Kali et al., 2017a; Kali et al., 2018a; Kali et al., 2018b). Indeed, apart from that STA ensures robustness, finite-time converge and chattering elimination, it does not require the measurements of the first time derivative of the sliding surface. However, when the system trajectories are far from the selected switching surface, the convergence becomes slow (Moreno, 2014) which is not desirable for fast robotic systems.

In order to improve the convergence speed, a modified STA with double closed-loop feedback regulation has been proposed (Yang and Xian, 2017). The proposed algorithm was tested on a DC servo system. The obtained results were satisfactory in comparison with different proposed STA structures. To the authors’ best knowledge, this structure has never been used for a tri-rotor UAV system. In this paper, this algorithm will be derived for the altitude and attitude tracking of an uncertain tri-rotor UAV system.

The rest of this paper is organized into four sections as follows. In the next section, the considered tri-rotor UAV is described and its altitude and attitude model are given. In Section 3, the modified STA with double closed-loop feedback regulation is designed for the problem of altitude and attitude tracking in presence of uncertainties and its stability analysis is proved using the Lyapunov method. In Section 4, simulation results on the considered tri-rotor UAV are given to demonstrate the effectiveness of the used STA with double closed-loop feedback regulation. The conclusion is given in the fifth section.

2 TRI-ROTOR UAV MODEL

The considered tri-rotor UAV system is shown in Fig. 1. The main advantage of this kind of UAVs is that they require fewer motors than the other proposed multi-rotors UAV systems such as four-rotors or six-rotors. This advantage allows a reduction in volume, weight and energy consumption. The two rotors placed in the forward part of the tri-rotor rotate in opposite direction with respect to the third rotor placed in the backward part.

2.1 Altitude Model

The altitude model of the considered tri-rotor can be expressed by the following equation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{X} &= \frac{1}{m} (\sin(\psi)\sin(\phi)\cos(\psi) - \cos(\psi)) \cos(\phi) \tau_1 \\
\dot{Y} &= \frac{1}{m} (\cos(\psi)\sin(\phi)\cos(\phi) + \sin(\psi)) \cos(\phi) \tau_1 \\
\dot{Z} &= -g + \frac{1}{m} \cos(\phi) \tau_1
\end{align*}
\]  

(1) (2) (3)

where \( m \) denotes the mass of the tri-rotor, \( g \) is the constant of gravity, \( \tau_1 \) is the collective or the vertical force and \( \phi, \theta, \psi \) denote the Euler angles (roll \( \phi \), pitch \( \theta \) and yaw \( \psi \)).

2.2 Attitude Model

The attitude model of the considered tri-rotor can be expressed by the following equation:

\[
J W \dot{\Theta} + J W \ddot{\Theta} + (W \dot{\Theta} \times J W \dot{\Theta}) = \tau
\]  

(4)

where \( \Theta = [\phi, \theta, \psi]^T \) are the Euler angles, \( \tau = [\tau_\phi, \tau_\theta, \tau_\psi]^T \) represents the roll, pitch and yaw torques, \( J = \text{diag}(I_x, I_y, I_z) \) is the diagonal inertia matrix while \( W \) is the Euler matrix. \( W \) and its first-time derivative \( \dot{W} \) are defined by:

\[
W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -\sin(\theta) \\ 0 & \cos(\phi) & \cos(\theta) \sin(\phi) \\ 0 & -\sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \cos(\phi) \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(5)

Moreover, the control torque inputs can be expressed as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau_\phi &= l_2 (f_1 - f_2) \\
\tau_\theta &= -l_1 (f_1 + f_2) + l_3 f_3 \cos(\alpha) \\
\tau_\psi &= -l_3 f_3 \sin(\alpha) \\
\tau_1 &= f_1 + f_2 + f_3 \cos(\alpha)
\end{align*}
\]  

(6) (7) (8) (9)
where $\alpha$ represents the tilting angle of the third rotor placed in the backward part, $f_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ is the thrust generated by the rotor $i$, $l_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are given in Fig. 2. The control torque inputs given by (6), (7), (8) and (9) can be written in a matrix form as follows:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\tau_1 \\
\tau_0 \\
\tau_0 \\
\tau_0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & \cos(\alpha) \\
1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & -\cos(\alpha) \\
-1 & 0 & -1 & \sin(\alpha) \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
f_1 \\
f_2 \\
f_3 \\
f_4 \\
\end{bmatrix}
$$

3 MODIFIED SUPER-TWISTING

In this section, the proposed second order sliding mode controller based on a modified STA for the finite-time altitude and attitude tracking of the considered tri-rotor UAV will be designed. The control objective is to ensure that the altitude and attitude positions defined by $Z$, $\phi$, $\theta$, $\psi$ track with high precision even in presence of uncertainties and disturbances the bounded desired trajectories $Z_d$, $\phi_d$, $\theta_d$, $\psi_d$.

Now, let us introduce $x = [x_1^T, x_2^T]^T$ as state variables with $x_1 = [Z, \phi, \theta, \psi]^T$ and $x_2 = [Z, \phi, \theta, \psi]^T$.
Then, the equations of motion are given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
x_1 &= x_2 \\
x_2 &= f(x) + g(x) u + h(t)
\end{align*}
$$

Comparing the above equation with (4) gives the following equivalences:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
f(x) \\
g(x)
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
-\frac{g}{(JW)^{-1}} (JW\Phi + (W\Phi \times JW\Phi)) \\
\frac{1}{\pi} \cos(\theta) \cos(\phi) 0_{1 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 1} \\
(JW)^{-1}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

Then, $u = [\tau_1 \tau_0 \tau_0 \tau_0]^T$ and $h(t) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ denotes the uncertain vector caused by the wind disturbances, unmodelled dynamics.

In the following, the control law that will force the system trajectories $x_1$ to track with high accuracy the known desired trajectories $x_{id} = [Z_d, \phi_d, \theta_d, \psi_d]^T$ is designed based on the following assumptions:

- **Assumption 1:** The system trajectories $x_1$ and their first-time derivative $x_\phi$ are available for measurements.

- **Assumption 2:** The desired trajectories $x_{id}$ and their first and second time derivatives $x_{id}$, $x_{id}^2$ are known, bounded and limited to:

$$
-\frac{\pi}{2} < \phi_d < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta_d < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad -\pi < \psi_d < \pi.
$$

- **Assumption 3:** The Euler angles (roll, pitch and yaw) are limited to:

$$
-\frac{\pi}{2} < \phi < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad -\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad -\pi < \psi < \pi.
$$

Based on all these assumptions, the uncertain functions $h_i(t)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are globally Lipschitz (Derafa et al., 2012):

$$
|h_i(t)| \leq \delta_i
$$

where $\delta_i > 0$ represents the Lipschitz constant.

Let $e = x_1 - x_{id} \in \mathbb{R}^4$ be the trajectory tracking error. Then, the first step in the design procedure consists on defining the sliding surface. In this paper, the integral sliding surface is selected:

$$
S = \dot{e} + K_p e + K_t \int_0^t e dt
$$

where $K_p = \text{diag}(K_{p1}, K_{p2}, K_{p3}, K_{p4})$ and $K_t = \text{diag}(K_{t1}, K_{t2}, K_{t3}, K_{t4})$ are diagonal positive definite matrices. The first time derivative of the above integral sliding surface is computed using the nominal model as follows:

$$
\dot{S} = \dot{e} + K_p \dot{e} + K_t e
$$

$$
\dot{S} = \dot{e} + K_p \dot{e} + K_t e
$$

Hence, the modified super-twisting control algorithm is obtained by resolving the following equation:

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{S} &= -K_1 \Lambda(S) \text{sign}(S) - K_2 S + \tilde{\sigma} \\
\tilde{\sigma} &= -K_3 \text{sign}(S) - K_4 \sigma
\end{align*}
$$

where $\Lambda(S) = \text{diag}(|S_1|^{0.5}, |S_2|^{0.5}, |S_3|^{0.5}, |S_4|^{0.5})$, $K_1 = \text{diag}(K_{11}, \cdots, K_{14})$, $K_2 = \text{diag}(K_{21}, \cdots, K_{24})$, $K_3 = \text{diag}(K_{31}, \cdots, K_{34})$ and $K_4 = \text{diag}(K_{41}, \cdots, K_{44})$ are diagonal positive matrices where the coefficients will be fixed in the stability analysis and $\text{sign}(S) = [\text{sign}(S_1), \text{sign}(S_2), \cdots, \text{sign}(S_4)]^T$ with:

$$
\text{sign}(S_i) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } S_i > 0 \\
0, & \text{if } S_i = 0 \\
-1, & \text{if } S_i < 0
\end{cases}
$$

Theorem 3.1. If the modified STA gains are chosen for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ as:

$$
K_{1i} = \gamma K_{3i}, \quad K_{2i} = \beta K_{4i}, \quad K_{4i} > 0, \quad K_{3i} > \max\{C_1, C_2\}
$$

with:

$$
\gamma > \frac{\beta - 2}{\sqrt{2} \beta}, \quad \gamma \neq 2, \quad \beta > 0, \quad \delta_i > 0
$$

$$
C_1 = \frac{\delta_i^2}{\gamma^2} + \frac{4}{\gamma^2} \beta
$$

437
Then, the modified super-twisting control algorithm with double closed-loop feedback regulation for the considered uncertain tri-rotor UAV (10) is given by:

\[
u = -g(x)^{-1} [f(x) + v]
\]

(16)

where \( v \) is defined as:

\[
v = -\dot{x}_{id} + K_p \dot{e} + K_i e + K_1 A(S) \text{sign}(S) + K_2 S
\]

\[+ K_3 \int_0^t \text{sign}(S) \, dt - K_4 \int_0^t \delta \, dt
\]

(17)

ensures finite-time altitude and attitude trajectory tracking.

**Proof.** The stability of the closed loop error will be examined using the same methodology used in (Guzmán and Moreno, 2015). First of all, substituting the modified super-twisting control algorithm (16) in the equation of motion (10) leads to:

\[
\dot{S} = -K_1 A(S) \text{sign}(S) - K_2 S + \Theta
\]

\[\Theta = -K_3 \text{sign}(S) - \Theta_0 + \dot{h}(t)
\]

(18)

The above closed-loop error dynamics can be decomposed into 4 sub-systems as:

\[
\dot{S}_i(t) = -K_{ii} |S_i|^{0.5} \text{sign}(S_i) - K_{si} S_i + \Theta_i
\]

\[\Theta_i = -K_{3i} \text{sign}(S_i) - \Theta_0 + \dot{h}_i(t)
\]

(19)

Now, let us consider the following candidate positive definite Lyapunov function:

\[
V = \xi^T L \xi
\]

(20)

where \( \xi = [\xi_{1i}, \xi_{2i}]^T \) with \( \xi_{1i} = |S_i|^{0.5} \text{sign}(S_i) \) and \( \xi_{2i} = \Theta_i \), and \( L \) is a symmetric positive definite matrix. The Lyapunov function in (20) is positive definite, continuous and differentiable except when the sliding surface is equal to zero \( S_i = 0 \) and radially bounded by choosing appropriate matrix \( L \) as:

\[
L = \begin{bmatrix}
\beta + \left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)^2 & -\frac{\gamma}{2} \\
-\frac{\gamma}{2} & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(21)

where \( \gamma > 0 \) and \( \beta > 0 \). To calculate the first-time derivative of the Lyapunov function, we need to calculate first the first-time derivative of the vector \( \xi \). Remark that \( |\xi_{1i}| = |S_i|^{0.5} \). Then, \( \dot{\xi} = [\dot{\xi}_{1i}, \dot{\xi}_{2i}]^T \) is as follows:

\[
\dot{\xi}_{1i} = \frac{1}{2|S_i|^{0.5}} \dot{S}_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\xi}_{2i} = \dot{\Theta}_i
\]

(22)

Hence:

\[
\dot{\xi} = \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \dot{A} \xi + \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} B \dot{h}_i(t) |\xi_{1i}|
\]

(23)

where:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
-\frac{1}{2} (K_{ii} + K_{3i} |\xi_{1i}|) & 0 \\
-K_{ii} & -K_{ii} |\xi_{1i}|
\end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

Moreover, the first-time derivative of the Lyapunov function \( V \) is calculated as:

\[
\dot{V} = \xi_i^T (t) L \xi + \xi_i^T L \xi_i
\]

(24)

Substituting \( \dot{\xi} \) in \( V \) leads to:

\[
\dot{V} = \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \xi_i^T (A^T L + LA) \xi_i + \frac{2h_i(t)}{|\xi_{1i}|} |\xi_{1i}| B^T L \xi_i
\]

\[\leq \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \xi_i^T (A^T L + LA) \xi_i + h_i(t) |\xi_{1i}|^2 + \xi_i^T LBB^T L \xi_i
\]

\[\leq \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \xi_i^T (A^T L + LA + \delta \xi_i C^T C + LBB^T L) \xi_i
\]

\[\leq -\xi_i^T Q \xi_i
\]

(25)

where \( C = [1, 0]^T \). Considering that \( K_{ii} = \gamma K_{3i} \) and \( K_{3i} = \beta K_{4i} \). Then, \( Q \) is calculated as follows:

\[
Q = -\frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} (A^T L + LA + \delta \xi_i C^T C + LBB^T L)
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\
Q_{21} & Q_{22}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(26)

where:

\[
Q_{11} = \left(\frac{4\beta}{\gamma} + \beta^2\right) K_{4i} + \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \left(2\beta \frac{\delta}{4} - \frac{\delta^2}{4}\right)
\]

\[
Q_{12} = -\left(\frac{2 + \beta}{\gamma}\right) K_{4i} + \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} - \frac{\beta}{2}\right)
\]

\[
Q_{22} = 2K_{4i} + \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} - 1\right)
\]

The above matrix \( Q \) can be split into two matrices as follows:

\[
Q = Q_1 + \frac{1}{|\xi_{1i}|} Q_2
\]

(27)

where

\[
Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\left(\frac{4\beta}{\gamma} + \beta^2\right) K_{4i} & -\left(\frac{2 + \beta}{\gamma}\right) K_{4i} \\
-\left(\frac{2 + \beta}{\gamma}\right) K_{4i} & 2K_{4i}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(28)

\[
Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
\gamma K_{3i} - \delta \xi_i C^T C & 0 \\
0 & \frac{2}{\gamma} - 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(29)

Since \( Q_1 \) and \( Q_2 \) are symmetrical. Then, they are positive definite if the four following conditions are met:

\[
\left(\frac{4\beta}{\gamma} + \beta^2\right) K_{4i} > 0
\]

(30)
det(Q1) > 0 \quad (31)
\alpha \beta K_3 i - \delta_1^2 - \frac{4}{\gamma^2} > 0 \quad (32)
det(Q2) > 0 \quad (33)
The condition in equation (30) is always verified. The inequality in (31) is met if:
\gamma > \frac{\|\beta - 2\|}{\sqrt{2} \beta} \quad (34)

While the inequalities in equations (32) and (33) are verified if:
K_3i > \max \{C1, C2\} \quad (35)
with:
C1 = \frac{\delta_1^2}{\beta^2} + \frac{4}{\gamma^2} \beta^2
C2 = \frac{32 + \gamma \beta^2 + 8\gamma^2 \beta + 8\gamma^2 \delta_1^2 - 4\gamma^2 \delta_1^2}{4\gamma^2 \beta^2 (2 - \gamma)}

Therefore, verifying the conditions above, V is negative definite. Hence, the stability of the closed-loop is proven.

To prove the finite-time convergence, let us recall the fact that the Lyapunov function is radially bounded. Then:
\lambda_{\min} \{L\} \left\| \xi \right\|_2 \leq V \leq \lambda_{\max} \{L\} \left\| \xi \right\|_2 \quad (36)

with \lambda_{\min} \{L\} and \lambda_{\max} \{L\} denote respectively the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of the matrix L and \left\| \xi \right\|_2 is the Euclidean norm of \xi. Hence:
\frac{V}{\lambda_{\max} \{L\}} \leq \left\| \xi \right\|_2 \leq \frac{V}{\lambda_{\min} \{L\}} \quad (37)

In the second part, equation (25) can be rewritten as:
V \leq -\xi^T Q_1 \xi \\
\leq -\xi^T Q_1 \xi - \frac{1}{\left\| \xi_1 \right\|} \xi^T Q_2 \xi \\
\leq -\lambda_{\min} \{Q_1\} \left\| \xi \right\|_2 - \frac{1}{\left\| \xi_1 \right\|} \lambda_{\min} \{Q_2\} \left\| \xi \right\|_2 \quad (38)

where \lambda_{\min} \{Q_i\} is the minimum eigenvalue of Q_i for i = 1, 2. As \left\| \xi_1 \right\| \leq \left\| \xi \right\|_2. Then, the above equation can be written as:
V \leq \frac{\lambda_{\min} \{Q_1\}}{\lambda_{\max} \{L\}} V + \frac{\lambda_{\min} \{Q_2\} \lambda_{\min} \{L\}}{\lambda_{\max} \{L\}} V \quad (39)

According to the equation above, the sliding surface converges to zero in finite-time. This concludes the proof.

4 SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, simulation results are presented in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed controller based on a modified STA with double closed-loop feedback regulation. The controller is simulated on the altitude and attitude model (10) of the considered tri-rotor UAV described in Section 2 using Matlab/Simulink software. The physical parameters of the used tri-rotor are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass, m</td>
<td>2.5 Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal mass, ( \bar{m} )</td>
<td>2.1 Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment of inertia, ( I_x )</td>
<td>0.111132 Kg.m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment of inertia, ( I_y )</td>
<td>0.13282 Kg.m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moment of inertia, ( I_z )</td>
<td>0.249039 Kg.m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal moment of inertia, ( I_x )</td>
<td>0.1 Kg.m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal moment of inertia, ( I_y )</td>
<td>0.1 Kg.m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length, ( l_1 )</td>
<td>0.275 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length, ( l_2 )</td>
<td>0.42 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length, ( l_3 )</td>
<td>0.52 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity, g</td>
<td>9.81 m.s⁻²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this part, an altitude and attitude tracking simulation has been performed. The initial altitude positions are chosen to be \( X(0) = 0 \) m, \( Y(0) = 0 \) m and \( Z(0) = 0 \) m while initial Euler angles are chosen to be \( \phi(0) = 0 \) rad, \( \theta(0) = 0 \) rad and \( \psi(0) = 0 \) rad. Moreover, the tracking is performed for the following desired trajectories:
\( Z_d(t) = 10 \) m
\( \phi_d(t) = 0.17 \sin(\pi t) \) rad
\( \theta_d(t) = -0.17 \sin(\pi t) \) rad
\( \psi_d(t) = 0.52 \sin(\pi t) \) rad

For this scenario, the chosen controller gains are given in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( K_p ) = \text{diag}(K_{p1}, \ldots, K_{p4})</td>
<td>\text{diag}(5, 5, 5, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_t ) = \text{diag}(K_{t1}, \ldots, K_{t4})</td>
<td>\text{diag}(6.5, 6.5, 6.5, 6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_1 ) = \gamma K_3</td>
<td>\text{diag}(10, 10, 10, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_2 ) = \beta K_4</td>
<td>\text{diag}(2, 2, 2, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_3 ) = \text{diag}(K_{31}, \ldots, K_{34})</td>
<td>\text{diag}(12, 12, 12, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_4 ) = \text{diag}(K_{41}, \ldots, K_{44})</td>
<td>\text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simulation results are given in Figs. 3-8. The proposed modified super-twisting control algorithm ensures the finite-time convergence of the altitude and
attitude positions to their known desired position trajectories with high precision due to the good rejection of uncertainties and disturbances as shown in Figs. 4 and 7. This is confirmed by the small values of the altitude and attitude tracking error as depicted in Figs. 4 and 8. Moreover, the range of variation of the tilt angle $\alpha$ of the third rotor placed in the backward part in Fig. 5 is fitting the mechanical structure of the system. Figure 6 shows that the control torque inputs effort is very small and chattering free. The values of the control torque inputs are acceptable for our tri-rotor UAV system.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, a robust modified second order sliding mode control has been designed and successfully simulated on a tri-rotor UAV system for the problem of altitude and attitude tracking in presence of uncertainties and disturbances. The proposed controller ensure robustness by rejecting the effects of the uncertainties and allowing chattering elimination. The obtained simulation results on the considered tri-rotor UAV sy-
Figure 7: Simulation results of finite-time attitude tracking. Stem show clearly the effectiveness of the proposed modified super-twisting control algorithm in the altitude and attitude tracking and disturbance rejection.
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