

## Relaxing the control-gain assumptions of DSC design for nonlinear MIMO systems

Chen, Yong; Lv, Maolong; Baldi, Simone; Liu, Zongcheng; Zhang, Wenqian; Zhou, Yang

**Publication date**

2019

**Document Version**

Accepted author manuscript

**Published in**

Proceedings of the 12th Asian Control Conference (ASCC 2019)

**Citation (APA)**

Chen, Y., Lv, M., Baldi, S., Liu, Z., Zhang, W., & Zhou, Y. (2019). Relaxing the control-gain assumptions of DSC design for nonlinear MIMO systems. In *Proceedings of the 12th Asian Control Conference (ASCC 2019)* (pp. 1595-1600). IEEE.

**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.

# Relaxing the Control-gain Assumptions of DSC Design for Nonlinear MIMO Systems

Yong Chen, Maolong Lv, Simone Baldi, Zongcheng Liu, Wenqian Zhang and Yang Zhou

**Abstract**—This work focuses on adaptive neural dynamic surface control (DSC) for an extended class of nonlinear MIMO strict-feedback systems whose control gain functions are continuous and possibly unbounded. The method is based on introducing a compact set which is eventually proved to be an invariant set: thanks to this set, the restrictive assumption that the upper and lower bounds of control gain functions must be bounded is removed. This method substantially enlarges the class of systems for which DSC can be applied. By utilizing Lyapunov theorem and invariant set theory, it is rigorously proved that all signals in the closed-loop systems are semi-globally uniformly ultimately bounded (SGUUB) and the output tracking errors converge to an arbitrarily small residual set. A simulation example is provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, approximation-based adaptive control of uncertain nonlinear systems has attracted much attention [1-3]. When combined with the backstepping technique, approximation-based adaptive approaches have been shown to obtain global stability for many classes of nonlinear systems [1-5]. However, it is well known that, due to repeatedly differentiating the virtual controllers at each step, the complexity of conventional backstepping controller drastically grows as the order of the systems increases. The DSC technique has been proposed to avoid this problem by introducing a first-order low-pass filter in the conventional backstepping design procedure. Approximation-based adaptive controllers stemming from this technique have been successfully constructed for many nonlinear systems and their applications, see [5-18] and references therein. To list a few, for example, a novel adaptive neural control is designed for a class of nonlinear MIMO time-delay systems in [5]. In [6], adaptive fuzzy hierarchical sliding-mode control is conducted for MIMO input-constrained nonlinear systems, etc.

However, it should be pointed out that, for all above schemes [5-9] to work, upper and lower bounds of the control

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61603411, and by Descartes Excellence Fellowship (French+Dutch grant).

M. Lv is with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 2, Delft 2628, CD, The Netherlands. e-mail: M.Lyu@tudelft.nl

S. Baldi is with the Department of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China, and also with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands e-mail: S.baldi@tudelft.nl

Yong Chen, Zongcheng Liu, Wenqian Zhang and Yang Zhou are with the Department of Flight control and Electrical Engineering, Aeronautics and Astronautics Engineering College, Air Force Engineering University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, 710038 China.

gain functions must be assumed to exist. In order to remove this restrictive assumption, some efforts have been made: most notably, in [3] the upper bound is relaxed to a known positive function, while the lower bound is still assumed to exist. However, the lower and upper bounds of the control gain functions maybe difficult to acquire in practical applications, or even nonexistent [4]. This motivates us to explore new approaches to remove this restrictive assumption from the control gain functions. The main contributions of this work are as follows:

(1) Only the signs of the control gain functions are assumed to be known: in other words, the control gain functions are only required to be positive (and possibly unbounded), rather than a priori bounded by positive constants. The main challenge arising from this setting is that the states cannot be assumed to be bounded a priori before obtaining system stability.

(2) A novel set-invariance neural adaptive design is carried out for MIMO nonlinear dynamic systems. The challenge of this design is to construct appropriate compact sets via Lyapunov stability and invariant set theory, which guarantee that the states of the closed-loop system will stay in those sets all the time, even in the presence of possibly unbounded control gain functions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the problem formulation and preliminaries. The control design and stability analysis are given in Section III. In Section IV simulation results are presented to show the effectiveness of the proposed scheme. Finally, Section V concludes the work.

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

### A. Problem Formulation

Consider a class of MIMO strict-feedback nonlinear systems given by [7]:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_{j,i_j} = \varphi_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) + g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})x_{j,i_j+1} + d_{j,i_j}(x,t) & 1 \leq i_j \leq \rho_j - 1 \\ \dot{x}_{j,\rho_j} = \varphi_{j,\rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) + g_{j,\rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})u_j + d_{j,\rho_j}(x,t) \\ y_j = x_{j,1} & j = 1, \dots, m \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $x_{j,i_j} \in \mathbb{R}$  is the state of the  $j$ th subsystem,  $x = [\bar{x}_{1,\rho_1}^T, \dots, \bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}^T, \dots, \bar{x}_{m,\rho_m}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is the state vector of the whole system ( $N = \rho_1 + \dots + \rho_m$ ), where  $\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j} = [x_{j,1}, \dots, x_{j,\rho_j}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{\rho_j}$  and  $\rho_j$  is the order of the  $j$ th subsystem.  $\bar{x}_{j,i_j} = [x_{j,1}, \dots, x_{j,i_j}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{i_j}$ ,  $u_j$  and  $y_j \in \mathbb{R}$  are the input and output of the  $j$ th subsystem respectively.  $\varphi_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$  are unknown continuous functions with

$\varphi_{j,i_j}(0) = 0$ ,  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})$  are unknown continuous control gain functions, and  $d_{j,i_j}(x, t)$ ,  $i_j = 1, \dots, \rho_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$  are uncertainties consisting of dynamical coupling terms and external disturbances.

*Assumption 1:* Only the signs of nonlinear functions  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})$  are known. Without loss of generality, it is further assumed that  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j}) > 0$  for  $i_j = 1, 2, \dots, \rho_j$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

*Remark 1:* It has to be noted that, in all the existing methods, e.g., [5-9], the control gain functions  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})$  are assumed to satisfy  $0 < a \leq g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j}) \leq b$ , with  $a$  and  $b$  being unknown constants. In fact, this assumption is sufficient for controllability of system (1). However, the assumption  $a \leq g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j}) \leq b$  is too restrictive since such a priori knowledge of  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})$  may be difficult or even impossible to be acquired in practice. In addition, the lower bound  $a$  and upper bound  $b$  of  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})$  may be nonexistent: for example, the control gain functions  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j}) = x_{j,1}^2 + e^{x_{j,i_j}}$  does not admit any  $a$  and  $b$  do not exist for all states: however, Assumption 1 holds since  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j}) = x_{j,1}^2 + e^{x_{j,i_j}} > 0$  for all  $\bar{x}_{j,i_j}$ . Therefore, Assumption 1 allows the functions  $g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})$  to be possibly unbounded, which require new stability tools.

*Assumption 2* [7]: For  $\forall t > 0$ , there exist positive constants  $d_{j,i_j}^*$  such that  $|d_{j,i_j}(x, t)| \leq d_{j,i_j}^*$ , for  $i_j = 1, \dots, \rho_j$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

*Assumption 3* [8]: The reference signal  $y_{j,d}(t)$  is a sufficiently smooth function of  $t$ , and there exist positive constants  $B_{j0}$  such that  $\Omega_{j0} := \left\{ \left[ y_{j,d}, \dot{y}_{j,d}, \ddot{y}_{j,d} \right]^T \left| \left( y_{j,d} \right)^2 + \left( \dot{y}_{j,d} \right)^2 + \left( \ddot{y}_{j,d} \right)^2 \leq B_{j0} \right. \right\}$ .

*Lemma 1* [4]: Consider the dynamic system

$$\dot{\chi}(t) = -\alpha\chi(t) + \beta v(t) \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are positive constants, and  $v(t)$  is a positive function. For any given bounded initial condition  $\chi(0) \geq 0$ , we have  $\chi(t) \geq 0$ , for  $\forall t \geq 0$ .

*Lemma 2* [4]: For any  $\varrho \in R$  and  $\varpi > 0$ , the hyperbolic tangent function fulfills  $\forall \varpi > 0$

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq |\varrho| - \varrho \tanh(\varrho/\varpi) \leq 0.2785\varpi \\ 0 \leq \varrho \tanh(\varrho/\varpi) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

### B. Properties of RBF NNs

The radial basis function neural networks (RBF NNs) is used to approximate the unknown continuous functions  $\varphi_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$  in this study. As is well known, for a given  $\varepsilon^* > 0$  and any continuous function  $h(Z)$  defined on a compact set  $\Omega_z \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exists a RBF NN  $\Theta^{*T}\bar{\phi}(Z)$  such that

$$h(Z) = \Theta^{*T}\bar{\phi}(Z) + \varepsilon(Z), \quad |\varepsilon(Z)| \leq \varepsilon^* \quad (4)$$

where  $Z \in \Omega_z \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is the input vector,  $\Theta^*$  is the ideal constant weight vector,  $\varepsilon(Z)$  is the approximation error, and  $\bar{\phi}(Z) = [\phi_1(Z), \dots, \phi_l(Z)]^T$  with  $l > 1$  being the number of

neural network nodes and  $\phi_i(Z)$  being commonly taken as Gaussian functions

$$\phi_i(Z) = \exp \left[ \frac{-(Z - \omega_i)^T (Z - \omega_i)}{\Theta_i^2} \right], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, l \quad (5)$$

where  $\omega_i = [\omega_{i1}, \omega_{i2}, \dots, \omega_{in}]^T$  and  $\Theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the center and the width of the Gaussian function, respectively.

## III. CONTROL DESIGN AND STABILITY ANALYSIS

### A. Adaptive dynamic surface tracking controller design

The DSC technique is employed to design the adaptive neural controller for system (1) under the framework of backstepping. The control design is carried out based on the following changes of coordinates:

$$\begin{cases} z_{j,1} = x_{j,1} - y_{j,d} \\ z_{j,i_j} = x_{j,i_j} - \chi_{j,i_j} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $z_{j,1}$  is the output tracking error and  $\chi_{j,i_j}$  is the output of the first-order filter with  $\psi_{j,i_j}$  as the input, where  $\psi_{j,i_j}$  is the virtual controller defined in the step  $i_j$ . The recursive design includes  $\rho_j$  steps. From step 1 to step  $\rho_j - 1$ , the virtual control  $\psi_{j,i_j}$  will be constructed in step  $j, i_j$  and the actual control input  $u_j$  will be designed in the step  $\rho_j$ .

Since  $\varphi_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$ ,  $i_j = 1, \dots, \rho_j$ , are unknown continuous functions, they cannot be used in the control design directly. Therefore, throughout this note, we use RBF NNs to approximate the continuous functions  $\varphi_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$  as follows:

$$\varphi_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) = \Theta_{j,i_j}^{*T} \bar{\phi}_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) + \varepsilon_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}), \quad \bar{x}_{j,\rho_j} \in \Omega_{\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}} \quad (7)$$

where  $\bar{\phi}_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) = [\phi_{j,i_j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}), \dots, \phi_{j,i_j,l_{j,i_j}}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})]^T$  with  $\phi_{j,i_j,n}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$ , for  $n = 1, \dots, l_{j,i_j}$ , being Gaussian functions defined in (5), and  $\varepsilon_{j,i_j}$  are the approximation errors, satisfying  $|\varepsilon_{j,i_j}| \leq \varepsilon_{j,i_j}^*$  with  $\varepsilon_{j,i_j}^*$  being unknown positive constants. For compactness, we let  $\varepsilon_{j,i_j}$  and  $d_{j,i_j}$  denote  $\varepsilon_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$  and  $d_{j,i_j}(x, t)$  respectively.

**Step  $j, 1$ :** To begin with, it follows from (1) and (7) that the dynamics of  $z_{j,1}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_{j,1} &= \Theta_{j,1}^{*T} \bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) + \varepsilon_{j,1} + g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})x_{j,2} \\ &\quad + d_{j,1} - \dot{y}_{j,d} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{j,1}$  is the approximation error satisfying  $|\varepsilon_{j,1}| \leq \varepsilon_{j,1}^*$  with  $\varepsilon_{j,1}^* > 0$  being an unknown constant.

To consider the stabilization of (8), we consider the following quadratic function

$$\dot{V}_{z_{j,1}} = \frac{1}{2} z_{j,1}^2. \quad (9)$$

Thus the time derivative of (9) can be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{z_{j,1}} &= z_{j,1} (\Theta_{j,1}^{*T} \bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) + \varepsilon_{j,1} + g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})x_{j,2} \\ &\quad + d_{j,1} - \dot{y}_{j,d}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Define a compact set  $\Omega_{j,1} := \{z_{j,1} \mid |V_{z_{j,1}}| \leq p\}$ , with  $p > 0$  being any positive constant. For  $\Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j0}$  and  $g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})$ , the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 3:** The continuous control gain function  $g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})$  has maximum and minimum in  $\Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j,0}$ , namely, there exist positive constants  $\underline{g}_{j,1}$  and  $\bar{g}_{j,1}$  satisfying  $\underline{g}_{j,1} = \min_{\Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j,0}} g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})$  and  $\bar{g}_{j,1} = \max_{\Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j,0}} g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})$ .

*Proof:* Observing  $z_{j,1} = x_{j,1} - y_{j,d}$ , we obtain  $x_{j,1} = y_{j,d} + z_{j,1}$ . Hence continuous function  $g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})$  can be expressed by

$$g_{j,1}(x_{j,1}) = \mu_{j,1}(z_{j,1}, y_{j,d}) \quad (11)$$

with  $\mu_{j,1}(\cdot)$  being a continuous function. Note that  $\Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j,0}$  is a compact set since  $\Omega_{j,1}$  and  $\Omega_{j,0}$  are compact sets respectively. It is possible to derive from (11) that all the variables of  $\mu_{j,1}(\cdot)$  are included in the compact set  $\Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j,0}$ , thus we have

$$0 < \underline{g}_{j,1} \leq g_{j,1}(x_{j,1}) \leq \bar{g}_{j,1}, \quad x_{j,1} \in \Omega_{j,1} \times \Omega_{j,0}. \quad (12)$$

□

Choose the virtual control law  $\psi_{j,1}$  and parameters adaptation laws  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}$  and  $\hat{\delta}_{j,1}$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{j,1} = & -c_{j,1}z_{j,1} - \frac{\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}z_{j,1}}{2a_{j,1}^2} - \hat{\delta}_{j,1} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j,1}}{\nu_{j,1}}\right) \\ & - \xi_{j,1}\dot{y}_{j,d} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j,1}\dot{y}_{j,d}}{\nu_{j,1}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\vartheta}}_{j,1} = \frac{\beta_{j,1}z_{j,1}^2}{2a_{j,1}^2} - \sigma_{j,1}\beta_{j,1}\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1} \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\delta}}_{j,1} = \gamma_{j,1}z_{j,1} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j,1}}{\nu_{j,1}}\right) - \sigma_{j,1}\gamma_{j,1}\hat{\delta}_{j,1} \quad (15)$$

where  $c_{j,1} > 0$ ,  $a_{j,1} > 0$ ,  $\nu_{j,1} > 0$ ,  $\beta_{j,1} > 0$ ,  $\sigma_{j,1} > 0$ ,  $\gamma_{j,1} > 0$  and  $\xi_{j,1} \geq \underline{g}_{j,1}^{-1}$  are design parameters.  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}$  and  $\hat{\delta}_{j,1}$  are estimates of the unknown constants  $\vartheta_{j,1} = \underline{g}_{j,1}^{-1} \|\Theta_{j,1}^*\|^2 l_{j,1}$  and  $\delta_{j,1} = \underline{g}_{j,1}^{-1} (\varepsilon_{j,1}^* + d_{j,1}^*)$  respectively, with  $l_{j,1}$  being the dimension of  $\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})$ . By recalling Lemma 1, we can obtain  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}(t) \geq 0$  and  $\hat{\delta}_{j,1}(t) \geq 0$  for  $\forall t \geq 0$  by choosing  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}(0) = 0$  and  $\hat{\delta}_{j,1}(0) = 0$ .

To avoid repeatedly differentiating  $\psi_{j,1}$ , in line with the DSC in [10], we introduce a first-order filter with positive time constant  $\tau_{j,2}$ , as follows

$$\tau_{j,2}\dot{\chi}_{j,2} + \chi_{j,2} = \psi_{j,1}, \quad \chi_{j,2}(0) = \psi_{j,1}(0). \quad (16)$$

Now, by defining the output error of filter (16) as  $e_{j,2} = \chi_{j,2} - \psi_{j,1}$ , which yields  $\dot{\chi}_{j,2} = -e_{j,2}/\tau_{j,2}$  and

$$\dot{e}_{j,2} = -\frac{e_{j,2}}{\tau_{j,2}} + \zeta_{j,2} \left( z_{j,1}, z_{j,2}, e_{j,2}, \hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}, \hat{\delta}_{j,1}, y_{j,d}, \dot{y}_{j,d}, \ddot{y}_{j,d} \right) \quad (17)$$

where  $\zeta_{j,2}(\cdot)$  is a continuous function, which will be used in the stability analysis.

In view of Young's inequality<sup>1</sup>, one has

$$\begin{aligned} z_{j,1}\Theta_{j,1}^{*T}\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) & \leq \frac{z_{j,1}^2 \|\Theta_{j,1}^*\|^2}{2a_{j,1}^2} \bar{\phi}_{j,1}^T(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) \\ & \quad + \frac{a_{j,1}^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Note that  $\bar{\phi}_{j,1}^T(\bar{x}_{j,\rho})\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho}) \leq l_{j,1}$  since  $\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) = [\phi_{j,1,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}), \dots, \phi_{j,1,l_{j,1}}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})]^T$  and  $|\phi_{j,1,n}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j})| \leq 1$ , for  $n = 1, \dots, l_{j,1}$ , with  $l_{j,1}$  being the dimension of  $\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho})$ . Thus we have

$$z_{j,1}\Theta_{j,1}^{*T}\bar{\phi}_{j,1}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) \leq \frac{z_{j,1}^2 \|\Theta_{j,1}^*\|^2}{2a_{j,1}^2} l_{j,1} + \frac{a_{j,1}^2}{2}. \quad (19)$$

Using  $x_{j,2} = z_{j,2} + e_{j,2} + \psi_{j,1}$  and substituting (19) and (13) into (10), we obtain the time derivative of  $V_{z_{j,1}}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{z_{j,1}} \leq & -c_{j,1}\underline{g}_{j,1}z_{j,1}^2 - \frac{g_{j,1}\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}z_{j,1}^2}{2a_{j,1}^2} + \frac{z_{j,1}^2 \|\Theta_{j,1}^*\|^2}{2a_{j,1}^2} l_{j,1} \\ & - \underline{g}_{j,1}z_{j,1}\hat{\delta}_{j,1} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j,1}}{\nu_{j,1}}\right) + z_{j,1}z_{j,2}g_{j,1}(x_{j,1}) \\ & - z_{j,1}\dot{y}_{j,d} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j,1}\dot{y}_{j,d}}{\nu_{j,1}}\right) + z_{j,1}g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})e_{j,2} \\ & + \frac{a_{j,1}^2}{2} + |z_{j,1}|(\varepsilon_{j,1}^* + d_{j,1}^*) - z_{j,1}\dot{y}_{j,d}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Choose the Lyapunov function candidate as

$$V_{j,1} = V_{z_{j,1}} + \frac{g_{j,1}\tilde{\delta}_{j,1}^2}{2\gamma_{j,1}} + \frac{g_{j,1}\tilde{\vartheta}_{j,1}^2}{2\beta_{j,1}} + \frac{1}{2}e_{j,2}^2 \quad (21)$$

where  $\tilde{\delta}_{j,1} = \delta_{j,1} - \hat{\delta}_{j,1}$  and  $\tilde{\vartheta}_{j,1} = \vartheta_{j,1} - \hat{\vartheta}_{j,1}$  are the estimation errors of  $\delta_{j,1}$  and  $\vartheta_{j,1}$ , respectively.

Substituting (14), (15) and (20) into (21), the time derivative of  $V_{j,1}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{j,1} \leq & -c_{j,1}\underline{g}_{j,1}z_{j,1}^2 + z_{j,1}z_{j,2}g_{j,1}(x_{j,1}) \\ & + \sigma_{j,1}\underline{g}_{j,1} \left( \tilde{\vartheta}_{j,1}\hat{\vartheta}_{j,1} + \tilde{\delta}_{j,1}\hat{\delta}_{j,1} \right) - \frac{e_{j,2}^2}{\tau_{j,2}} \\ & + 0.2785\nu_{j,1} (\varepsilon_{j,1}^* + d_{j,1}^* + 1) + \frac{a_{j,1}^2}{2} \\ & + |e_{j,2}\zeta_{j,2}(\cdot)| + z_{j,1}g_{j,1}(x_{j,1})e_{j,2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

**Step  $j, i_j$  ( $2 \leq i_j \leq \rho_j - 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ):** The design process for step  $i_j$  is similar to Step 1. From  $z_{j,i_j} = x_{j,i_j} - \psi_{j,i_j}$  and (4), the dynamics of  $z_{j,i_j}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_{j,i_j} = & \Theta_{j,i_j}^{*T}\bar{\phi}_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,\rho_j}) + \varepsilon_{j,i_j} + g_{j,i_j}(\bar{x}_{j,i_j})x_{j,i_j+1} \\ & + d_{j,i_j} - \dot{\psi}_{j,i_j} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with  $\varepsilon_{j,i_j}$  being the approximation error satisfying  $|\varepsilon_{j,i_j}| \leq \varepsilon_{j,i_j}^*$ , where  $\varepsilon_{j,i_j}^* > 0$  is an unknown constant.

<sup>1</sup> $xy \leq \frac{\alpha}{\epsilon} |x|^2 + \frac{1}{\beta\epsilon^2} |y|^2$  ( $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1, \epsilon > 0$  and  $(\alpha - 1)(\beta - 1) = 1$ )

Choose the following quadratic function

$$V_{z_j, i_j} = \frac{1}{2} z_{j, i_j}^2. \quad (24)$$

From (23), the time derivative of  $V_{z_j, i_j}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{z_j, i_j} = & z_{j, i_j} (\Theta_{j, i_j}^{*T} \bar{\phi}_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j}) + g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j}) x_{j, i_j+1} \\ & + d_{j, i_j} + \varepsilon_{j, i_j} - \dot{\psi}_{j, i_j}). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Design the virtual control law  $\psi_{j, i_j}$  and adaptation laws  $\hat{\delta}_{j, i_j}$  and  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j, i_j}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{j, i_j} = & -c_{j, i_j} z_{j, i_j} - \frac{\hat{\vartheta}_{j, i_j} z_{j, i_j}}{2a_{j, i_j}^2} - \hat{\delta}_{j, i_j} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j, i_j}}{\nu_{j, i_j}}\right) \\ & - \xi_{j, i_j} \frac{e_{j, i_j}}{\tau_{j, i_j}} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j, i_j} e_{j, i_j}}{\tau_{j, i_j} \nu_{j, i_j}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\vartheta}}_{j, i_j} = \frac{\beta_{j, i_j} z_{j, i_j}^2}{2a_{j, i_j}^2} - \sigma_{j, i_j} \beta_{j, i_j} \hat{\vartheta}_{j, i_j} \quad (27)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\delta}}_{j, i_j} = \gamma_{j, i_j} z_{j, i_j} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j, i_j}}{\nu_{j, i_j}}\right) - \sigma_{j, i_j} \gamma_{j, i_j} \hat{\delta}_{j, i_j} \quad (28)$$

where the parameters are chosen similar to (13)-(15).

Next, let  $\psi_{j, i_j}$  pass through a first-order filter with time constant  $\tau_{j, i_j+1}$  as follows

$$\tau_{j, i_j+1} \dot{\chi}_{j, i_j+1} + \chi_{j, i_j+1} = \psi_{j, i_j}, \chi_{j, i_j+1}(0) = \psi_{j, i_j}(0). \quad (29)$$

Define the filter errors  $e_{j, i_j+1} = \chi_{j, i_j+1} - \psi_{j, i_j}$ . We have  $\dot{\chi}_{j, i_j+1} = -e_{j, i_j+1}/\tau_{j, i_j+1}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e}_{j, i_j+1} = & -\frac{e_{j, i_j+1}}{\tau_{j, i_j+1}} \\ & + \zeta_{j, i_j+1} \left( \bar{z}_{j, i_j+1}, \bar{e}_{j, i_j+1}, \bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j}, \bar{\delta}_{j, i_j}, y_{j, d}, \dot{y}_{j, d}, \ddot{y}_{j, d} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

with  $\zeta_{j, i_j+1}(\cdot)$  being a continuous function.

Following similar lines as Lemma 3, we find that the continuous control gain function  $g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j})$  can be rewritten as

$$g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j}) = \mu_{j, i_j}(\bar{z}_{j, i_j}, \bar{e}_{j, i_j}, \bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j-1}, \bar{\delta}_{j, i_j-1}, y_{j, d}) \quad (31)$$

where  $\mu_{j, i_j}(\cdot)$  is a continuous function.

Then, define the following compact sets  $\Omega_{j, i_j}$

$$\Omega_{j, i_j} := \left\{ \left[ \bar{z}_{j, i_j}^T, \bar{e}_{j, i_j}^T, \bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j-1}^T, \bar{\delta}_{j, i_j-1}^T \right]^T \mid z_{j, i_j}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{i_j-1} \left( z_{j, k}^2 + e_{j, k+1}^2 + \frac{g_{j, i_j} \bar{\delta}_{j, i_j}^2}{\gamma_{j, i_j}} + \frac{g_{j, i_j} \bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j}^2}{\beta_{j, i_j}} \right) \leq 2p \right\}$$

where  $p$  is an arbitrary positive constant. For  $\Omega_{j, i_j}$  and  $g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j})$ , in a similar fashion as Lemma 3 was derived, we have that the continuous function  $g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j})$  has maximum and minimum in  $\Omega_{j, i_j} \times \Omega_{j0}$ , namely, there exist positive constants  $\underline{g}_{j, i_j}$  and  $\bar{g}_{j, i_j}$  satisfying

$$\underline{g}_{j, i_j} \leq g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j}) \leq \bar{g}_{j, i_j}, \bar{x}_{j, i_j} \in \Omega_{j, i_j} \times \Omega_{j0}. \quad (32)$$

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_{j, i_j} = V_{z_j, i_j} + \frac{g_{j, i_j} \bar{\delta}_{j, i_j}^2}{2\gamma_{j, i_j}} + \frac{g_{j, i_j} \bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j}^2}{2\beta_{j, i_j}} + \frac{1}{2} e_{j, i_j+1}^2 \quad (33)$$

where  $\bar{\delta}_{j, i_j} = \delta_{j, i_j} - \hat{\delta}_{j, i_j}$  and  $\bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j} = \vartheta_{j, i_j} - \hat{\vartheta}_{j, i_j}$ .

With the help of Young's inequality, we get

$$z_{j, i_j} \Theta_{j, i_j}^{*T} \bar{\phi}_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j}) \leq \frac{z_{j, i_j}^2 \left\| \Theta_{j, i_j}^* \right\|^2}{2a_{j, i_j}^2} l_{j, i_j} + \frac{a_{j, i_j}^2}{2} \quad (34)$$

where  $a_{j, i_j}$  and  $l_{j, i_j}$  are designed constants in line with (19).

Substituting (26) (28) and (34) into (33) and using Lemma 2 and  $\xi_{j, i_j} \underline{g}_{j, i_j} \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{j, i_j} \leq & -c_{j, i_j} \underline{g}_{j, i_j} z_{j, i_j}^2 + z_{j, i_j} g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j}) e_{j, i_j+1} - \frac{e_{j, i_j+1}^2}{\tau_{j, i_j+1}} \\ & + \sigma_{j, i_j} \underline{g}_{j, i_j} \left( \bar{\vartheta}_{j, i_j} \hat{\vartheta}_{j, i_j} + \bar{\delta}_{j, i_j} \hat{\delta}_{j, i_j} \right) + \frac{a_{j, i_j}^2}{2} \\ & + \left| e_{j, i_j+1} \zeta_{j, i_j+1}(\cdot) \right| + z_{j, i_j} z_{j, i_j+1} g_{j, i_j}(\bar{x}_{j, i_j}) \\ & + 0.2785 \nu_{j, i_j} \left( \varepsilon_{j, i_j}^* + d_{j, i_j}^* + 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

**Step  $j, \rho_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, m$ ):** From (1), (6) and (7), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_{j, \rho_j} = & \Theta_{j, \rho_j}^{*T} \bar{\phi}_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j}) + \varepsilon_{j, \rho_j} + g_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j}) u_j \\ & + d_{j, \rho_j} - \dot{\chi}_{j, \rho_j} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Consider the quadratic function

$$V_{z_j, \rho_j} = \frac{1}{2} z_{j, \rho_j}^2. \quad (37)$$

Similarly, we know that  $g_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j})$  can be rewritten as

$$g_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j}) = \mu_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{z}_{j, \rho_j}, \bar{e}_{j, \rho_j}, \bar{\vartheta}_{j, \rho_j-1}, \bar{\delta}_{j, \rho_j-1}, y_{j, d}) \quad (38)$$

where  $\mu_{j, \rho_j}(\cdot)$  is a continuous function.

In light of previous steps (Lemma 3), it can be seen that, for  $\Omega_{j, \rho_j} \times \Omega_{j0}$  and  $g_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j})$ , there exist positive constants  $\underline{g}_{j, \rho_j}$  and  $\bar{g}_{j, \rho_j}$  satisfying

$$\underline{g}_{j, \rho_j} \leq g_{j, \rho_j}(\bar{x}_{j, \rho_j}) \leq \bar{g}_{j, \rho_j}, \bar{x}_{j, \rho_j} \in \Omega_{j, \rho_j} \times \Omega_{j0}. \quad (39)$$

Let us now design the actual control law  $u_j$  and adaptation laws  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j, \rho_j}$  and  $\hat{\delta}_{j, \rho_j}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} u_j = & -c_{j, \rho_j} z_{j, \rho_j} - \frac{\hat{\vartheta}_{j, \rho_j} z_{j, \rho_j}}{2a_{j, \rho_j}^2} - \hat{\delta}_{j, \rho_j} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j, \rho_j}}{\nu_{j, \rho_j}}\right) \\ & - \xi_{j, \rho_j} \frac{e_{j, \rho_j}}{\tau_{j, \rho_j}} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j, \rho_j} e_{j, \rho_j}}{\tau_{j, \rho_j} \nu_{j, \rho_j}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\vartheta}}_{j, \rho_j} = \frac{\beta_{j, \rho_j} z_{j, \rho_j}^2}{2a_{j, \rho_j}^2} - \sigma_{j, \rho_j} \beta_{j, \rho_j} \hat{\vartheta}_{j, \rho_j} \quad (41)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\delta}}_{j, \rho_j} = \gamma_{j, \rho_j} z_{j, \rho_j} \tanh\left(\frac{z_{j, \rho_j}}{\nu_{j, \rho_j}}\right) - \sigma_{j, \rho_j} \gamma_{j, \rho_j} \hat{\delta}_{j, \rho_j} \quad (42)$$

where the corresponding parameters are defined similarly to that of (26)~(28).

Consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_{j, \rho_j} = V_{z_j, \rho_j} + \frac{g_{j, \rho_j} \bar{\delta}_{j, \rho_j}^2}{2\gamma_{j, \rho_j}} + \frac{g_{j, \rho_j} \bar{\vartheta}_{j, \rho_j}^2}{2\beta_{j, \rho_j}} \quad (43)$$

where  $\tilde{\delta}_{j,\rho_j} = \delta_{j,\rho_j} - \hat{\delta}_{j,\rho_j}$  and  $\tilde{\vartheta}_{j,\rho_j} = \vartheta_{j,\rho_j} - \hat{\vartheta}_{j,\rho_j}$ .

Following the same way as the former steps, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{j,\rho_j} \leq & -c_{j,\rho_j} g_{j,\rho_j} z_{j,\rho_j}^2 + 0.2785 \nu_{j,\rho_j} \left( \varepsilon_{j,\rho_j}^* + d_{j,\rho_j}^* + 1 \right) \\ & + \underline{g}_{j,\rho_j} \sigma_{j,\rho_j} \left( \hat{\delta}_{j,\rho_j} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\rho_j} + \hat{\vartheta}_{j,\rho_j} \tilde{\vartheta}_{j,\rho_j} \right) + \frac{a_{j,\rho_j}^2}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where  $a_{j,\rho_j}$  is a positive constant.

### B. Stability analysis

Consider the following Lyapunov function candidate for the whole systems

$$V = \sum_{j=1}^m V_j \quad (45)$$

where  $V_j$  is the Lyapunov function for the  $j$ th subsystem

$$\begin{aligned} V_j = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j} \left( z_{j,i_j}^2 + \frac{g_{j,i_j}}{\gamma_{j,i_j}} \tilde{\delta}_{j,i_j}^2 + \frac{g_{j,i_j}}{\beta_{j,i_j}} \tilde{\vartheta}_{j,i_j}^2 \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j-1} e_{j,i_j+1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The main stability result of the proposed method is summarized in the Theorem 1.

**Theorem 1:** Consider the nonlinear MIMO non-strict-feedback system (1), and let Assumptions 1-3 hold. Consider the control design composed by the virtual control laws (13) and (26), the actual control law (40), filters (17) and (29), adaptation laws (14), (15), (27), (28), (41) and (42). For any  $p > 0$  and bounded initial conditions satisfying  $\hat{\vartheta}_{j,i_j}(0) \geq 0$ ,  $\hat{\delta}_{j,i_j}(0) \geq 0$  and  $V_j(0) \leq p$ , there exist design parameters  $c_{j,i_j}$ ,  $a_{j,i_j}$ ,  $\nu_{j,i_j}$ ,  $\beta_{j,i_j}$ ,  $\sigma_{j,i_j}$ ,  $\gamma_{j,i_j}$ ,  $\xi_{j,\rho_j}$  and  $\tau_{j,i_j}$  such that: (1)  $\Omega_{j,\rho_j} \times \Omega_{j0}$  is an invariant set, namely,  $V_j(t) \leq p$  for  $\forall t > 0$ , and hence all the closed-loop signals are SGUUB; (2) the output tracking error  $z_{j,1}$  is such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |z_{j,1}(t)| \leq \Delta_{j,1}$ , where  $\Delta_{j,1}$  is a positive constant depending on the design parameters. Furthermore, the whole system output tracking error  $z_1 = [z_{1,1}, \dots, z_{m,1}]^T$  satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|z_1(t)\| \leq \Delta_1$  with  $\Delta_1$  a positive constant depending on the design parameters.

*Proof:* According to (22), (35) and (44), the time derivative of  $V_j$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_j \leq & \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j} \left[ -c_{j,i_j} g_{j,i_j} z_{j,i_j}^2 \right] + \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j-1} \left[ |e_{j,i_j+1} \zeta_{j,i_j+1}(\cdot)| \right] \\ & + \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j-1} \left[ -\frac{e_{j,i_j+1}^2}{\tau_{j,i_j+1}} + \bar{g}_{j,i_j} (|z_{j,i_j+1}| + |e_{j,i_j+1}|) |z_{j,i_j}| \right] \\ & + \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j} \left[ \sigma_{j,i_j} \underline{g}_{j,i_j} \left( \tilde{\vartheta}_{j,i_j} \hat{\vartheta}_{j,i_j} + \tilde{\delta}_{j,i_j} \hat{\delta}_{j,i_j} \right) + b_{j,i_j} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where  $b_{j,i_j} = 0.2785 \nu_{j,i_j} \left( \varepsilon_{j,i_j}^* + d_{j,i_j}^* + 1 \right) + \frac{a_{j,i_j}^2}{2}$ .

By completion of squares, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |e_{j,i_j+1} \zeta_{j,i_j+1}(\cdot)| & \leq \frac{e_{j,i_j+1}^2 \zeta_{j,i_j+1}^2(\cdot)}{2k_{j,1}} + \frac{k_{j,1}}{2} \\ \bar{g}_{j,i_j} |z_{j,i_j+1}| |z_{j,i_j}| & \leq \frac{\bar{g}_{j,i_j} z_{j,i_j+1}^2}{2} + \frac{\bar{g}_{j,i_j} z_{j,i_j}^2}{2} \\ \bar{g}_{j,i_j} |z_{j,i_j}| |e_{j,i_j+1}| & \leq \frac{k_{j,2} \bar{g}_{j,i_j}^2 e_{j,i_j+1}^2}{2} + \frac{z_{j,i_j}^2}{2k_{j,2}} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

with  $k_{j,1}$  and  $k_{j,2}$  being positive constants.

Let  $\frac{1}{\tau_{j,i_j+1}} \geq \frac{D_{j,i_j+1}^2(\cdot)}{2k_{j,1}} + \frac{k_{j,2} \bar{g}_{j,i_j}^2}{2} + \alpha_j$  with  $\bar{G}_j = \max\{\bar{g}_{j,1}, \dots, \bar{g}_{j,\rho_j}\}$  and  $\alpha_j$  positive constant. Therefore, we obtain the time derivative of  $V_j$  as

$$\dot{V}_j \leq -\lambda_j V_j + C_j \quad (49)$$

where  $\lambda_j = \min\{2\alpha_j, \sigma_{j,i_j} \gamma_{j,i_j}, \sigma_{j,i_j} \beta_{j,i_j}\}$  and  $C_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j} \sigma_{j,i_j} \underline{g}_{j,i_j} \left( \vartheta_{j,i_j}^2 + \delta_{j,i_j}^2 \right) + \sum_{i_j=1}^{\rho_j} b_{j,i_j} + \frac{(\rho_j-1)k_{j,1}}{2}$ .

By solving (49), one has

$$V_j(t) \leq [V_j(0) - \Sigma] e^{-\lambda_j t} + \Sigma \quad (50)$$

with  $\Sigma = C_j / \lambda_j$  a positive constant. Thus we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |z_{j,1}| \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{2V_j(t)} \leq \sqrt{2\Sigma} = \Delta_{j,1} \quad (51)$$

Now let us consider the Lyapunov function candidate for the whole systems as  $V = \sum_{j=1}^m V_j$ . From (50), it follows that

$$\dot{V} = \sum_{j=1}^m \dot{V}_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^m [-\lambda_j V_j + C_j] \leq -\kappa V + \Pi \quad (52)$$

with  $\kappa = \min\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$  and  $\Pi = \sum_{j=1}^m C_j$ . Then, one has

$$V(t) \leq [V(0) - \Gamma] e^{-\kappa t} + \Gamma \quad (53)$$

where  $\Gamma = \frac{\Pi}{\kappa}$  is a positive constant.

Similarly, we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(t) \leq \Gamma$ , which leads to

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|z_1(t)\| \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{2V(t)} \leq \sqrt{2\Gamma} = \Delta_1 \quad (54)$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

## IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

Consider the nonlinear MIMO uncertain systems as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_{1,1} = x_{1,1}^3 e^{-0.3x_{1,2}^2} + (0.5 + e^{x_{2,1}^2}) x_{1,2} + d_{1,1}(t, x) \\ \dot{x}_{1,2} = \cos(x_{1,1}(x_{1,2}^2)) x_{1,2} + (1 + e^{x_{1,1}^2 x_{1,2}^3}) u_1 \\ \quad + d_{1,2}(t, x) \\ \dot{x}_{2,1} = (1 + \sin(x_{1,2} x_{2,1}^2)) + e^{x_{1,1} x_{2,1}} x_{2,2} + d_{2,1}(t, x) \\ \dot{x}_{2,2} = x_{2,1} x_{2,2}^2 + x_{1,1} x_{1,2}^2 + (1.5 + e^{x_{1,1} x_{2,1} x_{2,2}}) u_2 \\ \quad + d_{2,2}(t, x) \\ y_1 = x_{1,1}, y_2 = x_{2,1} \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

where  $d_{1,1} = 0.5 \cos(x_{1,1}^2 x_{2,1} x_{2,2}) \sin(0.2t)$ ,  $d_{1,2} = 0.5 \cos(x_{1,2}^2 + x_{1,2} x_{2,1})$ ,  $d_{2,1} = 2 \sin(x_{1,1} x_{2,1} x_{1,2}^2)$  and




Fig. 1: Simulation results

$d_{2,2} = \sin(x_{2,2}^2 + x_{2,1}^2)(\sin(t))^3$ . The desired tracking trajectories are  $y_{1,d} = 0.5(\sin(t) + \sin(0.5t))$  and  $y_{2,d} = \sin(t)$ . Note that the control gain functions  $g_{1,1} = (0.5 + e^{x_{2,1}^2})$ ,  $g_{1,2} = (1 + e^{x_{1,1}^2 x_{1,2}^2})$ ,  $g_{2,1} = e^{x_{1,1} x_{2,1}}$  and  $g_{2,2} = (1.5 + e^{x_{1,1} x_{2,1} x_{2,2}})$  cannot be bounded a priori, but they apparently satisfy Assumption 1. Thus, where existing methods cannot be applied, our scheme can be used to the nonlinear system (55).

The adaptation laws are given by (14), (15), (27) and (28) with design parameters  $\beta_{1,1} = \beta_{1,2} = 1.5$ ,  $\beta_{2,1} = \beta_{2,2} = 1$ ,  $\sigma_{1,1} = \sigma_{1,2} = 0.2$ ,  $\sigma_{2,1} = \sigma_{2,2} = 0.15$ ,  $\gamma_{1,1} = 1$ ,  $\gamma_{1,2} = \gamma_{2,2} = 1.5$  and  $\gamma_{2,1} = 2$ . Let the initial conditions be  $[x_{1,1}(0), x_{1,2}(0), x_{2,1}(0), x_{2,2}(0)]^T = [0, 0, 0, 0]^T$ ,  $\hat{v}_{1,1}(0) = \hat{v}_{1,2}(0) = \hat{v}_{2,1}(0) = \hat{v}_{2,2}(0) = 0$  and  $\hat{\delta}_{1,1}(0) = \hat{\delta}_{1,2}(0) = \hat{\delta}_{2,1}(0) = \hat{\delta}_{2,2}(0) = 0$ . The simulation results are provided in Fig. 1 (a) and (b).

From Fig. 1 (a), we can see that the outputs  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  track the desired trajectories  $y_{1,d}$  and  $y_{2,d}$  as closely as possible and excellent tracking performance has been achieved. Fig. 1 (b) shows that the proposed scheme works well with bounded system inputs even in the presence of possibly unbounded control gain functions.

## V. CONCLUSION

A novel extended adaptive tracking control approach has been presented for a less restrictive class of nonlinear MIMO systems with possibly unbounded control gain functions and external disturbances. The restrictive assumption that the upper and lower bounds of control gain functions must be positive constants or coefficients has been removed by introducing appropriate compact sets where the maximums and minimums of continuous control gain functions are well defined and used in the control design. Stability of the closed-loop systems has been rigorously proved using Lyapunov theory in combination with invariant set theory.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Baldi and P. A. Ioannou, "Stability margins in adaptive mixing control via a Lyapunov-based switching criterion" *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1194-1207, May 2016.
- [2] M. Lv, X. Sun, S. Liu, and D. Wang, "Adaptive tracking control for non-affine nonlinear systems with non-affine function possibly being discontinuous," *Int. J. Syst. Science.*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 1115-1122, Jan. 2017.

- [3] Z. Sun, and Y. Liu, "Adaptive state-feedback stabilization for a class of high-order nonlinear uncertain systems" *Automatica*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1772-1783, May 2007.
- [4] M. Lv, Y. Wang, S. Baldi, Z. Liu, and Z. Wang, "A DSC method for strict-feedback nonlinear systems with possibly unbounded control gain functions," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 275, pp. 1383-1392, Nov. 2018.
- [5] B. Chen, X. Liu, K. Liu, and C. Lin, "Novel adaptive neural control design for nonlinear MIMO time-delay systems," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 1554-1560, Aug. 2009.
- [6] X. Zhao, H. Yang, W. Xia, and X. Wang, "Adaptive fuzzy hierarchical sliding-mode control for a class of MIMO nonlinear time-delay systems with input saturation," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 1062-1077, Oct. 2017.
- [7] T. Li, S. Tong, and G. Feng, "A novel robust adaptive fuzzy-tracking control for a class of nonlinear multi-input/multi-output systems," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp.150-160, Feb. 2010.
- [8] H. Wang, B. Chen, X. Liu, K. Liu, and C. Lin, "Robust adaptive fuzzy tracking control for pure-feedback stochastic nonlinear systems with input constraints," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 2093-2014, Dec. 2013.
- [9] B. Chen, K. Liu, X. Liu, P. Shi, and C. Lin, "Approximation-based adaptive neural control design for a class of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 111-123, Oct. 2014.
- [10] D. Swaroop, J. K. Hedrick, and J. C. Gerdes, "Dynamic surface control for a class of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 1893-1899, Oct. 2000.
- [11] M. Lv, S. Baldi, and Z. Liu, "The non-smoothness problem in disturbance observer design: a set-invariance based adaptive fuzzy control method" *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, to be published, DOI 10.1109/TFUZZ.2019.2892353.
- [12] Z. Liu, X. Dong, J. Xue, H. Li, and Y. Chen, "Adaptive neural control for a class of pure-feedback nonlinear systems via dynamic surface technique," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks & Learning Systems*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 1969-1975, 2016.
- [13] N. Wang, Y. Wang, and M. Lv, "Fuzzy adaptive dsc design for an extended class of mimo pure-feedback non-affine nonlinear systems in the presence of input constraints," *Mathematical problems in engineering*, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/4360643>.
- [14] Z. Liu, X. Dong, W. Xie, Y. Chen, and H. Li, "Adaptive fuzzy control for pure-feedback nonlinear systems with non-affine functions being semi-bounded and in-differentiable," *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 395-408, 2018.
- [15] M. Lv, W. Yu, and S. Baldi, "The set-invariance paradigm in fuzzy adaptive dsc design of large-scale nonlinear input-constrained systems" *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern., Syst.*, to be published, DOI 10.1109/TSMC.2019.2895101.
- [16] Z. Liu, X. Dong, J. Xue, and Y. Chen, "Adaptive neural control for a class of time-delay systems in the presence of backlash or deadzone non-linearity," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 1009-1022, 2014.
- [17] M. Lv, Y. Wang, S. Baldi, Z. Liu, C. Shi, C. Fu, X. Meng, and Y. Qi, "Adaptive neural control for pure feedback nonlinear systems with uncertain actuator nonlinearity," *ICONIP (6)*, pp. 201-211, 2017.
- [18] Q. Li, R. Yang, and Z. Liu, "Adaptive tracking control for a class of nonlinear non-strict-feedback systems," *Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 88, no. 3, pp. 1-14, 2017.