

Inertial Measurements Based Velocity-free Attitude Stabilization

A. Tayebi, A. Roberts, A. Benallegue

Abstract

The existing attitude controllers (without angular velocity measurements) involve explicitly the orientation (*e.g.*, the unit-quaternion) in the feedback. Unfortunately, there does not exist any sensor that directly measures the orientation of a rigid body, and hence, the attitude must be reconstructed using a set of inertial vector measurements as well as the angular velocity (which is assumed to be unavailable in velocity-free control schemes). To overcome this *circular reasoning*-like problem, we propose a velocity-free attitude stabilization control scheme relying solely on inertial vector measurements. The originality of this control strategy stems from the fact that the reconstruction of the attitude as well as the angular velocity measurements are not required at all. Moreover, as a byproduct of our design approach, the proposed controller does not lead to the unwinding phenomenon encountered in unit-quaternion based attitude controllers.

I. INTRODUCTION

The attitude control problem of rigid bodies has been widely studied over the last decades. The interest devoted to this problem is motivated by its technical challenges as well as its practical implications in many areas such aerospace and marine engineering. The main technical difficulty encountered in this type of mechanical systems may be attributed to the fact that the orientation (angular position) of the rigid body is not a straightforward integration of the angular velocity. Several interesting solutions to the attitude control problem have been proposed in the literature (see, for instance, [2], [11], [22], [25]).

Partial and preliminary results related to this work have been presented in [21]. This work is supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

A. Tayebi and A. Roberts are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada. A. Tayebi is also with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada. A. Benallegue is with LISV, Versailles, France. atayebi@lakeheadu.ca, arober88@uwo.ca, benalleg@lisv.uvsq.fr

As it is customary in the position control of mechanical systems, the majority of the control schemes developed for rigid bodies are (roughly speaking) of Proportional-Derivative (PD) type, where the proportional action is in terms of the orientation and the derivative action (generating the necessary damping) is in terms of the angular velocity. The requirement of the angular velocity can be removed through an appropriate design, usually based on the passivity properties of the system, as done in [4], [6], [11], [17], [22] and [24], for instance. Since there is no sensor that directly measures the orientation, the explicit use of the attitude (*e.g.*, the unit-quaternion) in the control law calls for the development of suitable attitude estimation algorithms that reconstruct the attitude from the measurements provided by some appropriate sensors (such as inertial measurements units (IMUs)). Therefore, the integration of the attitude estimation algorithm with the attitude controller has to be taken with extra care as the separation principle does not generally hold for non-linear systems.

Initially, the attitude determination from vector observations, has been tackled as a static optimization problem for which several solutions, based on Wahba's problem, have been proposed [19]. These algorithms have been refined, later on, incorporating filtering techniques of Kalman-type to handle the measurement noise (see, for instance, [3], [20] and the survey paper [5]). On the other hand, probably the most simple and yet practical dynamic attitude estimation approach is the linear complementary filtering (see, for instance, [23]), where the angular velocity and the inertial vector measurements are fused (via some appropriate linear filters) to recover the orientation of the rigid body for small angular movements. This approach has been extended to nonlinear complementary filtering for the attitude estimation from vector measurements in [7], [12], [13], [14], [16].

In fact, the existing dynamic estimation algorithms (involving signals filtering) make use of the angular velocity information to reconstruct the orientation of the rigid body. Therefore, a natural question that may arise is whether it makes sense to use velocity-free attitude controllers such as those proposed, for instance, in [11], [22] and [24], since the angular velocity will be used (anyways) to recover the attitude via dynamic estimation algorithms. In this context, the main contribution of the present paper, is the development of a new attitude stabilization control scheme that uses explicitly inertial vector measurements without requiring (either directly or indirectly) the velocity measurement. This controller is a *true velocity-free* scheme since neither the angular velocity nor the orientation are used in the control law. Moreover, as it will be shown

later, the unwinding phenomenon¹ (inherent to the quaternion representation) is avoided in our approach.

II. RIGID-BODY ATTITUDE REPRESENTATION AND EQUATIONS OF MOTION

The attitude (orientation) of a rigid body can be represented in several ways, among which, one can recall the rotation matrix R evolving in the special orthogonal group of degree three,

$$SO(3) = \{R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid R^T R = R R^T = I_3, \det(R) = 1\},$$

where I_3 is a 3-by-3 identity matrix. Another globally non-singular representation of the attitude consists of using four-dimensional vectors Q , called unit-quaternion, evolving in the three-sphere \mathbb{S}^3 , embedded in \mathbb{R}^4 , $\mathbb{S}^3 = \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid Q^T Q = 1\}$.

A unit-quaternion $Q = (q_0, q^T)^T$ is composed of a scalar component $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a vector component $q \in \mathbb{R}^3$, such that $q_0^2 + q^T q = 1$. A rotation matrix R describing a rotation by an angle θ about the unit-vector $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, can be represented by the unit-quaternion Q or $-Q$ such that $q_0 = \cos(\theta/2)$ and $q = \sin(\theta/2)\hat{k}$. Note that the mapping from $SO(3)$ to \mathbb{S}^3 is not a one-to-one mapping as there are two unit quaternion that represent the rotation matrix R . The rotation matrix R (that describes the orientation of the body-attached frame with respect to the inertial frame) is related to the unit-quaternion $Q = (q_0, q^T)^T$ through the Rodriguez formula $R = \mathcal{R}(Q)$ (see, for instance, [8], [18]). The mapping $\mathcal{R} : \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow SO(3)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) = I_3 + 2q_0 S(q) + 2S(q)^2 = (q_0^2 - q^T q)I_3 + 2qq^T + 2q_0 S(q), \quad (1)$$

where $S : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$, such that

$$S(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -x_3 & x_2 \\ x_3 & 0 & -x_1 \\ -x_2 & x_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

with $x = [x_1, x_2, x_3]^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and $\mathfrak{so}(3) = \{S \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid S^T = -S\}$ is the set of 3-by-3 skew symmetric matrices. Given a rotation matrix R and two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we have the following useful properties: $S(x)y = -S(y)x = x \times y$, $S(x)x = 0$, $S(x)S(y) = yx^T - (x^T y)I_3$

¹Using the unit-quaternion representation, the same attitude can be represented by two different unit-quaternion, namely Q and $-Q$. This fact, often leads to the so-called unwinding phenomenon, which is undesirable since some closed-loop trajectories, for some initial conditions close to the desired attitude equilibrium, can undergo an unnecessary homoclinic-like orbit [1], [2].

and $S(Rx) = RS(x)R^T$, where \times denotes the vector cross product.

The three-sphere (where the unit-quaternion evolve) has a natural Lie group structure given by the quaternion multiplication (which is distributive and associative but not commutative) denoted by “ \odot ”. The multiplication of two quaternion $P = (p_0, p^T)^T$ and $Q = (q_0, q^T)^T$ is defined as

$$P \odot Q = \begin{bmatrix} p_0q_0 - p^Tq \\ p_0q + q_0p + p \times q \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

and has the quaternion $(1, \mathbf{0}_3^T)^T$ as the identity element. Given a unit-quaternion $Q = (q_0, q^T)^T$, we have $Q \odot Q^{-1} = Q^{-1} \odot Q = (1, \mathbf{0}_3^T)^T$, where $Q^{-1} = (q_0, -q^T)^T$ and $\mathbf{0}_3$ is 3-dimensional zero vector.

Throughout this paper, $\bar{x} := (0, x^T)^T$ will denote the quaternion associated to the three-dimensional vector x . A vector $x_{\mathcal{I}}$ expressed in the inertial frame \mathcal{I} can be expressed in the body frame \mathcal{B} by $x_{\mathcal{B}} = R^T x_{\mathcal{I}}$ or equivalently in terms of unit-quaternion as $\bar{x}_{\mathcal{B}} = Q^{-1} \odot \bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}} \odot Q$, where $\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}} = (0, x_{\mathcal{I}}^T)^T$, $\bar{x}_{\mathcal{B}} = (0, x_{\mathcal{B}}^T)^T$, and Q is the unit-quaternion associated to R as per (1). The rigid body attitude kinematics, in terms of the rotation matrix, are given by $\dot{R} = RS(\omega)$, and, in terms of the unit-quaternion, by

$$\dot{Q} := \begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_0 \\ \dot{q} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}Q \odot \bar{\omega} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2}q^T\omega \\ \frac{1}{2}(q_0I_3 + S(q))\omega \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

with ω being the angular velocity of the rigid body expressed in the body-attached frame \mathcal{B} .

The rigid body rotational dynamics are governed by

$$J\dot{\omega} = \tau - S(\omega)J\omega, \quad (4)$$

where $J \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is a symmetric positive definite constant inertia matrix of rigid body with respect to the body attached frame \mathcal{B} , and τ is the external torque applied to the system expressed in \mathcal{B} .

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

We assume that the rigid body is equipped with at least two inertial sensors that provide measurements (in the body-attached frame) of constant and known inertial vectors $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $i = 1, \dots, n \geq 2$, satisfying the following assumption:

Assumption 1: At least two vectors, among the n inertial vectors, are not collinear.

The vector measurements in the body-attached frame are denoted by $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The vectors r_i and b_i are related by $b_i = R^T r_i$. We assume that the angular velocity ω of

rigid body as well as the attitude (Q or R) are unknown (unavailable for feedback). The only variables available for feedback are the inertial vector measurements. Our objective is to design a control input τ (using only the vector measurements) guaranteeing almost global asymptotic stability of the equilibrium points characterized by $(q_0 = \pm 1, q = 0, \omega = 0)$ or, equivalently, $(R = I_3, \omega = 0)$. Since the motion on $SO(3)$ (which is not a contractible space), is hampered by some well known topological obstructions that preclude global asymptotic stability results via time-invariant continuous state feedback (see, for instance, [1], [10]), the notion of almost global asymptotic stability is commonly used in this context and is defined as follows:

Definition 1: An equilibrium point x^* of a dynamical system is said to be almost globally asymptotically stable if it is stable and all the trajectories starting in some open dense subset of the state space converge to x^* .

IV. MAIN RESULTS

A. Preliminary results

Let us define the following dynamic auxiliary system:

$$\dot{\hat{Q}} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{Q} \odot \bar{\beta}, \quad (5)$$

with an arbitrary initial condition $\hat{Q}(0) \in \mathbb{S}^3$, where $\bar{\beta} := (0, \beta^T)^T$ with β being a design variable to be defined later in Theorem 1.

Let us define the vectors $\hat{b}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, as $\hat{b}_i = \mathcal{R}(\hat{Q})^T r_i$ or, equivalently, $\bar{\hat{b}}_i = \hat{Q}^{-1} \odot \bar{r}_i \odot \hat{Q}$, corresponding to the vector r_i in the frame attached to the auxiliary system (5).

Let $\tilde{R} := \mathcal{R}(\tilde{Q}) = \mathcal{R}(Q)\mathcal{R}(\hat{Q})^T$ denote the discrepancy between the actual rigid-body orientation and the orientation of the auxiliary system (5), which corresponds to the unit quaternion error $\tilde{Q} := (\tilde{q}_0, \tilde{q}^T)^T = Q \odot \hat{Q}^{-1}$ whose dynamics is governed by

$$\dot{\tilde{Q}} = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{Q} \odot \tilde{\omega} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} \tilde{q}^T \tilde{\omega} \\ \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{q}_0 I_3 + S(\tilde{q})) \tilde{\omega} \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\omega} = \mathcal{R}(\hat{Q})(\omega - \beta)$.

In the sequel, for the sake of simplicity, the arguments associated to the rotation matrices will be omitted. It is understood that R, \hat{R} and \tilde{R} correspond, respectively, to the rotation matrices $\mathcal{R}(Q), \mathcal{R}(\hat{Q})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\tilde{Q})$, associated, respectively, to the unit quaternion Q, \hat{Q} and \tilde{Q} .

Before stating our main results, let us define the following variables: $z_\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i S(\hat{b}_i) b_i$, $z_\rho := \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i S(r_i) b_i$, $W_\gamma := -\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i S(r_i)^2$ and $W_\rho := -\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i S(r_i)^2$, where $\gamma_i > 0$ and $\rho_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let us state the following useful Lemmas:

Lemma 1: The following equalities hold:

$$z_\gamma = -2\hat{R}^T(\tilde{q}_0 I - S(\tilde{q}))W_\gamma \tilde{q}, \quad (7)$$

$$z_\rho = -2(q_0 I - S(q))W_\rho q, \quad (8)$$

Proof: Using the facts that $b_i = R^T r_i$, $\hat{b}_i = \hat{R}^T r_i$ and $S(\hat{R}^T r_i) = \hat{R}^T S(r_i) \hat{R}$, we have

$$z_\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i S(\hat{b}_i) b_i = \hat{R}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i S(r_i) \hat{R}^T r_i. \quad (9)$$

Rewriting \tilde{R} in terms of the unit-quaternion \tilde{Q} , i.e., $\tilde{R} = \mathcal{R}(\tilde{Q})$, and using the facts that $S(r_i)r_i = 0$ and $S(\tilde{q})r_i = -S(r_i)\tilde{q}$, one gets

$$z_\gamma = 2\hat{R}^T \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i S(r_i) (\tilde{q}\tilde{q}^T - \tilde{q}_0 S(\tilde{q})) r_i = -2\hat{R}^T (S(\tilde{q})M_\gamma + \tilde{q}_0 W_\gamma) \tilde{q}, \quad (10)$$

where $M_\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i r_i r_i^T$. One can also show that $M_\gamma = \mu I_3 - W_\gamma$, $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i r_i^T r_i$. Substituting the expression of M_γ in (10), yields (7). Similar steps can be used to obtain z_ρ . ■

Lemma 2: Under Assumption 1, the matrices W_γ and W_ρ are positive definite.

Proof: For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have

$$-y^T S(r_i)^2 y = y^T (r_i^T r_i) y - y^T r_i r_i^T y = \|r_i\|^2 \|y\|^2 - (y^T r_i)^2 \geq 0,$$

which shows that $-S(r_i)^2 \geq 0$. Now, without loss of generality, assuming that r_1 and r_2 are the two non-collinear vectors, one has

$$y^T W_\gamma y = -y^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i S(r_i)^2 \right) y = -\gamma_1 y^T S(r_1)^2 y - \gamma_2 y^T S(r_2)^2 y + y^T \Xi y, \quad (11)$$

where $\Xi = -\sum_{i=3}^n \gamma_i S(r_i)^2 \geq 0$. It is clear that $y^T S(r_1)^2 y = 0$ is equivalent to $S(r_1)y = r_1 \times y = 0$, which is satisfied, for some $y \neq 0$, if and only if y and r_1 are collinear. Similarly, for $y \neq 0$, $y^T S(r_2)^2 y = 0$ if and only if y and r_2 are collinear. Since r_1 and r_2 are non-collinear, they cannot be both collinear to the same y , and hence, $-\gamma_1 y^T S(r_1)^2 y - \gamma_2 y^T S(r_2)^2 y > 0$ for all $y \neq 0$. Consequently, from (11), one can conclude that $y^T W_\gamma y > 0$ for all $y \neq 0$, which ends the proof. ■

Lemma 3: Under Assumption 1, the following statements hold:

- i) $z_\gamma = 0$ is equivalent to $(\tilde{q}_0 = 0, \tilde{q} = v_\gamma)$ or $(\tilde{q}_0 = \pm 1, \tilde{q} = 0)$, where v_γ are the unit eigenvectors of W_γ .
- ii) $z_\rho = 0$ is equivalent to $(q_0 = 0, q = v_\rho)$ or $(q_0 = \pm 1, q = 0)$, where v_ρ are the unit eigenvectors of W_ρ .

Proof: Using Lemma 1, $z_\gamma = 0$ is equivalent to

$$(\tilde{q}_0 I - S(\tilde{q}))W_\gamma \tilde{q} = 0, \quad (12)$$

from which one can see that $(\tilde{q}_0 = \pm 1, \tilde{q} = 0)$ is a trivial solution. The other solutions can be obtained by assuming $\tilde{q} \neq 0$ and multiplying (12) by \tilde{q}^T to obtain $\tilde{q}_0 \tilde{q}^T W_\gamma \tilde{q} = 0$, which shows that $\tilde{q}_0 = 0$ is a solution since W_γ is positive definite (as per Lemma 2). Now, we need to find the values of \tilde{q} for which $\tilde{q}_0 = 0$. Using (12) with $\tilde{q}_0 = 0$, we obtain $S(\tilde{q})W_\gamma \tilde{q} = 0$. Since W_γ is non-singular, the last equality is satisfied if and only if $W_\gamma \tilde{q} = \lambda \tilde{q}$ for some constant scalar λ , which shows that $\tilde{q} = v_\gamma$, where v_γ are the unit eigenvectors of W_γ . Similar steps can be used to prove (ii) and hence omitted here. This completes the proof. ■

Remark 1: It worth pointing out that the unit-eigenvectors of W_γ are also the unit-eigenvectors of $M_\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i r_i r_i^T$. This can be easily deduced from the fact that $M_\gamma = \mu I_3 - W_\gamma$, with $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i r_i^T r_i$. Likewise, the unit-eigenvectors of W_ρ are also the unit-eigenvectors of $M_\rho = \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i r_i r_i^T$. Note also that the eigenvalues of W_γ (resp. W_ρ) can be arbitrarily increased by increasing the gains γ_i (resp. ρ_i).

B. Vector measurements based attitude stabilization

We propose the following control law:

$$\tau = z_\gamma + z_\rho, \quad (13)$$

where z_γ and z_ρ are defined in subsection IV-A, and the following input for the auxiliary system (5):

$$\beta = -z_\gamma. \quad (14)$$

Under the proposed control law, the closed loop dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{q}} &= \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{q}_0 I_3 + S(\tilde{q}))\hat{R}(\omega + z_\gamma) \\ \dot{q} &= \frac{1}{2}(q_0 I_3 + S(q))\omega \\ J\dot{\omega} &= -S(\omega)J\omega + z_\gamma + z_\rho, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{R} := \mathcal{R}(\hat{Q}) = \mathcal{R}(\tilde{Q})^T \mathcal{R}(Q)$, and $z_\gamma = -2\mathcal{R}(Q)^T \mathcal{R}(\tilde{Q})(\tilde{q}_0 I - S(\tilde{q}))W_\gamma \tilde{q}$ and $z_\rho = -2(q_0 I - S(q))W_\rho q$. Note that the scalar parts of Q and \tilde{Q} that appear in (15) are related to the vector parts as follows: $q_0^2 = 1 - q^T q$ and $\tilde{q}_0^2 = 1 - \tilde{q}^T \tilde{q}$. It is clear that the closed loop dynamics (15) are autonomous.

Let $\chi := (\tilde{q}, q, \omega)^T$ be the state vector belonging to the state space $\Upsilon := D \times D \times \mathbb{R}^3$, with $D := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$. Now, one can state our first theorem.

Theorem 1: Consider system (3)-(4) under the control law (13). Let (14) be the input of (5). Assume that n vector measurements b_i , corresponding to the inertial vectors r_i , $i = 1, \dots, n \geq 2$ are available, and Assumption 1 holds. Then,

- 1) The equilibria of the closed-loop system (15) are given by² $\Omega_1 = (0, 0, 0)$, $\Omega_2 = (v_\gamma, 0, 0)$, $\Omega_3 = (v_\gamma, v_\rho, 0)$ and $\Omega_4 = (0, v_\rho, 0)$, where v_γ and v_ρ are, respectively, the unit eigenvectors of W_γ and W_ρ .
- 2) The equilibrium point Ω_1 is asymptotically stable with the domain of attraction containing the following domain³:

$$\Phi_1 = \{\chi \in \Upsilon \mid \chi^T P \chi \leq c\},$$

where $P = \text{diag}(2W_\gamma, 2W_\rho, \frac{1}{2}J)$, $c < 2 \min\{\lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma), \lambda_{\min}(W_\rho)\}$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\star)$ is the minimum eigenvalue of (\star) .

- 3) There exist $k_\rho > 0$ and $k_\gamma > 0$ such that if $\lambda_{\min}(W_\rho) > k_\rho$ and $\lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma) > k_\gamma$, then Ω_2 , Ω_3 and Ω_4 are unstable, and Ω_1 is almost globally asymptotically stable.

Proof: Consider the positive definite, radially unbounded, function $V : \Upsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$V(\tilde{q}, q, \omega) = 2\tilde{q}^T W_\gamma \tilde{q} + 2q^T W_\rho q + \frac{1}{2}\omega^T J \omega, \quad (16)$$

where $W_\gamma^T = W_\gamma > 0$, $W_\rho^T = W_\rho > 0$ are defined in subsection IV-A. Using (1) and the properties of the skew symmetric matrix and the unit-quaternion, one can show that $\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \tilde{b}_i^T \tilde{b}_i =$

²Note that Ω_2 is not a single equilibrium point as we have multiple values for v_γ (unit eigenvectors of W_γ). The same remark goes for Ω_3 and Ω_4 .

³Note that the domain of attraction Φ_1 includes the domain $\Phi_1^l := \{\chi \in \Upsilon \mid \|\tilde{q}\|^2 + \|q\|^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(J)}{2\lambda_M} \|\omega\|^2 < \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_M}\}$, with $\lambda_m = 2 \min\{\lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma), \lambda_{\min}(W_\rho)\}$, $\lambda_M = 2 \max\{\lambda_{\max}(W_\gamma), \lambda_{\max}(W_\rho)\}$, where $\lambda_{\max}(\star)$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue of (\star) . If the control gains are sufficiently large such that $\lambda_M \gg \lambda_{\max}(J)$, the domain Φ_1^l approaches $\{\chi \in \Upsilon \mid \|\tilde{q}\|^2 + \|q\|^2 < \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_M}\}$.

$4\tilde{q}^T W_\gamma \tilde{q}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i e_i^T e_i = 4q^T W_\rho q$, where $\tilde{b}_i := \hat{b}_i - b_i$ and $e_i := r_i - b_i$. One can also show that the dynamics of \tilde{b}_i and e_i are governed by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{b}}_i &= S(\hat{b}_i)(\beta - \omega) + S(\tilde{b}_i)\omega \\ \dot{e}_i &= -S(b_i)\omega,\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

where we used the fact that $\dot{R} = RS(\omega)$ and $\dot{\hat{R}} = \hat{R}S(\beta)$.

Consequently, one can rewrite (16) as follows:

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \tilde{b}_i^T \tilde{b}_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i e_i^T e_i + \frac{1}{2} \omega^T J \omega,\tag{18}$$

whose time-derivative, along the trajectories of (4) and (17), is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \tilde{b}_i^T S(\hat{b}_i)(\beta - \omega) - \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i e_i^T S(b_i)\omega + \omega^T \tau \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \tilde{b}_i^T S(\hat{b}_i)(\beta - \omega) - \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i r_i^T S(b_i)\omega + \omega^T \tau = (\beta - \omega)^T z_\gamma - \omega^T z_\rho + \omega^T \tau,\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

which, in view of (13) and (14), yields

$$\dot{V} = -z_\gamma^T z_\gamma = -4\tilde{q}^T W_\gamma^T (I_3 - \tilde{q}\tilde{q}^T) W_\gamma \tilde{q},\tag{20}$$

where we used Lemma 1 and the properties of the unit-quaternion and the skew-symmetric matrix to obtain the second equality. Since the closed-loop dynamics $(\tilde{q}, \dot{q}, \dot{\omega})$ are autonomous, we proceed with LaSalle's invariance theorem. From (20), setting $\dot{V} \equiv 0$ leads to $z_\gamma \equiv 0$, which in view of Lemma 3, implies that $\tilde{Q} \equiv (\pm 1, \mathbf{0}_3^T)^T$ or $\tilde{Q} \equiv (0, v_\gamma^T)^T$. Since \tilde{Q} is constant, one can conclude from (6) that $\omega - \beta \equiv 0$. Since $z_\gamma \equiv 0$, it follows from (14) that $\beta \equiv 0$, and consequently $\omega \equiv 0$ since $\omega \equiv \beta$. Since $\omega \equiv 0$, from (4), it follows that $\tau \equiv 0$. Using this last fact, together with the fact that $z_\gamma \equiv 0$, one can conclude from (13) that $z_\rho \equiv 0$. Again, invoking Lemma 3, one has $Q \equiv (\pm 1, \mathbf{0}_3^T)^T$, or $Q \equiv (0, v_\rho^T)^T$. It is clear that the largest invariant set in Υ , for the closed loop system, characterized by $\dot{V} = 0$ is given by $\Omega_{inv} = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 \Omega_i$.

Since we showed that $\dot{V} \leq 0$, one has $V(\chi(t)) \leq V(\chi(0))$, for all $t \geq 0$, which shows that Φ_1 is a positively invariant sublevel set. Since $V(\chi) \geq 2\lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma)\|\tilde{q}\|^2$ and $V(\chi) \geq 2\lambda_{\min}(W_\rho)\|q\|^2$, it is clear that $\min_{\|\tilde{q}\|=1, \|q\|=1} V(\chi) = 2\min\{\lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma), \lambda_{\min}(W_\rho)\}$. Consequently, $\Phi_1 \subset \{\chi \in \Upsilon \mid \|\tilde{q}\| < 1, \|q\| < 1\}$. Therefore, Ω_2, Ω_3 and Ω_4 do not belong to Φ_1 . Finally, since the largest invariant set in Φ_1 , corresponding to $\dot{V} = 0$, is nothing else but Ω_1 , the second claim of

the theorem is proved.

Now, we need to show that Ω_2 , Ω_3 and Ω_4 are unstable. First, let us focus our attention on Ω_2 and Ω_3 that belong to the manifold characterized by $(\tilde{q}_0 = 0, \omega = 0)$. In fact, the closed loop dynamics of \tilde{q}_0 are given by $\dot{\tilde{q}}_0 = (\tilde{q}^T W_\gamma \tilde{q})\tilde{q}_0 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{q}^T \hat{R}\omega$, which can be written, around $(\tilde{q}_0 = 0, \omega = 0)$, as follows:

$$\dot{\tilde{q}}_0 = \eta_\gamma \tilde{q}_0 - \frac{1}{2}v_\gamma^T \hat{R}\omega, \quad (21)$$

where $\eta_\gamma := v_\gamma^T W_\gamma v_\gamma$. Consider the following positive definite function: $V_0(\tilde{q}_0) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{q}_0^2$, whose time derivative along the trajectories of (21) is given by

$$\dot{V}_0 = \eta_\gamma \tilde{q}_0^2 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{q}_0 v_\gamma^T \hat{R}\omega \geq \eta_\gamma \tilde{q}_0^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\omega\| |\tilde{q}_0|. \quad (22)$$

Since \tilde{q}_0 and ω are bounded (as per (16) and (20)), and $\tilde{q}_0 = 0$ is not an invariant manifold, it is clear that, in the neighborhood of $(\tilde{q}_0 = 0, \omega = 0)$, there exists a finite parameter $k_\gamma > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{2}\|\omega\| \leq k_\gamma |\tilde{q}_0|$. Consequently, one has $\dot{V}_0 \geq (\eta_\gamma - k_\gamma)\tilde{q}_0^2$. Since η_γ is an eigenvalue of W_γ , $\eta_\gamma \geq \lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma) > 0$. Hence, $\dot{V}_0 > 0$ as long as $\lambda_{\min}(W_\gamma) > k_\gamma$ and $\tilde{q}_0 \neq 0$, which shows that Ω_2 and Ω_3 are unstable.

Now, let us show that Ω_4 is unstable, using Chetaev arguments⁴. To this end, we will show the instability of the manifold characterized by $(q_0 = 0, \omega = 0)$. Let us define $\delta := q^T J\omega$, and consider the dynamics of q_0 and δ in the neighborhood of Ω_4

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}_0 &= -\frac{1}{2}v_\rho^T \omega \\ \dot{\delta} &= -2\eta_\rho q_0, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $\eta_\rho = v_\rho^T W_\rho v_\rho$. Let us consider the following Chetaev function: $\mathcal{V}(q_0, \delta) = -q_0\delta$. Define the set $B_r = \{x := (q_0, \delta) \in [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \mid \|x(t)\| < r\}$ where $0 < r < 1$. Let us also define a subset of B_r where $\mathcal{V} > 0$, that is, $U_r = \{x \in B_r \mid \mathcal{V}(x) > 0\}$. Note that U_r is non-empty for all $0 < r < 1$, and $\mathcal{V}(0, 0) = 0$. The time derivative of \mathcal{V} , in view of (23), is given by

$$\dot{\mathcal{V}} = 2\eta_\rho q_0^2 + \frac{1}{2}\delta v_\rho^T \omega \geq (2\eta_\rho - \frac{1}{2}k_f k_q^2)q_0^2, \quad (24)$$

where we used the fact that $|\delta| \leq k_f \|\omega\|$, with $\|J\| = k_f$, and the fact that, around the manifold characterized by $(q_0 = 0, \omega = 0)$, with $q_0 \neq 0$, there exists a positive parameter k_q such that $\|\omega\| \leq k_q |q_0|$. Since η_ρ is an eigenvalue of W_ρ , $\eta_\rho \geq \lambda_{\min}(W_\rho) > 0$. Therefore, picking

⁴The reader is referred to [9] for more details about Chetaev Theorem.

$\lambda_{\min}(W_\rho) > \frac{1}{4}k_f k_q^2 =: k_\rho$, it follows that $\dot{V} > 0$ for all $q_0 \neq 0$.

Picking the initial conditions $x(0) \in U_r$, $x(t)$ must leave U_r since $\mathcal{V}(x)$ is bounded on U_r and $\dot{\mathcal{V}}(x) > 0$ everywhere in U_r . Since $\mathcal{V}(x(t)) \geq \mathcal{V}(x(0))$, $x(t)$ must leave U_r through the circle $\|x\| = r$ and not through the edges $\mathcal{V}(x) = 0$ (i.e., $\delta = 0$ or $\tilde{q}_0 = 0$). Since this can happen for arbitrarily small r , the equilibrium $(q_0 = 0, \delta = 0)$ is unstable and so is Ω_4 .

Finally, since the possible stable manifolds associated with the unstable equilibria belong to a set of Lebesgue measure zero in the state space, it is clear that Ω_1 is almost globally attractive. ■

Remark 2: For the sake of simplicity, the desired attitude has been taken as I_3 . However, it is straightforward to extend the proposed control law to the case of an arbitrary constant desired attitude $R_d = \mathcal{R}(Q_d)$ by taking $z_\rho = \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i S(R_d^T r_i) b_i$.

C. Attitude stabilization using preconditioned vector measurements

In this section, we will show almost global asymptotic stability of the desired equilibrium point without any conditions on the minimum eigenvalues of W_γ and W_ρ . This results are made possible through an appropriate preconditioning of the inertial measurement vectors.

Let us assume that we have only two vector measurements $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ corresponding, respectively, to two inertial vectors $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ (which are assumed non-collinear). Let us define the normalized (unit) vectors $v_1 = \frac{r_1}{\|r_1\|}$, $v_2 = \frac{r_1 \times r_2}{\|r_1 \times r_2\|}$ and $v_3 = \frac{(r_1 \times r_2) \times r_1}{\|(r_1 \times r_2) \times r_1\|}$. It is clear that $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ forms a unit orthonormal basis. Let us define $u_1 = \frac{b_1}{\|r_1\|}$, $u_2 = \frac{b_1 \times b_2}{\|r_1 \times r_2\|}$ and $u_3 = \frac{(b_1 \times b_2) \times b_1}{\|(r_1 \times r_2) \times r_1\|}$. Using the fact that $b_1 = R^T r_1$ and $b_2 = R^T r_2$, one can easily show that $u_i = R^T v_i$, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Let us define $z_\gamma := \gamma \sum_{i=1}^3 S(\hat{u}_i) u_i$, $z_\rho := \rho \sum_{i=1}^3 S(v_i) u_i$, $\hat{u}_i = \mathcal{R}(\hat{Q})^T v_i$, $W_\gamma := -\gamma \sum_{i=1}^3 S(v_i)^2$ and $W_\rho := -\rho \sum_{i=1}^3 S(v_i)^2$, with $\gamma > 0$, $\rho > 0$.

The choice of v_1 , v_2 and v_3 leads to $W_\gamma = 2\gamma I_3$ and $W_\rho = 2\rho I_3$. This can be shown as follows: Since $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is a unit orthonormal basis, one has $M_\gamma := \gamma \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i v_i^T = \gamma I_3$ since $M_\gamma v_i = \gamma v_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Furthermore, since $W_\gamma = \mu I_3 - M_\gamma$ with $\mu = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i^T v_i = 3\gamma$, it is clear that $W_\gamma = 2\gamma I_3$.

In this case, using Lemma 1 and the new values of W_γ and W_ρ , it follows that

$$z_\gamma = -4\gamma \hat{R}^T \tilde{q}_0 \tilde{q}, \quad z_\rho = -4\rho q_0 q. \quad (25)$$

Now, one can state our second theorem:

Theorem 2: Consider system (3)-(4) under the control law (13) and the input of the auxiliary system (5) given in (14), with z_γ and z_ρ as defined in subsection IV-C. Then,

- 1) The equilibria of the closed-loop system are given by $\Psi_1 = (0, 0, 0)$, $\Psi_2 = (\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{S}^2, 0, 0)$, $\Psi_3 = (\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{S}^2, q \in \mathbb{S}^2, 0)$ and $\Psi_4 = (0, q \in \mathbb{S}^2, 0)$.
- 2) The equilibria Ψ_2 , Ψ_3 and Ψ_4 are unstable, and Ψ_1 is almost globally asymptotically stable.

Proof: As in the proof of Theorem 1, one can show that the closed-loop system is autonomous. Consider the positive definite function (16) which, due to the fact that $W_\gamma = 2\gamma I_3$ and $W_\rho = 2\rho I_3$, can be written as

$$V(\tilde{q}, q, \omega) = 4\gamma \tilde{q}^T \tilde{q} + 4\rho q^T q + \frac{1}{2} \omega^T J \omega = \frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma \sum_{i=1}^3 \tilde{u}_i^T \tilde{u}_i + \rho \sum_{i=1}^3 e_i^T e_i + \omega^T J \omega \right), \quad (26)$$

where $\tilde{u}_i := \hat{u}_i - u_i$ and $e_i := v_i - u_i$. Using the fact that $\dot{\hat{u}}_i = S(\hat{u}_i)(\beta - \omega) + S(\tilde{u}_i)\omega$ and $\dot{e}_i = -S(u_i)\omega$, the time derivative of (26), along the closed-loop system trajectories, is given by

$$\dot{V} = -z_\gamma^T z_\gamma = -16\gamma^2 \tilde{q}^T (I_3 - \tilde{q}\tilde{q}^T) \tilde{q} = -16\gamma^2 \|\tilde{q}\|^2 (1 - \|\tilde{q}\|^2), \quad (27)$$

which vanishes at $\tilde{q} = 0$ or $\|\tilde{q}\| = 1$. Similar steps as in the proof of Theorem 1, in view of (25), can be applied to conclude that the largest invariant set in Υ , characterized by $\dot{V} = 0$, is given by $\Psi_{inv} = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 \Psi_i$. Again, as in the proof of Theorem 1, one can show that the equilibrium Ψ_1 is asymptotically stable with the domain of attraction containing the domain $\Phi_2 = \{\chi \in \Upsilon \mid \chi^T P \chi < 4 \min\{\gamma, \rho\}\} \subset \{\chi \in \Upsilon \mid \|\tilde{q}\| < 1, \|q\| < 1\}$.

Now, we need to show that Ψ_2 , Ψ_3 and Ψ_4 are unstable. In fact, at the equilibria characterized by Ψ_2 , the Lyapunov function becomes $V_{\Psi_2} = 4\gamma v^T v = 4\gamma$, where v is an arbitrary vector living in the unit 2-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . A small disturbance $\epsilon \in D$ acting on v , in the neighborhood of Ψ_2 , i.e., $\tilde{q} = v + \epsilon$, such that $0 \leq \|\tilde{q}\| < 1$, would lead to $V = 4\gamma \|\tilde{q}\|^2 < 4\gamma = V_{\Psi_2}$. Since V is non-increasing, it is clear that Ψ_2 is unstable. Similar arguments can be used to show that Ψ_3 and Ψ_4 are unstable as well, and hence omitted here. Finally, almost global attractivity of Ψ_1 follows from the previous results and the fact that \mathbb{S}^2 has Lebesgue measure zero on D . ■

Remark 3: The proposed approach guarantees *a priori* boundedness of the control input, that is, $\|\tau\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (\gamma_i + \rho_i) \|r_i\|^2$ in Theorem 1, and $\|\tau\| \leq 3(\gamma + \rho)$ in Theorem 2.

Remark 4: The control law (13) can be written as $\tau(\tilde{Q}, Q) = -2\hat{R}^T(\tilde{q}_0 I - S(\tilde{q}))W_\gamma \tilde{q} - 2(q_0 I - S(q))W_\rho q$, with $\hat{R} := \mathcal{R}(\tilde{Q})^T \mathcal{R}(Q)$. Note that $\tau(\tilde{Q}, Q) = \tau(-\tilde{Q}, -Q)$, which confirms the fact

that the proposed control strategy is not affected by the sign ambiguity of the unit-quaternion representation since our approach does not rely on any attitude reconstruction.

Remark 5: In practical applications involving small scale aerial vehicles, for instance, it is customary to equip the vehicle with an IMU composed of accelerometers, magnetometers and gyroscopes. The gyroscopes provide the angular velocity ω , the magnetometers provide a vector measurement of the earth magnetic field in the body attached frame m_B , which is related to the earth's magnetic field m_I expressed in the inertial frame through $\bar{m}_B = Q^{-1} \odot \bar{m}_I \odot Q$. The accelerometers provide a vector measurement of the apparent acceleration a_B in the body attached frame, which is related to the acceleration a_I expressed in the inertial frame through $\bar{a}_B = Q^{-1} \odot \bar{a}_I \odot Q$. In the case of quasi-stationary flights (*i.e.*, $\|\dot{v}\| \ll g$), the acceleration expressed in the inertial frame is given by $a_I = [0, 0, -g]^T$. The attitude stabilization controllers in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, could be implemented using the vector measurements obtained from the IMU (a_B, m_B) , taking $r_1 = a_I$, $b_1 = a_B$, $r_2 = m_I$ and $b_2 = m_B$.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we present some simulation results showing the effectiveness of the proposed approach. The inertia matrix has been taken as $J = \text{diag}(0.5, 0.5, 1)$ and the inertial vectors as $r_1 = [0, 0, 1]^T$ and $r_2 = [1, 0, 1]^T$. The control parameters have been taken as $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 10$ and $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0.5$. We performed two simulation tests, using the control law in Theorem 1, to show the performance of the proposed control scheme and confirm the avoidance of the unwinding phenomenon. In the first simulation test, we considered the following initial conditions: $\omega(0) = [0, 0, 0]^T$, $Q(0) = [0.8, 0, 0, 0.6]^T$ and $\hat{Q}(0) = [1, 0, 0, 0]^T$. In the second simulation test, we considered the same initial conditions except for Q , where we started the scalar part of the unit quaternion from a negative value, *i.e.*, $Q(0) = [-0.8, 0, 0, 0.6]^T$. Figure 1 and Figure 3 show the evolution of the three components of the angular velocity with respect to time for Test 1 and Test 2, respectively. Figure 2 and Figure 4 show the evolution of the unit-quaternion with respect to time for Test 1 and Test 2, respectively. We can clearly see that the unwinding phenomenon is avoided since both equilibria $(q_0 = 1, q = 0, \omega = 0)$ and $(q_0 = -1, q = 0, \omega = 0)$ are asymptotically stable.




Fig. 1: Test 1: Angular velocity vs. time




Fig. 2: Test 1: Unit-quaternion vs. time




Fig. 3: Test 2: Angular velocity vs. time




Fig. 4: Test 2: Unit-quaternion vs. time

VI. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

It is important to point out that the present work was motivated by the fact that the existing attitude control schemes (without angular velocity measurement) use explicitly the orientation of the rigid body which is not directly measurable by any means. Therefore, an additional algorithm is required for attitude reconstruction (or estimation) using the available measurements (*e.g.*, IMU measurements). Reconstructing the attitude from inertial vector measurements via static optimization algorithms is often hampered by two problems: 1) Sensitivity to noise; 2) Non-robustness due to a memoryless (random) selection among the two possible quaternion solutions Q and $-Q$ (which represent exactly the same orientation) as pointed out in [15]. On the other hand, dynamic attitude estimation algorithms of Kalman-type or complementary-filtering-type require the use of the angular velocity measurement. Hence, the integration of such algorithms

with a velocity-free attitude controller is questionable since the angular velocity is assumed to be unavailable. Besides this fundamental circular-reasoning-like problem, the stability of the overall system (observer-controller) is not generally guaranteed as the separation principle does not generally hold for nonlinear systems.

Motivated by this facts, we proposed a velocity-free attitude stabilization scheme that does not require the orientation reconstruction. To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first incorporating directly vector measurements in the design of velocity-free attitude controllers without attitude reconstruction.

The second point that is worth mentioning, is the fact that our control scheme guarantees almost global asymptotic stability of the equilibrium points characterized by $(q_0 = \pm 1, q = 0, \omega = 0)$ which clearly avoids the well-known unwinding phenomenon (as shown in the simulation results). Usually unwinding is generated when the equilibria at $q_0 = 1$ and $q_0 = -1$ are not both stable, which causes some trajectories, initialized around the unstable equilibrium, to undergo an unnecessary motion before joining the stable equilibrium, while both equilibria represent the same physical orientation.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. P. Bhat and D. S. Bernstein "A topological obstruction to continuous global stabilization of rotational motion and the unwinding phenomenon," *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 39, pp. 63-70, 2000.
- [2] N.A. Chaturvedi, A.K. Sanyal and N.H. McClamroch, "Rigid-Body Attitude Control," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, Vol. 31, No. 3, 2011, pp. 30-51.
- [3] D. Choukroun, H. Weiss, I.Y. Bar-Itzhack and Y. Oshman, "Direction Cosine Matrix Estimation from Vector Observations using a Matrix Kalman Filter," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, Vol. 46, No. 1, 2010, pp. 61-79.
- [4] B.T. Costic, D.M. Dawson, M.S. de Queiroz, and V. Kapila, "A quaternion-based adaptive attitude tracking controller without velocity Measurements," *AIAA Journal of Guidance, Control and Dynamics*, Vol. 24, N. 6, 2001.
- [5] J. L. Crassidis, F. L. Markley and Y. Cheng "Survey of Nonlinear Attitude Estimation Methods," *Journal of Guidance, Control and Dynamics*, Vol. 30, No. 1, , pp. 12-28, 2007.
- [6] O. Egeland and J.M. Godhavn, "Passivity-based adaptive attitude control of a rigid spacecraft," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 39, pp. 842-846, 1994.
- [7] M. Hua, "Attitude estimation for accelerated vehicles using GPS/INS measurements," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 723732, 2010.
- [8] P.C. Hughes, *Spacecraft attitude dynamics*. New York: Wiley, 1986.
- [9] H.K. Khalil *Nonlinear systems* . Prentice Hall, 3rd Edition, 2002.
- [10] D. E. Koditschek, "Application of a New Lyapunov Function to Global Adaptive Attitude Tracking," In proc. of the 27th IEEE CDC, 1988, pp. 63-68.
- [11] F. Lizarralde and J. T. Wen, "Attitude control without angular velocity measurement: A passivity approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 468-472, 1996.

- [12] R. Mahony, T. Hamel, J.-M. Pflimlin, "Nonlinear complementary filters on the special orthogonal group," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. 53 No. 5, pp. 1203–1218, 2008.
- [13] P. Martin, E. Salaun, "An invariant observer for earth-velocity-aided attitude heading reference systems," *17th IFAC World Congress*, Seoul, Korea, pp. 9857–9864, 2008.
- [14] P. Martin and E. Salaun, "Design and implementation of a low-cost observer-based attitude and heading reference system," *Control Engineering Practice*, Vol 17, no 7, 2010, pp. 712722.
- [15] C. G. Mayhew, R. G. Sanfelice and A. R. Teel, "On the non-robustness of inconsistent quaternion-based attitude control systems using memoryless path-lifting schemes," In Proc. of the *American Control Conference*, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2011, pp. 1003-1008.
- [16] A. Roberts and A. Tayebi, "Attitude Estimation and Position Control of VTOL UAVs using IMU and GPS Measurements," Submitted to *Automatica* (2011), (arxiv.org/abs/1106.0016).
- [17] S. Salcudean, "A globally convergent angular velocity observer for rigid body motion," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 36, No. 12, pp. 1493-1497, 1991.
- [18] M.D. Shuster, "A survey of attitude representations," *J. Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 41 , No. 4, pp. 439-517, 1993.
- [19] M. D. Shuster and S. D. Oh, "Three-Axis Attitude Determination from Vector Observations," *Journal of Guidance and Control* , Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 7077, 1981, .
- [20] M. D. Shuster, "Kalman Filtering of Spacecraft Attitude and the QUEST Model," *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 377393, 1990.
- [21] A. Tayebi, A. Roberts and A. Benallegue, "Inertial Measurements Based Dynamic Attitude Estimation and Velocity-Free Attitude Stabilization," In Proc. of the *American Control Conference*, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2011, pp. 1027-1032.
- [22] A. Tayebi "Unit quaternion based output feedback for the attitude tracking problem", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, Vol. 53, No. 6, pp. 1516-1520, 2008.
- [23] A. Tayebi and S. McGilvray, "Attitude stabilization of a quadrotor aircraft," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 562-571, 2006.
- [24] P. Tsiotras, "Further passivity results for the attitude control problem ," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 43, No. 11, pp. 1597-1600, 1998.
- [25] J. T-Y. Wen and K. Kreutz-Delgado, "The attitude control problem," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 36, No. 10, pp. 1148-1162, 1991.