

# Convergence time estimate and tuning of twisting algorithm

Ramón I. Verdés Kairuz<sup>a</sup>, Yury Orlov<sup>b</sup>, Luis T. Aguilar<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Instituto Politécnico Nacional—CITEDI, Avenida Instituto Politécnico Nacional 1310  
Colonia Nueva Tijuana 22435 Tijuana, México*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Mexican Scientific and Advanced  
Studies Center of Ensenada, Carretera Ensenada-Tijuana No. 3918, Zona Playitas, CP.  
22860, Ensenada, México*

---

## Abstract

Gain tuning is given for the twisting controller to ensure that the closed-loop trajectories of the perturbed double integrator, initialized within a bounded domain and affected by uniformly bounded disturbances, settle at the origin in prescribed time.

---

## 1. Introduction

In [1], a settling time estimate of the perturbed double integrator

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_1 &= x_2, \\ \dot{x}_2 &= u(x_1, x_2) + \omega(t),\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

driven by the twisting algorithm

$$u(x_1, x_2) = -\mu_2 \operatorname{sign}(x_1) - \mu_1 \operatorname{sign}(x_2),\tag{2}$$

was obtained in terms of the positive constant gains  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ , of the upper magnitude bound  $N > 0$  on the external disturbance  $\omega(\cdot)$  such that

$$|\omega(t)| \leq N \quad \text{for all } t,\tag{3}$$

---

*Email addresses:* [rverdes@citedi.mx](mailto:rverdes@citedi.mx) (Ramón I. Verdés Kairuz), [yorlov@cicese.mx](mailto:yorlov@cicese.mx) (Yury Orlov), [laguilarb@ipn.mx](mailto:laguilarb@ipn.mx) (Luis T. Aguilar)

and of the size  $R > 0$  of the initial domain

$$\Gamma_R = \{x : V(x_1, x_2) \leq R\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $V(x_1, x_2)$  is the positive definite function

$$V(x_1, x_2) = \mu_2 |x_1| + \frac{1}{2}x_2^2. \quad (5)$$

The aim of this note is to further simplify the afore-mentioned estimate to suit it to control applications of the twisting algorithm in the closed-loop form. For convenience of the reader, the nomenclature of [1] is used throughout.

## 2. Settling time estimate

Given the parameters

$$R > 0, \quad \beta > 1, \quad \rho \in (0, 1), \quad \delta > \frac{\sqrt{2R}(\beta + 1)}{\beta - 1} \quad (6)$$

let us choose

$$\mu_1 > \frac{2\delta}{\mathcal{T}_s \sqrt{1 - \beta^{-2}}} + N, \quad (7)$$

$$\mu_2 > \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{R}{2}}, \rho \sqrt{\frac{R}{2(1 - \rho)}}, \rho, \beta\mu_1, \mu_1 + N \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_s > 0$  is a prescribed convergence time.

Setting the initial domain boundary

$$\partial\Gamma_R = \{x : V(x_1, x_2) = R\}, \quad (9)$$

the following result is in order.

**Theorem 1.** *Consider the perturbed double integrator (1), driven by the twisting algorithm (2) and affected by an external disturbance (3). Let  $x(\cdot) = (x_1(\cdot), x_2(\cdot))^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be an arbitrary solution of the closed-loop system (1)–(2), initialized on the domain boundary (9) of the size  $R > 0$ , and let the gains*

$\mu_1, \mu_2$  be chosen according to (7)–(8), specified with  $N, \mathcal{T}_s > 0$  and the parameters  $R, \beta, \rho, \delta$ , satisfying (6). Then  $x(t) \equiv 0$  for all  $t \geq \mathcal{T}_s$ , regardless of whichever external disturbance (3) affects the closed-loop system.

### 3. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof follows the line of reasoning used in [1]. All relations, which are subsequently invoked from [1], are accordingly referenced.

For later use, let us introduce embedded balls

$$B_{r_1} = \{x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq r_1^2\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{r_2} = \{x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq r_2^2\} \quad \text{such that} \quad B_{r_2} \subset \Gamma_R \subset B_{r_1}.$$

The balls, thus introduced, are depicted in Figure 1, reproduced from [1].




Figure 1: Sets  $\Gamma_R, B_{r_1}, B_{r_2}$  and  $B_\delta$ .

The radiuses  $r_1, r_2$  of such balls are established in [1, relations (4.18) and (4.25)] to be

$$r_1 = \max \left\{ \frac{R}{\mu_2}, \sqrt{2R} \right\} \quad (10)$$

$$r_2 = \min \left\{ \frac{\rho R}{\mu_2}, \sqrt{2R(1-\rho)} \right\} \quad (11)$$

with  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . Since  $\mu_2 > \sqrt{\frac{R}{2}}$  due to (8), relation (10) is simplified to [1, relation (6.6)]

$$r_1 = \sqrt{2R} \quad (12)$$

In addition,  $\mu_2 > \rho\sqrt{\frac{R}{2(1-\rho)}}$  by its choice (8), and (11) is therefore simplified to [1, relation (4.28)]

$$r_2 = \frac{\rho R}{\mu_2}. \quad (13)$$

Taking into account that (8) results in  $\mu_2 > \rho$ , it follows that  $r_2 < R$ .

The convergence time  $T_2$  of the closed-loop system (1)–(2), initialized on the domain boundary (9), is upper estimated by that of initialized at the intersection point  $O_4$  of the vertical axis and the circle  $\partial B_\delta = \{x_1^2 + x_2^2 = \delta^2\}$  of a (properly chosen) radius  $\delta$ , satisfying (6); see Figure 1. As shown in [1, p.480], such a value of  $\delta$  ensures that the resulting convergence time estimate is conservative regardless of whichever initial conditions are chosen on the domain boundary  $\partial\Gamma_R$ .

Thus, the convergence time  $\mathcal{T}_2$  of the closed-loop system (1)–(2), initialized at  $O_4$ , is bigger than the convergence time  $T_2$  of (1)–(2), initialized on (9), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}_2 \geq T_2, \quad (14)$$

and it is given by [1, relation (5.37)]

$$\mathcal{T}_2 = \frac{\delta \left( \sqrt{1 - \eta^2} + 1 \right)}{(\mu_1 - N) \sqrt{1 - \eta^2}} \quad (15)$$

where

$$\eta = \frac{\mu_1 - N}{\mu_2} < \frac{1}{\beta}. \quad (16)$$

Relations (15) and (16), coupled together, ensure [1, cf. relation (5.40)] that

$$\mathcal{T}_2 = \frac{\delta \left( \sqrt{1 - \eta^2} + 1 \right)}{(\mu_1 - N) \sqrt{1 - \eta^2}} \leq \frac{2\delta}{(\mu_1 - N) \sqrt{1 - \beta^{-2}}}. \quad (17)$$

Employing (14) and taking into account that under condition (7), imposed on  $\mu_1$ , one has

$$\frac{2\delta}{(\mu_1 - N) \sqrt{1 - \beta^{-2}}} \leq \mathcal{T}_s, \quad (18)$$

it follows that

$$T_2 \leq \mathcal{T}_2 \leq \mathcal{T}_s. \quad (19)$$

Hence, the convergence time  $T_2$  of the closed-loop system (1)–(2), initialized on the domain boundary (9), is smaller than the prescribed time instant  $\mathcal{T}_s$ . The proof of Theorem 1 is thus completed.

#### 4. Supporting simulations

Capabilities of the tuning of the twisting controller gains, resulting from Theorem 1, are illustrated in the numerical study of the fixed-time regulation problem of a simple pendulum, initialized in a prespecified domain. Consider a simple pendulum governed by

$$\ddot{q} = b[\tau(q, \dot{q}, t) - f_v \dot{q} - mgl \sin(q) + d(t)] \quad (20)$$

where  $b = 1/(m_p l^2 + J)$  and  $q$  is the angular position. Hereinafter,  $m_p$  is the mass of the pendulum,  $l$  is the distance from its rotation axis to its center of mass,  $J$  is the moment of inertia of the pendulum with respect to its center of mass,  $f_v$  is the viscous friction coefficient,  $g$  is the gravity acceleration,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$  is the torque produced by the actuator, the unknown term  $d(t)$  stands to account for external uniformly bounded disturbances. The parameters of the pendulum (20) are given in Table 1. The pendulum model (20), represented in terms of

Table 1: Parametric values of the pendulum driven by actuator

parameter	value	unit
$m$	0.0474	kg
$l$	0.11	m
$J$	$3.11 \times 10^{-03}$	kg m <sup>2</sup>
$g$	9.81	m/s <sup>2</sup>
$f_v$	$2.43 \times 10^{-04}$	N s/rad

the state errors  $x_1(t) = q(t) - r$ ,  $x_2(t) = \dot{q}(t)$ , takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 &= b[\tau - f_v x_2 - mgl \sin(x_1 + r)] + \omega, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where  $x = (x_1, x_2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  is the desired position for the pendulum such that the initial error state vector  $x^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $x_1^0 = q(t_0) - r$  and  $x_2^0 = \dot{q}(t_0)$  satisfies  $x^0 \in \Gamma_R$  and

$$\omega(t) = bd(t). \tag{22}$$

Setting

$$\tau = \frac{1}{b}u + f_v x_2 + mgl \sin(x_1 + r), \tag{23}$$

the control input (23) is then composed of the friction-gravitation compensator  $f_v x_2 + mgl \sin(x_1 + r)$  and the twisting algorithm  $u(x_1, x_2)$  to be designed as in (2). Substituting (23) in (21) for  $\tau$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 &= u(x_1, x_2) + \omega(t). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The resulting system (24) is consistent with the underlying system (1) provided that  $\omega(t)$  is a uniformly bounded disturbance entering the system.

The control objective is that the closed-loop trajectories (20), (23) reach the origin of the state space in a prescribed time  $\mathcal{T}_s$  for any initial error  $x^0 \in \Gamma_R$ , regardless of whichever uniformly bounded disturbance  $\omega(t)$  affects the system.

The simulations are carried out with several initial conditions for the pendulum as  $q(0) = \{0, \frac{0.9R}{\mu_2}\}$  and  $\dot{q}(0) = \{0.8\sqrt{2R}, 0\}$ . With this initial conditions we guaranties that  $x^0 \in \Gamma_R$  in both cases. The desired value for the reference  $r$  is set to zero, i.e.,  $r = 0$ . The unknown function  $d(t)$  in (22) is modeled as

$$d(t) = A \sin(\omega t) \quad (25)$$

where  $A = 7 \times 10^{-4}$  and  $\omega = 2 \text{ rad/s}$ , thus the disturbance  $\omega(t)$  given in (22) is uniformly bounded as  $|\omega(t)| \leq 0.19$ .

The initial domain  $\Gamma_R$  in (4) is specified with  $R = 2$ , and the prescribed settling time is set to  $\mathcal{T}_s = 1$  s. Taking  $N = 0.2$ , and using the Theorem 1, the tuning variables (6) are selected as

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 2, & \beta &= 5, \\ \rho &= 0.5, & \delta &= 3.1. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Then, using (7)–(8) together with (26), the twisting algorithm parameters are set to

$$\mu_1 = 6.63, \quad \mu_2 = 33.24. \quad (27)$$

As it can be seen in the Figure 2, the closed-loop system (2), (20), (23) escape to the origin  $(x_1, x_2) = 0$  in a prescribed-time  $t \leq \mathcal{T}_s$  irrespective of the initial conditions  $x^0 \in \Gamma_R$  and the uniformly bounded disturbances entering the system. It can additionally be concluded from the phase portrait of Figure 3 that once in  $\Gamma_R$ , the trajectories of the closed-loop system (2), (20), (23) never leave the level set  $\Gamma_R$  of the Lyapunov function (5).




Figure 2: Simulation results: time responses of the pendulum position error, velocity error, and control input.






Figure 3: Simulation results: a region near the origin of the phase-portrait illustrating the set  $\Gamma_R$ .

## 5. Conclusions

In the present note, a tuning procedure is formalized for the fixed time stabilization of the perturbed double integrator, initialized on an *a priori* given domain and driven by the twisting algorithm. The resulting tuning procedure is supported by numerical simulations enriching that of [1].

## References

- [1] H. B. Oza, Y. V. Orlov, S. K. Spurgeon, Lyapunov-based settling time estimate and tuning for twisting controller, IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and information 29 (4) (2012) 471–490.