

# Optimal Robust Exact Differentiation via Linear Adaptive Techniques

Richard Seeber<sup>a</sup>, Hernan Haimovich<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Graz University of Technology, Institute of Automation and Control, Christian Doppler Laboratory for Model Based Control of Complex Test Bed Systems, Graz, Austria.*

<sup>b</sup>*Centro Internacional Franco-Argentino de Ciencias de la Información y de Sistemas (CIFASIS) CONICET-UNR, 2000 Rosario, Argentina*

---

## Abstract

The problem of differentiating a function with bounded second derivative in the presence of bounded measurement noise is considered. Performance limitations in terms of the smallest achievable worst-case differentiation error of causal and exact differentiators are shown. A robust exact differentiator is then constructed via the adaptation of a single parameter of a linear differentiator. It is demonstrated that the resulting differentiator is robust with respect to noise, that it instantaneously converges to the exact derivative in the absence of noise, and that it attains the smallest possible—hence optimal—upper bound on its differentiation error under noisy measurements. For practical realization in the presence of sampled measurements, a discrete-time realization is shown that achieves optimal asymptotic accuracy with respect to the noise and the sampling period.

*Key words:* Differentiation, Optimal worst-case accuracy, Discrete-time implementation

---

## 1 Introduction

The signal differentiation problem consists in estimating a signal's derivatives based on signal measurements. This seemingly simple task becomes complicated in the presence of measurement noise and other perturbations, even if measurements are assumed to be available continuously over time. In a practical setting, moreover, measurements become available only at sampling instants, and calculations need to be performed on a digital computer; this may present additional obstacles to differentiation.

Methods for signal differentiation include algebraic methods involving elementary differential algebraic (linear) operations (Mboup et al., 2009), linear high-gain observers (Vasiljevic and Khalil, 2008; Khalil and Praly, 2014) and sliding-mode differentiators (Yu and Xu, 1996; Levant, 1998, 2003). The linear differentiators can have good measurement noise

rejection capability but are not exact, meaning that in the absence of noise their output is not ensured to converge to the true value of the signal derivative. Sliding-mode differentiators, in contrast, can be exact but this may lead to the exact differentiation also of some (differentiable) noise signals. Some strategies even aim to combine the positive features of linear and sliding-mode differentiators (Ghanes et al., 2020).

One specific differentiation problem of particular interest in relation to sliding-mode control is the estimation of a signal's first  $n$  derivatives having knowledge of a bound for the  $n + 1$ -th derivative. In this context, the presence of measurement noise limits the accuracy of any differentiator with a bound depending on noise amplitude and known derivative bound. The expressions for these accuracy limitations are related to the so-called Landau-Kolmogorov inequalities (Kolmogorov, 1962; Schoenberg and Cavaretta, 1970). The differentiation accuracy for many sliding-mode differentiators can be shown to be of the asymptotic order indicated by these inequalities as the noise amplitude tends to zero (Levant, 2003; Cruz-Zavala et al., 2011).

Since the derivative estimates are usually required for achieving some subsequent control objective, an important feature of any differentiator is its convergence speed. Sliding-mode differentiators can converge in finite time

---

\* Work partially supported by the Christian Doppler Research Association, the Austrian Federal Ministry for Digital and Economic Affairs and the National Foundation for Research, Technology and Agencia I+D+i grant PICT 2018-01385, Argentina.

*Email addresses:* richard.seeber@tugraz.at (Richard Seeber), haimovich@cifasis-conicet.gov.ar (Hernan Haimovich).

(Levant, 1998), whereas linear differentiators only do so asymptotically (Vasiljevic and Khalil, 2008). Moreover, some sliding-mode differentiators can even converge in a finite time that is independent of initial conditions (Cruz-Zavala et al., 2011), a situation that is called fixed-time convergence (Bhat and Bernstein, 2000). In addition, differentiators can be designed to achieve any given bound on the convergence time (Seeber et al., 2021).

When only sampled measurements are available and differentiator implementation becomes digital, then the differentiators conceived as continuous-time systems must be discretized. Care must be taken, however, because with improper discretization the accuracy of the resulting discretized differentiator can worsen significantly compared to the continuous-time one (Levant, 2012). The analysis of different discretization techniques becomes then highly relevant (Mojallizadeh et al., 2021; Carvajal-Rubio et al., 2021; Andritsch et al., 2021). Livne and Levant (2014) propose a proper discretization that preserves the accuracy asymptotics of the original differentiator. Several extensions of this idea are given in Barbot et al. (2020). Moreover, Hanan et al. (2021) introduce a rather slight modification that allows to lower the resulting discrete differentiator's output chattering in the absence of noise. Filtering differentiators (Levant and Yu, 2018; Levant and Livne, 2020) are even capable of filtering out unbounded noise with small average values while preserving all advantageous features of the standard sliding-mode-based differentiators. A radically different strategy for signal differentiation in a digital implementation setting is to directly consider the information carried by noisy sampled measurements accounting for noise magnitude and known derivative bound. If a suitable bound on the noise magnitude is known, then the differentiation problem can be performed through solving specific convex optimization problems (Haimovich et al., 2022) in the form of linear programs. This strategy is shown to achieve the best possible worst-case accuracy and to have explicitly computable fixed-time convergence and accuracy bounds for first-order differentiation, provided that the noise amplitude is known.

For the continuous-time case, an interesting consequence of the results in (Haimovich et al., 2022) is that the best possible worst-case accuracy may also be achieved by a linear finite difference. However, this is true only if the noise magnitude is known to the differentiator; if the actual noise magnitude happens to be lower than the assumed bound, then performance can worsen greatly. In particular, such a linear differentiator can never be exact for arbitrary signals with bounded second derivative. The use of such finite differences for robust output-feedback control was explored by Levant (2007), who showed that when utilized in conjunction with homogeneous sliding-mode controllers, differentiation via finite differences turns into an appealing strategy by adaptation of the sampling time. This adaptation allowed to achieve similar asymptotic accuracy as is obtained when using sliding-mode differentiators. However, its use is restricted to differentiation in a closed feedback loop.

In this paper, first-order differentiation of noisy signals is considered. Via the adaptation of the parameter of a linear finite difference, a robust exact differentiator is constructed that achieves *optimal differentiation accuracy*. Contrary to what is called asymptotic optimality in (Levant, 1998), which relates just to optimality of the exponents in the accuracy expression, this optimality is achieved in the sense that the differentiation error is ultimately bounded from above by the *smallest possible upper bound*. It is further shown that the convergence time of the resulting differentiator in the absence of noise is zero, i.e., that it outputs the true derivative from the beginning, and hence converges faster than any fixed-time differentiator. For practical realization, finally, it is shown that a straightforward discretization of the proposed differentiator retains the optimal accuracy with respect to the noise. In the absence of noise, it moreover achieves optimal accuracy also with respect to the sampling time.

**Notation:**  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$  denote the reals, nonnegative reals, and positive reals, respectively. If  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $|\alpha|$  denotes its absolute value. The set of measurable, real-valued functions defined on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{J}$ . For a real-valued function  $f$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\|f\|_{T, \infty} = \sup_{t \geq T} |f(t)|$  denotes its  $\mathcal{L}_{\infty}$  norm on the interval  $[T, \infty)$ ; in particular,  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty} = \|\cdot\|_{0, \infty}$ . For a set  $A$ , the image of  $A$  under  $f$  is denoted by  $f(A) = \{f(a) : a \in A\}$ . The infimum of an empty set is defined to be  $\infty$ . One-sided limits of a function  $f$  at time instant  $T$  from above or below are written as  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^+} f(t)$  or  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} f(t)$ , respectively.

## 2 Problem Statement

### 2.1 Signal Differentiation

Consider the problem of computing the derivative of a function  $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  based on a noisy measurement  $u = f + \eta$ , under the assumption that uniform bounds  $N$  and  $L$  for the noise  $\eta$  and for the second derivative  $\ddot{f}$ , respectively, exist. More precisely, the condition on the second derivative  $\ddot{f}$  is to be understood as follows:  $f$  is differentiable and  $\dot{f}$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , with Lipschitz constant  $L$ . Therefore, the second derivative  $\ddot{f}$  exists almost everywhere (a.e.) due to Rademacher's Theorem. The corresponding classes of signals to consider, from which the measurements are generated, are hence given by

$$\mathcal{F}_L = \{f \text{ differentiable} : |\ddot{f}(t)| \leq L \text{ a.e. on } \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} \quad (1a)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_N = \{\eta \text{ measurable} : |\eta(t)| \leq N \text{ for all } t \geq 0\}. \quad (1b)$$

Write  $\mathcal{F}_L + \mathcal{E}_N = \{f + \eta : f \in \mathcal{F}_L, \eta \in \mathcal{E}_N\}$  for the set of inputs  $u$  with fixed  $L$  and  $N$ . All admissible inputs for the differentiator then belong to the set

$$\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{\substack{L \geq 0 \\ N \geq 0}} (\mathcal{F}_L + \mathcal{E}_N). \quad (2)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{U}$  includes all bounded measurable functions.

A differentiator is a causal operator  $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$  that maps the measured signal  $u$  to an estimate  $\mathcal{D}u$  for the derivative of  $f$ . This estimate is usually denoted by  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  in the following. The following definition introduces some common terminology related to a differentiator that is used throughout the paper.

**Definition 2.1** *The differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  is said*

- *to be causal, if  $[\mathcal{D}u_1](T) = [\mathcal{D}u_2](T)$  whenever  $u_1(t) = u_2(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .*
- *to be linear, if  $\mathcal{D}(\alpha_1 u_1 + \alpha_2 u_2) = \alpha_1 \mathcal{D}u_1 + \alpha_2 \mathcal{D}u_2$  for  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ .*
- *to have  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  gain  $\gamma$ , if  $\|\mathcal{D}u\|_\infty \leq \gamma \|u\|_\infty$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .*

Two further important properties are exactness and robustness, as introduced by Levant (1998). A differentiator is called exact, if it differentiates signals in  $\mathcal{F}_L$  exactly. It is moreover called robust, if uniformly vanishing noise also causes the effect of the noise on the output to vanish uniformly. Formal definitions for both terms are introduced in Section 3.

An important performance criterion of a differentiator is the ultimate worst-case bound of its differentiation error. For many established differentiators, such as robust exact sliding mode differentiators and—with proper tuning—also linear differentiators, this ultimate bound has the form  $C\sqrt{NL}$  with  $C > 0$  for inputs  $u \in \mathcal{F}_L + \mathcal{E}_N$ . This expression is commonly called the differentiator's accuracy in the literature. The concrete problem is to construct a robust exact differentiator whose accuracy is optimal in the sense that  $C$  is as small as possible.

### 3 Exactness, Robustness, and Differentiation Accuracy

This section introduces formal definitions for exactness, robustness, and (asymptotic) differentiation accuracy. To that end, a worst-case differentiation error is introduced first, which is utilized in the definitions of exactness and accuracy and also motivates the definition of robustness.

Several results related to robustness, exactness, accuracy, and their connection are moreover proven following their respective definitions. In particular, lower bounds for the worst-case differentiation error and for the asymptotic accuracy are shown, which motivate the construction of optimal differentiators in Sections 4 and 5.

#### 3.1 Worst-Case Differentiation Error

For future reference, for every  $R \geq 0$ , define the class of signals with bounded second derivative that, in addition, have a bounded initial value and initial derivative, as follows

$$\mathcal{F}_L^R := \{f \in \mathcal{F}_L : |f(0)| \leq R, |\dot{f}(0)| \leq R\}. \quad (3)$$

This definition allows to introduce the concept of a worst-case differentiation error from some time  $t$  as follows:

**Definition 3.1** *Let  $L, N \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . A differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  is said to have*

- *worst-case error  $M_N^f(t)$  from time  $t \geq 0$  for a signal  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$  with noise bound  $N$  if*

$$M_N^f(t) = \sup_{\substack{u=f+\eta \\ \eta \in \mathcal{E}_N}} \sup_{\tau \geq t} |f(\tau) - [\mathcal{D}u](\tau)|. \quad (4)$$

- *worst-case error  $M_N^{L,R}(t)$  from time  $t \geq 0$  over the signal class  $\mathcal{F}_L^R$  with noise bound  $N$  if*

$$M_N^{L,R}(t) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L^R} M_N^f(t). \quad (5)$$

Clearly,  $M_N^f(t)$  and hence also  $M_N^{L,R}(t)$  are non-increasing with respect to  $t$  and non-decreasing with respect to  $N$ . The latter is furthermore also non-decreasing with respect to  $L$  and  $R$ .

As the following example shows, the worst-case error  $M_N^{L,R}(t)$  for a fixed time instant  $t$  may be an unbounded function of  $R$ . This is the reason for restricting considerations to the signal class  $\mathcal{F}_L^R \subset \mathcal{F}_L$  in Definition 3.1. Consider the linear<sup>1</sup> differentiator

$$\dot{y}_1 = \frac{2}{\tau}(u - y_1) + y_2, \quad y_1(0) = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$y_2 = (u - y_1), \quad y_2(0) = 0 \quad (7)$$

with output  $\mathcal{D}u = y_2$ . This differentiator has worst-case error

$$M_N^{L,R}(t) = (2t + 1)e^{-t}R + L \int_0^t |(\tau + 1)e^{-\tau}| d\tau + N \int_0^t |(\tau - 1)e^{-\tau}| d\tau \geq 2L + 2e^{-1}N \quad (8)$$

over the signal class  $\mathcal{F}_L^R$  with noise bound  $N$ . For every  $R$ , as  $t$  increases,  $M_N^{L,R}(t)$  converges exponentially to the lower bound  $2L + 2e^{-1}N$ , which in turn is bounded from below by  $4e^{-1/2}\sqrt{NL}$  for all  $N, L > 0$ .

The main limitation of the worst-case differentiation error of *any* causal differentiator is shown in the following proposition. It stems from the fact that the differentiator, when fed zero input  $u = 0$ , cannot distinguish between the zero function and a parabola arc  $Lt^2/2 - N$  staying within the noise bound. In Section 4, a differentiator is constructed that attains this lower bound.

<sup>1</sup> Note that a linear system is a linear differentiator in the sense of Definition 2.1 only if the initial condition is also a linear function of  $u(0)$ .




Fig. 1. Input signal limiting the worst-case error of any causal differentiator: for zero input  $u(t)$ , no differentiator can distinguish between the two illustrated signals  $f(t)$ , leading to a worst-case error of at least  $|f'(T)| = 2\sqrt{NL}$  at time instant  $T$ .

**Proposition 3.2** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a causal differentiator and let  $L, N, R, \tau \geq 0$ . Then,  $M_N^{L,R}(\tau) \geq 2\sqrt{NL}$ .

**Remark 3.3** A sketch of the proof idea (up to some technical details) is shown and described in Fig. 1.

**PROOF.** If  $L = 0$ , then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, let  $\kappa = \sqrt{N/L}$  and define  $h : [0, 2\kappa] \rightarrow [0, N]$  as

$$h(t) = \begin{cases} L\frac{t^2}{2} & t \in [0, \kappa] \\ N - L\frac{(t-2\kappa)^2}{2} & t \in [\kappa, 2\kappa]. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

One may verify that  $h(0) = \dot{h}(0) = \dot{h}(2\kappa) = 0$  and that  $h(2\kappa) = N$ . Let  $T = \tau + 4\kappa$  and consider the functions

$$g_1(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t \in [0, \tau] \\ -h(t - \tau) & t \in [\tau, \tau + 2\kappa] \\ -N + L\frac{(t-\tau-2\kappa)^2}{2} & t \geq \tau + 2\kappa, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

$$g_2(t) = \begin{cases} -g_1(t) & t \leq T \\ -N & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

It is straightforward to verify that  $|\dot{g}_1(t)| \leq L$  and  $|g_2(t)| \leq N$  hold for all  $t \geq 0$ , so that  $g_1 \in \mathcal{F}_L^0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_L^R$  and  $g_2 \in \mathcal{E}_N$ . Choosing either  $f = g_1$  and  $\eta = g_2$  or  $f = -g_1$  and  $\eta = -g_2$  results in identical (zero) input for all  $t \leq T$ . Since the differentiator is causal, its output value  $y(T)$  must be the same in either case. We have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} 2\dot{g}_1(t) = 4\sqrt{NL}$ . Hence,  $\max\{M_N^{g_1}(\tau), M_N^{-g_1}(\tau)\} \geq 2\sqrt{NL}$  since  $\tau \leq T$  and, as a consequence,  $M_N^{L,R}(\tau) \geq 2\sqrt{NL}$ . ■

Using the worst-case differentiation error from time  $t$ , different notions of exactness may now be defined.

### 3.2 Exactness

Exactness, as introduced by Levant (1998), is an important property of differentiators. It guarantees that noise-free signals in a certain class, specifically  $\mathcal{F}_L$  in the following, are differentiated exactly, i.e., that the worst-case differentiation

error for the noise-free case,  $M_0^{L,R}(t)$ , is zero for certain values of  $t$ . For a given differentiator, this property may sometimes be established only after a certain transient period. Hence, distinctions between different convergence behaviors are made:

**Definition 3.4** A differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  is said to be

- exact in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  if for every  $R$  there exists a  $t$  such that  $M_0^{L,R}(t) = 0$ .
- exact in fixed time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  if there exists  $t$  such that  $M_0^{L,R}(t) = 0$  for all  $R$ .
- exact from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  if  $M_0^{L,R}(t) = 0$  for all  $R$  and all  $t > 0$ .
- not exact over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  if it is not exact in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .

Note that the time instant  $t = 0$  is excluded when speaking about exactness from the beginning, since a causal differentiator only knows  $f(0)$  at this point. This makes it impossible to deduce  $\dot{f}(0)$ ; specifically,  $M_0^{L,R}(0) \geq R$  for all causal differentiators.

There exist several exact differentiators in the literature. For example, the well-known robust exact differentiator (RED) introduced by Levant (1998) is exact in finite time, while the uniform robust exact differentiator (URED) proposed by Cruz-Zavala et al. (2011) is exact in fixed time. In contrast, the linear high gain differentiator (HGD) in state-space form as considered by Vasiljevic and Khalil (2008) is not exact. The only existing differentiator that is exact from the beginning is the Euler differentiator given by  $\mathcal{D}u = \dot{u}$ . It is well-defined only in the absence of noise, however, i.e., only for  $u \in \mathcal{F}_L$ . In Section 5, a differentiator is constructed that is exact from the beginning and well-defined for input signals in  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Exact differentiators have a more restrictive bound on their worst-case differentiation error than the bound in Proposition 3.2. This is due to the fact that also some noise signals are differentiated exactly. The bound is shown in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.5** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a causal differentiator and let  $L, N, R, \tau \geq 0$ . If  $\mathcal{D}$  is exact in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , then  $M_N^{L,R}(\tau) \geq 2\sqrt{2NL}$ .

**Remark 3.6** A sketch of the proof idea (up to some technical details) is shown and described in Fig. 2.

**Remark 3.7** A similar bound is shown in (Levant et al., 2017, Proposition 1) for arbitrary differentiation orders. However, that bound is also valid for acausal differentiators, and hence the lower bound  $2\sqrt{NL}$  is obtained there for a first-order differentiator. The more accurate bound is also mentioned by Fraguela et al. (2012) in a footnote.

**PROOF.** For  $N = 0$  or  $L = 0$ , the statement is triv-




Fig. 2. Input signal limiting the worst-case error of any causal and exact differentiator: for differentiable input  $u(t) = -f(t)$ , a causal, exact differentiator makes an error of at least  $2|\dot{f}(T)| = 2\sqrt{2NL}$  at time instant  $T$ .

ial. Consider hence arbitrary  $L, N > 0$ , let  $t$  be such that  $M_0^{L,0}(t) = 0$  from Definition 3.4, and consider any  $\tau \geq t$ . It will be shown that  $M_N^{L,0}(\tau) \geq 2\sqrt{2NL}$ , from which the claim follows from the fact that  $M_N^{L,R}(t)$  is non-decreasing with respect to  $R$  and non-increasing with respect to  $t$ . Let  $\kappa = \sqrt{N/L}$  and define  $h : [0, 2\kappa] \rightarrow [0, N]$  as in (9). Let  $T = \tau + (2 + \sqrt{2})\kappa$  and consider the functions

$$g_1(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t \in [0, \tau] \\ -\frac{h(t-\tau)}{2} & t \in [\tau, \tau + 2\kappa] \\ -\frac{N}{2} + L\frac{(t-\tau-2\kappa)^2}{2} & t \geq \tau + 2\kappa, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

$$g_2(t) = \begin{cases} 2g_1(t) & t \leq T \\ N & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

It is straightforward to verify that  $|\ddot{g}_1(t)| \leq L$  a.e. for  $t \geq 0$ , that  $g_1 \in \mathcal{F}_L^0$ , and that  $g_2 \in \mathcal{E}_N$ . Due to exactness,  $[\mathcal{D}g_1](t) = \dot{g}_1(t)$  for all  $t \geq \tau$ . Choosing  $f = -g_1$  and  $\eta = g_2$  yields  $u(t) = f(t) + \eta(t) = g_1(t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ ; hence, also  $[\mathcal{D}u](t) = \dot{g}_1(t)$  for  $t \in [\tau, T]$ , since the differentiator is causal. Consequently,  $[\mathcal{D}u](T) = \sqrt{2NL}$  whereas  $\dot{f}(T) = -\sqrt{2NL}$ . This establishes that  $M_N^f(\tau) \geq 2\sqrt{2NL}$  with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L^0$ . Therefore,  $M_N^{L,0}(\tau) \geq 2\sqrt{2NL}$ . ■

### 3.3 Robustness

A concept that is closely connected with exactness is robustness. In Levant (1998), a differentiator is said to be robust if the differentiator output  $\mathcal{D}(f + \eta)$  tends to  $\mathcal{D}f$  uniformly as the uniform bound on the noise tends to zero.

To define it here, the following quantities (almost) analogous to  $M_N^f(t)$  and  $M_0^{L,R}(t)$  are introduced to quantify the deviation between  $\mathcal{D}u$  and  $\mathcal{D}f$ :

$$Q_N^f(t) = \sup_{\substack{u=f+\eta \\ \eta \in \mathcal{E}_N}} \sup_{\tau \geq t} |[\mathcal{D}f](\tau) - [\mathcal{D}u](\tau)|, \quad (14)$$

$$Q^{L,R}(t) = \limsup_{N \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L^R} Q_N^f(t). \quad (15)$$

With these abbreviations, robustness may then be defined in a similar style as exactness:

**Definition 3.8** A differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  is said to be

- robust in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , if for every  $R$  there exists a  $t$  such that  $Q^{L,R}(t) = 0$ .
- robust in fixed time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , if there exists  $t$  such that  $Q^{L,R}(t) = 0$  for all  $R$ .
- robust almost from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , if  $Q^{L,R}(t) = 0$  for all  $R$  and all  $t > 0$ .
- robust from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , if  $Q^{L,R}(0) = 0$  for all  $R$ .
- not robust over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  if it is not robust in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .

Unlike for exactness, the time instant  $t = 0$  is not excluded when speaking about robustness *from the beginning*. However, it is impossible for a causal differentiator to be both robust and exact from the beginning as shown in the following, which motivates the additional notion of robustness *almost from the beginning*.

**Proposition 3.9** Let  $L \geq 0$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a causal differentiator. Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  is either not robust from the beginning or not exact from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .

**PROOF.** Suppose to the contrary that  $M_0^{L,1}(t) = 0$  for all  $t > 0$  and that  $Q^{L,0}(0) = 0$ . Consider the function  $g(t) = t$ . Clearly,  $g \in \mathcal{F}_L^1$ , and hence  $[\mathcal{D}g](t) = 1$  for all  $t > 0$  due to exactness. Let  $N > 0$ , and choose the signal  $f = 0 \in \mathcal{F}_L^0$  and noise  $\eta(t) = \min(N, t)$ . This yields  $u(t) = f(t) + \eta(t) = g(t)$  for  $t \in [0, N]$ , and hence  $[\mathcal{D}u](N) = 1$ . Consequently,  $Q_N^f(0) \geq Q_N^f(N) \geq 1$ , for all  $N > 0$ , which yields the contradiction  $Q^{L,0}(0) \geq 1$ . ■

All differentiators previously mentioned, i.e., the HGD, the RED, and the URED, are robust from the beginning. The following proposition exemplarily shows this for linear differentiators.

**Proposition 3.10** Let  $L \geq 0$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a linear differentiator with finite  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  gain. Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  is robust from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $\gamma$  be the  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  gain of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Then, due to linearity,

$$Q_N^f(t) = \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N} \sup_{\tau \geq t} |[\mathcal{D}\eta](\tau)| \leq \gamma N. \quad (16)$$

Hence,  $Q^{L,R}(t) = 0$  for all  $R$  and  $t$ . ■

Finally, it is worth to point out the well-known fact that linear differentiators cannot be both robust and exact over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  for  $L > 0$ . This is shown in following proposition.

**Proposition 3.11** *Let  $L > 0$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a linear differentiator. Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  is either not robust or not exact over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .*

**PROOF.** Suppose to the contrary that  $\mathcal{D}$  is robust and exact over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  in finite time. Let  $T \geq 1$  be such that  $M_0^{L,0}(T) = 0$  and  $Q^{L,0}(T) = 0$ . Let  $\omega_k = 2\pi k$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and consider the sequence of noise inputs  $\eta_k(t) = \min(1, t^2) \sin(\omega_k t) / \omega_k$ . One verifies that  $\eta_k(0) = \dot{\eta}_k(0) = 0$ . Since  $L > 0$ , there furthermore exists an  $\alpha_k > 0$  for each  $\eta_k$  such that  $\alpha_k \eta_k \in \mathcal{F}_L^0$ , since  $\dot{\eta}_k$  is uniformly bounded. Due to linearity,  $\mathcal{D}$  then differentiates also  $\eta_k$  exactly for  $t \geq T$ . Thus, for  $f = 0$ ,

$$Q_{1/\omega_k}^f(T) \geq \sup_{\tau \geq T} |[\mathcal{D}\eta_k](\tau)| = \sup_{\tau \geq T} |\dot{\eta}_k(\tau)| = 1 \quad (17)$$

for all  $k$ . Since  $1/\omega_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , this contradicts  $Q^{L,0}(T) = 0$ . ■

### 3.4 Accuracy

As one can see from Proposition 3.2, the lower bound of the worst-case differentiation error is proportional to  $\sqrt{NL}$ . The HGD is also shown to achieve a similar proportionality with properly chosen parameters, which depend on  $N$ , however.

If the noise bound is unknown, it is desirable that this proportionality be maintained either for all  $N$ , or at least for sufficiently small  $N$ . This motivates the following notion of asymptotic accuracy. This notion is loosely consistent with similar notions in the context of sliding mode differentiators, where asymptotic accuracy also refers to the asymptotic behavior of the differentiation error with respect to the noise bound  $N$ .

**Definition 3.12** *A differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  is said to have asymptotic accuracy  $C_L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$  for signals in  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , if  $C_L$  is the infimum of all numbers  $C$  with the property that there exist  $\epsilon > 0$  and a function  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R} \times [0, \epsilon] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  continuous in its second argument such that*

$$M_N^{L,R}[\mathcal{T}(R, N)] \leq C\sqrt{NL} \quad (18)$$

for all  $N \in [0, \epsilon]$  and  $R \geq 0$ .

Note that  $\mathcal{T}$  in this definition can be considered as a kind of convergence time function. For given initial value bound  $R$  and noise bound  $N$ , it yields the time  $\mathcal{T}(R, N)$  after which the worst-case differentiation error is bounded by  $C\sqrt{NL}$ .

As can be seen from Definition 3.12, asymptotic accuracy is a property pertaining to small values of the noise amplitude. When  $N$  is unknown, it may be desirable to establish a global variant of this definition, which guarantees an error bound for all noise amplitudes. This motivates the following notion of a differentiator's global accuracy.

**Definition 3.13** *A differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  is said to have global accuracy  $\overline{C}_L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$  for signals in  $\mathcal{F}_L$ , if  $\overline{C}_L$  is the infimum of all numbers  $C$  with the property that there exists a function  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  continuous in its second argument such that (18) holds for all  $R, N \geq 0$ .*

Clearly,  $\overline{C}_L \geq C_L$  holds by definition, and it is also possible that  $C_L$  is finite when  $\overline{C}_L$  is infinite. Important differentiators with a finite asymptotic accuracy are the RED and the URED. The former also has finite global accuracy due to its homogeneity properties, while the latter does not.

The connection between robustness, exactness and accuracy is established by the following proposition, which shows that finite asymptotic accuracy implies robustness and exactness.

**Proposition 3.14** *Let  $L \geq 0$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a differentiator with asymptotic accuracy  $C_L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  is both robust and exact in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .*

**PROOF.** To prove robustness in finite time, note that  $Q_N^f(t) \leq M_N^f(t) + M_0^f(t)$  for all  $\tau$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ . Let  $R \geq 0$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the function from Definition 3.12 for some  $C > C_L$ . Consider the image  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{T}(R, [0, \epsilon])$ , which is a compact interval due to continuity of  $\mathcal{T}$  with respect to its second argument, and set  $t = \max \mathcal{I}$ . For all  $N \in [0, \epsilon]$ , then  $M_N^{L,R}(t) \leq C\sqrt{NL}$  since  $M_N^{L,R}(\cdot)$  is non-increasing with respect to its argument. Hence,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L^R} Q_N^f(t) \leq M_N^{L,R}(t) + M_0^{L,R}(t) \leq C\sqrt{NL}, \quad (19)$$

holds for all  $N \in [0, \epsilon]$ , proving that  $Q^{L,R}(t) = 0$ . Exactness follows by noting that also  $M_0^{L,R}(t) = 0$ . ■

Note that, although only robustness in finite time may be concluded from finite asymptotic accuracy, most existing differentiators in fact exhibit robustness from the beginning. In contrast, exactness from the beginning, as pointed out before, is a very strong property which is not known to be obtained by any existing robust differentiators up to now.

An immediate consequence of the previous proposition along with Proposition 3.11 is the fact that linear differentiators cannot have finite asymptotic accuracy.

**Proposition 3.15** *Let  $L > 0$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a linear differentiator. Then,  $\overline{C}_L = C_L = \infty$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $\overline{C}_L \geq C_L$ , assume to the contrary that  $C_L$  is finite. Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  is robust and exact in finite time over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  according to Proposition 3.14, contradicting Proposition 3.11. ■

From Proposition 3.2 it is clear that the asymptotic accuracy of any causal differentiator is bounded from below by  $C_L \geq 2$ . This bound is too conservative, however; a tighter lower bound, which will be shown to be achievable later on, is obtained from Propositions 3.14 and 3.5.

**Proposition 3.16** *Let  $L > 0$  and let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a causal differentiator. Then,  $\overline{C}_L \geq C_L \geq 2\sqrt{2}$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $\overline{C}_L \geq C_L$  by definition, it is sufficient to show  $C_L \geq 2\sqrt{2}$ . To that end, assume to the contrary that  $C_L < 2\sqrt{2}$ . Then,  $C_L$  is finite and  $\mathcal{D}$  is exact in finite time according to Proposition 3.14. From Proposition 3.5, then  $M_N^{L,R}(t) \geq 2\sqrt{2NL}$  for all  $N > 0$ , yielding the contradiction  $C_L \geq 2\sqrt{2}$ . ■

#### 4 Linear differentiators with best worst-case error

As a preliminary result for ultimately constructing a robust exact differentiator with optimal global accuracy, this section shows how linear differentiators with lowest possible worst-case error  $2\sqrt{NL}$ , as given by Proposition 3.2, can be constructed.

Consider the following differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  with a positive parameter  $T$  and output  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  given by

$$y(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{u(t) - u(t-T)}{T} & \text{if } t \geq T \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

It will be shown that by selecting  $T$  as

$$T = 2\sqrt{\frac{N}{L}}, \quad (21)$$

this differentiator achieves  $M_N^{L,R}(t) = 2\sqrt{NL}$  for  $t \geq T$ , and hence achieves the best possible worst-case differentiation error after a fixed time  $T$  for given  $N$  and  $L$ , as shown in Proposition 3.2.

The result is shown using the following two lemmas:

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ . Then,*

$$\left| f(t - \sigma) - f(t) + \dot{f}(t)\sigma \right| \leq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} \quad (22)$$

*holds for all  $t \geq 0$  and all  $\sigma \in [0, t]$ .*

**PROOF.** For fixed  $t$ , define

$$g(\sigma) = f(t - \sigma) - f(t) + \dot{f}(t)\sigma. \quad (23)$$

Clearly,  $g$  is a.e. twice differentiable and its second derivative satisfies  $\ddot{g}(\sigma) = \ddot{f}(t - \sigma)$  a.e. in  $[0, t]$ . Also,  $g(0) = \dot{g}(0) = 0$ . The claim follows by double integration of  $\ddot{g}$  using the bound  $|\ddot{g}(\sigma)| \leq L$  and starting from  $\sigma = 0$ . ■

**Lemma 4.2** *Let  $T > 0$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  with output  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  defined in (20). Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$ . Then,*

$$\left| y(t) - \dot{f}(t) \right| \leq \frac{2N}{T} + \frac{LT}{2} \quad (24)$$

*holds for all  $t \geq T$ .*

**Remark 4.3** *As will be shown later, the bound is also valid when the parameter  $T$  is time varying. This motivates the adaptation of that parameter to eventually obtain a robust exact differentiator in Section 5. A related approach is proposed by Levant (2007), where finite differences with adaptation of the sampling time are used in a closed-loop sliding mode control scheme.*

**PROOF.** By definition of  $y(t)$  one has

$$\left| u(t - T) - u(t) + y(t)T \right| = 0 \quad (25)$$

and hence

$$\left| f(t - T) - f(t) + y(t)T \right| \leq 2N. \quad (26)$$

Moreover, setting  $\sigma = T$  in Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\left| f(t - T) - f(t) + \dot{f}(t)T \right| \leq \frac{LT^2}{2}. \quad (27)$$

Combining the two inequalities yields

$$\left| y(t)T - \dot{f}(t)T \right| \leq \frac{LT^2}{2} + 2N \quad (28)$$

and the claim follows by dividing by  $T$ . ■

The following interesting corollary shows the well-known fact that Proposition 3.11 is not true for  $L = 0$ , cf. (Levant, 1998), because this linear differentiator is exact for (and only for)  $L = 0$ .

**Corollary 4.4** *For every  $T > 0$ , the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  with output  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  defined in (20) is robust from the beginning and exact in fixed time  $T$  over  $\mathcal{F}_0$ .*

**PROOF.** Set  $L = N = 0$  in (24) to obtain  $M_0^{0,R}(T) = 0$  for all  $R \geq 0$ . Robustness follows from Proposition 3.10. ■

Using Lemma 4.2, the optimal worst-case accuracy of the linear differentiator (20) may now be shown.

**Theorem 4.5** Let  $N \geq 0$ ,  $L > 0$  and consider the differentiator (20) with  $T = 2\sqrt{N/L}$ . Then,  $M_N^{L,R}(\tau) = 2\sqrt{NL}$  for all  $R \geq 0$  and all  $\tau \geq T$ .

**PROOF.** From Lemma 4.2 and with  $T = 2\sqrt{N/L}$ ,

$$M_N^{L,R}(t) \leq \frac{2N}{T} + \frac{LT}{2} = 2\sqrt{NL} \quad (29)$$

for  $t \geq T$ . Equality is concluded by noting that also  $M_N^{L,R}(t) \geq 2\sqrt{NL}$  due to Proposition 3.2. ■

Due to Proposition 3.15, the linear differentiator (20) has infinite asymptotic accuracy  $C_L$  for  $L > 0$ . In fact, it is infinite even for  $L = 0$ , as the following proposition shows.

**Proposition 4.6** Let  $T > 0$ ,  $L \geq 0$ , and consider the differentiator (20). Then, its asymptotic accuracy is  $C_L = \infty$ .

**PROOF.** For  $L > 0$ , the statement follows from Proposition 3.15. For  $L = 0$ , let  $f = 0 \in \mathcal{F}_L^0$  and consider arbitrary  $N > 0$  and  $\tau \geq 0$ . Let  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$  such that  $\eta(\tau + T) - \eta(\tau) = 2N$ . Then,  $u = \eta$  and consequently  $M_N^{L,0}(\tau) \geq y(\tau + T) = 2N/T > C\sqrt{NL} = 0$  for all  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ . ■

## 5 Robust exact differentiators with best accuracy

The problem with differentiator (20) is that if the noise affecting its input is actually of lower amplitude than the design parameter  $N$  used in the differentiator's construction, the corresponding worst-case differentiation error cannot be ensured to decrease. The main idea for obtaining an optimal differentiator based only on knowledge of an upper bound on the noise amplitude or directly without any knowledge on the noise amplitude is to obtain a reasonable estimate  $\hat{N}$  for this amplitude. Clearly, it is impossible to determine  $N$  exactly, because the noise may be differentiable and hence indistinguishable from the signal.

### 5.1 Proposed Differentiator

From the above considerations, a robust exact differentiator with best possible worst-case accuracy is constructed as the linear time-varying differentiator

$$y(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ \lim_{T \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(t) - u(t-T)}{T} & \text{if } t > 0, \hat{T}(t) = 0 \\ \frac{u(t) - u(t - \hat{T}(t))}{\hat{T}(t)} & \text{if } t > 0, \hat{T}(t) > 0. \end{cases} \quad (30a)$$

with an adaptation of the time difference  $\hat{T}(t)$  according to

$$\hat{T}(t) = \min \left\{ t, 2\gamma(t) \sqrt{\frac{\hat{N}(t)}{L}} \right\} \quad (30b)$$

$$(30c)$$

wherein  $\hat{N}(t)$  is an estimate for the noise amplitude determined from the measurement  $u(t)$  according to

$$\hat{N}(t) = \max \left\{ 0, \sup_{\substack{T \in (0,t) \\ \sigma \in [0,T]}} \frac{|Q(t,T,\sigma)|}{2} - \frac{L\sigma(T-\sigma)}{4} \right\} \quad (30d)$$

with the abbreviation  $Q(t,T,\sigma)$  defined as

$$Q(t,T,\sigma) = u(t-\sigma) - u(t) + \frac{u(t) - u(t-T)}{T} \sigma. \quad (30e)$$

It will be shown that the output  $y(t)$  of this differentiator is always well-defined; in particular, it will be shown that the one-sided limit occurring in (30a) exists whenever  $\hat{T}(t) = 0$  and  $t > 0$ .

The function  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$  in (30b) is a degree of freedom that has to satisfy  $1 \leq \gamma(t) \leq 1 + \sqrt{2}$  to achieve optimal accuracy, but can otherwise be an arbitrary function. The presence of the function  $\gamma$  shows that the optimal robust exact differentiator without knowledge of  $N$  is not unique (unlike the optimal linear differentiator with knowledge of  $N$  given in Section 4). The degree of freedom offered by  $\gamma$  may furthermore be used, for example, to achieve some smoothing of the differentiator output without violating the accuracy bound. For example, a discrete time implementation may choose  $\gamma(t_k)$  at every sampling time instant  $t_k$  in such a way that the difference between  $y(t_k)$  and  $y(t_{k-1})$  is minimized.

In the following subsections, the properties of this differentiator will be analyzed. Using this analysis, it will be shown in Section 5.5 that the differentiator has optimal global accuracy  $\bar{C}_L = 2\sqrt{2}$ , and that it is exact from the beginning and robust almost from the beginning.

To begin with the analysis of the differentiation error, the following lemma is obtained essentially as a corollary of Lemma 4.2.

**Lemma 5.1** Let  $N, L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  with output  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  defined in (30). Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ ,  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$ , and  $u = f + \eta$ . Then,

$$\left| y(t) - \dot{f}(t) \right| \leq \frac{2N}{\hat{T}(t)} + \frac{L\hat{T}(t)}{2} \quad (31)$$

holds whenever  $t \geq \hat{T}(t) > 0$ .



**PROOF.** Replace  $T$  by  $\hat{T}(t)$  in the proof of Lemma 4.2. ■

The previous lemma on its own does not yet allow to prove optimal accuracy of the proposed differentiator. Moreover, it does not yield any bound on the differentiation error at time instants where  $\hat{N}(t)$  and hence also  $\hat{T}(t)$  are zero. The properties of the noise estimate  $\hat{N}(t)$  hence are analyzed next.

## 5.2 Properties of the Noise Estimate

In the following, all considerations are performed at time instant  $t$ , i.e.,  $t$  is considered fixed and is a (suppressed) argument of all functions defined in the following.

For fixed  $t$ , define the abbreviation

$$a_T(\sigma) = Q(t, T, \sigma), \quad (32)$$

i.e., consider the family of functions  $a_T : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  parametrized by  $T \in (0, t]$  given by

$$a_T(\sigma) = u(t - \sigma) - u(t) + \frac{u(t) - u(t - T)}{T} \sigma. \quad (33)$$

The following lemma shows how  $a_T$  is related to the noise bound  $N$ .

**Lemma 5.2** *Let  $L, N \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . For fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , consider the family of functions  $a_T$  defined in (33) with  $u \in \mathcal{F}_L + \mathcal{E}_N$ . Then,*

$$|a_T(\sigma)| \leq 2N + \frac{L\sigma(T - \sigma)}{2} \quad (34)$$

holds for all  $T \in (0, t]$  and all  $\sigma \in [0, T]$ .

**PROOF.** It may be noted that  $a_T(0) = a_T(T) = 0$  holds by construction. Due to linearity, the impact of the function  $f$  and the noise  $\eta$  on  $a_T$  may be analyzed separately. Consider analogously defined functions  $b_T$  and  $c_T$  using  $\eta$  and  $f$ , respectively, such that  $a_T = b_T + c_T$ , i.e.,

$$b_T(\sigma) = \eta(t - \sigma) - \eta(t) + \frac{\eta(t) - \eta(t - T)}{T} \sigma, \quad (35a)$$

$$c_T(\sigma) = f(t - \sigma) - f(t) + \frac{f(t) - f(t - T)}{T} \sigma. \quad (35b)$$

An upper bound for  $b_T$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |b_T(\sigma)| &\leq |\eta(t - \sigma)| + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma}{T}\right) |\eta(t)| + \frac{\sigma}{T} |\eta(t - T)| \\ &\leq N + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma}{T}\right) N + \frac{\sigma}{T} N = 2N. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Moreover,  $c_T$  is continuously differentiable and satisfies

$$c_T(0) = c_T(T) = 0, \quad \ddot{c}_T(\sigma) = \ddot{f}(t - \sigma), \quad (37)$$

and hence a.e.  $|\ddot{c}_T(\sigma)| \leq L$ . Subject to these constraints, the extremal is given by

$$c_T^*(\sigma) = \frac{L\sigma(T - \sigma)}{2} \quad (38)$$

i.e.,  $|c_T(\sigma)| \leq c_T^*(\sigma)$ . The proof is concluded by noting that  $|a_T(\sigma)| \leq |b_T(\sigma)| + |c_T(\sigma)| \leq 2N + c_T^*(\sigma)$ . ■

Lemma 5.2 suggests that an estimate for  $N$  may be obtained by subtracting from  $a_T(\sigma)$  the parabola arc  $L\sigma(T - \sigma)/2$ . Indeed, the proposed estimate  $\hat{N}$  in (30d) may now be written as

$$\hat{N} = \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ 0, \sup_{\substack{T \in [0, t] \\ \sigma \in [0, T]}} \left[ |a_T(\sigma)| - \frac{L\sigma(T - \sigma)}{2} \right] \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Clearly  $\hat{N}$  is bounded by  $N$  from above by construction; moreover, discontinuities in the noise impose a lower bound. These properties are summarized in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3** *Let  $L, N \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , suppose that  $u = f + \eta$  with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$ , and consider a fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Define the (right-sided) discontinuity of  $\eta$  at  $t_0$  as*

$$D(t_0) = \limsup_{\tau \rightarrow t_0^+} |\eta(\tau) - \eta(t_0)|. \quad (40)$$

Then,  $\hat{N}$  as defined in (39) satisfies

$$\frac{D(t_0)}{2} \leq \hat{N} \leq N \quad (41)$$

for all  $t_0 \in [0, t)$ .

**PROOF.** For fixed  $t_0 \in [0, t)$ , let  $(\tau_k)$  be a sequence satisfying  $\tau_k \in [t_0, t)$ ,  $\tau_k \rightarrow t_0$ , and  $|\eta(\tau_k) - \eta(t_0)| \rightarrow D(t_0)$ . Let  $\sigma_k = t - \tau_k \geq 0$ ,  $T = t - t_0 > 0$  and define  $b_T, c_T$  as in (35), with  $a_T = b_T + c_T$ . Then,  $\sigma_k \rightarrow T$  and due to the continuity of  $f$ , one has

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_T(\sigma_k) = 0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L\sigma_k(T - \sigma_k)}{2}. \quad (42)$$

Hence,  $2\hat{N}$  is bounded from below by

$$\begin{aligned} 2\hat{N} &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |b_T(\sigma_k)| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\eta(t - \sigma_k) - \eta(t - T)| \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\eta(\tau_k) - \eta(t_0)| = D(t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

proving the first part of the inequality.

To show  $\hat{N} \leq N$ , note that this is trivially fulfilled for  $\hat{N} = 0$ . Otherwise, there exist sequences  $(\sigma_k)$  and  $(T_k)$  with  $0 \leq \sigma_k < T_k \leq t$  such that

$$\hat{N} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \left[ |a_{T_k}(\sigma_k)| - \frac{L\sigma_k(T_k - \sigma_k)}{2} \right] \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N = N, \quad (44)$$

thus concluding the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Depending on whether  $\hat{N}$  is zero or nonzero, two cases need to be distinguished.

### 5.3 The case $\hat{N} = 0$

If  $\hat{N}$  is zero, then the estimation does not detect the presence of noise. From Lemma 5.3 it is clear that the noise is continuous in this case. Moreover,

$$|a_T(\sigma)| \leq \frac{L\sigma(T - \sigma)}{2} \leq \frac{LT^2}{8} \quad (45)$$

holds in this case by definition of  $\hat{N}$  in (39). In the following, it will be shown that a (one-sided) derivative of the measurement  $u$  exists in this case, and that  $u$  satisfies a similar growth bound as  $f$  in Lemma 4.1. To do this, the following useful property of the function  $a_T$  is exploited.

**Lemma 5.4** *Let  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and define*

$$g(\sigma) = u(t - \sigma) + \beta\sigma - u(t). \quad (46)$$

*Then,  $a_T$  defined in (33) satisfies*

$$a_T(\alpha T) = g(\alpha T) - \alpha g(T) \quad (47)$$

*for all  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .*

**PROOF.** A straightforward computation directly yields the desired equality

$$\begin{aligned} a_T(\alpha T) &= u(t - \alpha T) - u(t) - \alpha(u(t - T) - u(t)) \\ &= u(t - \alpha T) + \beta\alpha T - u(t) \\ &\quad - \alpha(u(t - T) + \beta T - u(t)) \\ &= g(\alpha T) - \alpha g(T), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

which is valid for every  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\blacksquare$

#### 5.3.1 Differentiability of measurements

The following lemma shows that  $\hat{N} = 0$  implies left-sided differentiability of the noisy measurement  $u$ .

**Lemma 5.5** *Let  $L, N \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , suppose that  $u \in \mathcal{F}_L + \mathcal{E}_N$  and consider a fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . Let  $\mu \in (0, t]$  and suppose that  $a_T$  as defined in (33) satisfies*

$$|a_T(\sigma)| \leq \frac{LT^2}{8} \quad (49)$$

*for all  $T \in (0, \mu]$  and all  $\sigma \in [0, T]$ . Then, the limit*

$$\beta := \lim_{T \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(t) - u(t - T)}{T} \quad (50)$$

*exists.*

**PROOF.** Consider the function  $h : (0, \mu] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$h(\sigma) = \frac{u(t) - u(t - \sigma)}{\sigma}. \quad (51)$$

One then has, for all  $T \in (0, \mu]$  and  $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h(T) - h(\alpha T) &= \frac{u(t - \alpha T) - u(t)}{\alpha T} + \frac{u(t) - u(t - T)}{T} \\ &= \frac{a_T(\alpha T)}{\alpha T} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and hence

$$|h(T) - h(\alpha T)| = \frac{|a_T(\alpha T)|}{\alpha T} \leq \frac{LT^2}{8\alpha T} \leq \frac{LT}{4}. \quad (53)$$

For given  $\epsilon > 0$ , consider  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  satisfying the inequalities  $\min(\epsilon, \mu) > \sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > 0$ . If  $\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , then set  $\alpha = \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}$  to obtain

$$|h(\sigma_1) - h(\sigma_2)| = |h(\sigma_1) - h(\alpha\sigma_1)| \leq \frac{L\sigma_1}{4} \leq \frac{L\epsilon}{4} \quad (54)$$

Otherwise,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  exists such that  $\alpha = \sqrt[k]{\sigma_2/\sigma_1} \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$  and  $\sigma_2 = \alpha^k \sigma_1$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |h(\sigma_1) - h(\sigma_2)| &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} h(\alpha^i \sigma_1) - h(\alpha^{i+1} \sigma_1) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} |h(\alpha^i \sigma_1) - h(\alpha^{i+1} \sigma_1)| \\ &\leq \frac{L\sigma_1}{4} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha^i \leq \frac{L\epsilon}{4(1-\alpha)} \leq L\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

which implies existence of the limit  $\beta = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0^+} h(\sigma)$ .  $\blacksquare$

### 5.3.2 Growth bound of measurements

The next lemma shows that the measurements satisfy a similar growth bound as  $f$  in Lemma 4.1.

**Lemma 5.6** *Suppose that the conditions of Lemma 5.5 are fulfilled and let  $\beta$  and  $\mu$  be defined as in that lemma. Then,*

$$|u(t - \sigma) + \beta\sigma - u(t)| \leq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} \quad (56)$$

holds for all  $\sigma \in [0, \mu]$ .

**PROOF.** Introduce the abbreviation

$$g(\sigma) = u(t - \sigma) + \beta\sigma - u(t) \quad (57)$$

as in Lemma 5.4. Assume now the opposite, i.e., that there exists a  $\sigma \in (0, \mu]$  and a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|g(\sigma)| \geq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} + \sigma\delta \quad (58)$$

holds. Using Lemma 5.4 with  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ , one then has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L\sigma^2}{8} &\geq \left| a_\sigma \left( \frac{\sigma}{2} \right) \right| = \left| g \left( \frac{\sigma}{2} \right) - \frac{g(\sigma)}{2} \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} |g(\sigma)| - \left| g \left( \frac{\sigma}{2} \right) \right| \geq \frac{L\sigma^2}{4} + \frac{\sigma\delta}{2} - \left| g \left( \frac{\sigma}{2} \right) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Rewriting yields

$$|g(\sigma/2)| \geq \frac{L\sigma^2}{8} + \frac{\sigma\delta}{2} = \frac{L(\sigma/2)^2}{2} + (\sigma/2)\delta \quad (60)$$

and thus

$$|g(\sigma_k)| \geq \frac{L\sigma_k^2}{2} + \sigma_k\delta \quad (61)$$

for the sequence  $\sigma_k = \sigma/2^k$  tending to zero. Hence, for sufficiently large  $k$  such that  $|h(2\sigma_k) - \beta| \leq \epsilon < \delta$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L(2\sigma_k)^2}{8} &\geq |a_{2\sigma_k}(\sigma_k)| = |u(t - \sigma_k) - u(t) + h(2\sigma_k)\sigma_k| \\ &\geq |g(\sigma_k)| - \sigma_k\epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

leading to the contradiction

$$|g(\sigma_k)| \leq \frac{L\sigma_k^2}{2} + \sigma_k\epsilon < \frac{L\sigma_k^2}{2} + \sigma_k\delta \leq |g(\sigma_k)|, \quad (63)$$

thus proving the claim.  $\blacksquare$

### 5.4 The case $\hat{N} > 0$

If  $\hat{N}$  is non-zero, then the measurements allow to distinguish noise, whose magnitude  $N$  is at least  $\hat{N}$  according to Lemma 5.3. In this case, it is neither possible nor necessary to compute an exact derivative of  $u$ .

The following lemma shows that a similar inequality as in Lemma 5.6 may nonetheless be obtained with a suitable value of  $\beta$ .

**Lemma 5.7** *Let  $L, N, \hat{N} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , let  $u \in \mathcal{F}_L + \mathcal{E}_N$  and consider a fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . Let  $\hat{T} \geq 2\sqrt{\hat{N}/L}$ , define*

$$\beta := \frac{u(t) - u(t - \hat{T})}{\hat{T}}, \quad (64)$$

and suppose that  $a_T$  as defined in (33) satisfies

$$\left| a_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{T}) \right| \leq 2\hat{N} + \frac{L\hat{T}(\hat{\sigma} - \hat{T})}{2} \quad (65)$$

for some  $\hat{\sigma} \in [\hat{T}, t]$ . Then,

$$|u(t - \sigma) - u(t) + \beta\sigma| \leq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} \quad (66)$$

holds for  $\sigma = \hat{\sigma}$ .

**Remark 5.8** *Note that for  $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(t)$  as defined in (30d) or equivalently in (39), condition (65) of this lemma is fulfilled for every  $\hat{\sigma} \in [\hat{T}, t]$ , provided that  $\hat{T} \leq t$ .*

**PROOF.** Define

$$g(\sigma) = u(t - \sigma) + \beta\sigma - u(t) \quad (67)$$

as in Lemma 5.4 and note that  $g(\hat{T}) = 0$  due to the definition of  $\beta$ . Assume to the contrary that

$$|g(\hat{\sigma})| > \frac{L\hat{\sigma}^2}{2}. \quad (68)$$

Due to (65) it is possible to select  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $|c| \leq 2\hat{N}$  such that

$$\left| a_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{T}) - c \right| \leq \frac{L\hat{T}(\hat{\sigma} - \hat{T})}{2}. \quad (69)$$

With the abbreviation  $\alpha = \frac{\hat{T}}{\hat{\sigma}} \in (0, 1]$  and using Lemma 5.4, one then has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L\hat{\sigma}^2(\alpha - \alpha^2)}{2} &\geq \left| a_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{T}) - c \right| = \left| g(\hat{T}) - \alpha g(\hat{\sigma}) - c \right| \\ &= \left| \alpha g(\hat{\sigma}) + c \right| \geq \alpha |g(\hat{\sigma})| - |c| \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Consequently, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |c| &\geq \alpha |g(\hat{\sigma})| - \frac{L\hat{\sigma}^2(\alpha - \alpha^2)}{2} \\ &> \frac{L\alpha\hat{\sigma}^2}{2} - \frac{L\hat{\sigma}^2(\alpha - \alpha^2)}{2} = \frac{L\hat{T}^2}{2} \geq 2\hat{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

which yields the contradiction  $|c| > 2\hat{N}$ .  $\blacksquare$

### 5.5 Accuracy

To prove the optimal accuracy, the following lemma is introduced. It shows how a bound for the differentiation error may be obtained from the growth bounds proven in Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7.

**Lemma 5.9** *Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define  $\ell := \sqrt{2N/L}$ , let  $t \geq \ell$  and suppose that  $u = f + \eta$  with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$  and  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$  satisfies*

$$|u(t - \sigma) - u(t) + \beta\sigma| \leq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} \quad (72)$$

for  $\sigma = \ell + x$  with  $x \in [0, \Delta]$  for some  $\Delta \in [0, \ell]$ . Then,  $|\beta - \dot{f}(t)| \leq 2\sqrt{2NL} + L\frac{\Delta}{2}$ .

**Remark 5.10** *The degree of freedom  $\Delta$  introduced in this lemma is zero in the continuous-time case, which yields the desired optimal bound (cf. Proposition 3.5). Later,  $\Delta$  will be used to derive an error bound also for a discrete-time implementation of the differentiator.*

**PROOF.** According to Lemma 4.1,  $f$  satisfies

$$|f(t - \sigma) - f(t) + \dot{f}(t)\sigma| \leq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} \quad (73)$$

for all  $\sigma \in [0, t]$ . From (72), one moreover has

$$|f(t - \sigma) - f(t) + \beta\sigma| \leq \frac{L\sigma^2}{2} + 2N \quad (74)$$

for  $\sigma = \ell + x$  due to the fact that  $f = u - \eta$  and  $|\eta| \leq N$ . By combining the inequalities and dividing by  $\sigma$ , one obtains

$$\left| \beta - \dot{f}(t) \right| \leq L\sigma + \frac{2N}{\sigma} \quad (75)$$

for  $\sigma = \ell + x$ . Next, the right-hand side of (75) is shown to be less than or equal to  $2\sqrt{2NL} + L\Delta/2$ . Since  $x \in [0, \Delta]$ , then  $x - \Delta \leq 0$  and it follows that

$$0 \geq (x + \Delta/2)(x - \Delta) = x^2 - \frac{\Delta}{2}x - \frac{\Delta^2}{2}$$

and since  $\Delta \in [0, \ell]$ , then

$$0 \geq x^2 - \frac{\Delta}{2}x - \frac{\Delta}{2}\ell \Leftrightarrow x^2 \leq \frac{\Delta}{2}\sigma.$$

Adding  $2\ell^2 + 2\ell x$  to both sides of the inequality, then

$$\sigma^2 + \ell^2 \leq 2\ell\sigma + \frac{\Delta}{2}\sigma$$

which after multiplying by  $L/\sigma$  and using the definition of  $\ell$ , gives

$$L\sigma + \frac{2N}{\sigma} \leq 2\sqrt{2NL} + L\frac{\Delta}{2}.$$

Combining this with (75) establishes the required result.  $\blacksquare$

Using Lemmas 5.1 and 5.9, optimal global accuracy is now proven in the following theorem and its corollary.

**Theorem 5.11** *Let  $L, \epsilon > 0$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  defined by (30) and suppose that  $\gamma(t) \in [1, 1 + \sqrt{2}]$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Define the function  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  as*

$$\mathcal{T}(R, N) = \max \left\{ 2\sqrt{N/L}, \epsilon \right\}. \quad (76)$$

Then,  $M_N^{L,R}[\mathcal{T}(R, N)] \leq 2\sqrt{2NL}$ .

**PROOF.** For arbitrary  $N, R \geq 0$  and fix  $t \geq \mathcal{T}(R, N) > 0$ . If  $2\gamma(t)\sqrt{\hat{N}(t)}/L > \hat{T}(t)$ , then, since  $\hat{T}(t) = t \geq 2\sqrt{N/L}$  in this case, it is always possible to reduce  $\gamma(t)$  such that  $\gamma(t) \geq 1$  and  $\hat{T}(t) = 2\gamma(t)\sqrt{\hat{N}(t)}/L$ . Distinguish the cases  $N < L\hat{T}(t)^2/2$  and  $N \geq L\hat{T}(t)^2/2$ . In the first case,  $\hat{T}(t) \in (\sqrt{2N/L}, 2\gamma(t)\sqrt{N/L}]$  follows from  $\hat{T}(t) = 2\gamma(t)\sqrt{\hat{N}(t)}/L$  and the inequality  $\hat{N}(t) \leq N$  from Lemma 5.3. According to Lemma 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| y(t) - \dot{f}(t) \right| &\leq \frac{2N}{\hat{T}(t)} + \frac{L\hat{T}(t)}{2} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{1}{\gamma(t)} + \gamma(t) \right\} \sqrt{NL} \\ &\leq \frac{1 + (1 + \sqrt{2})^2}{1 + \sqrt{2}} \sqrt{NL} = 2\sqrt{2NL}. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

then holds.

In the second case, note that  $\sqrt{2N/L} \geq \hat{T}(t)$ , and distinguish again two cases  $\hat{T}(t) > 0$  and  $\hat{T}(t) = 0$ . For  $\hat{T}(t) > 0$ , use Lemma 5.7 to find that (72) holds for  $\beta = y(t)$

and  $\sigma = \sqrt{2N/L} \geq \hat{T}(t)$ . For  $\hat{T}(t) = 0$ , deduce from Lemma 5.6 that (72) holds for  $\beta = y(t)$  and all  $\sigma \geq 0$ . The bound  $|y(t) - \dot{f}(t)| \leq 2\sqrt{2NL}$  then follows from Lemma 5.9 setting  $\Delta = 0$ . ■

**Corollary 5.12** *Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  with output  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  defined by (30). Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  has global and asymptotic accuracy  $\bar{C}_L = C_L = 2\sqrt{2}$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $\bar{C}_L \geq C_L \geq 2\sqrt{2}$  for all causal differentiators according to Proposition 3.16, the statement is a direct consequence of the inequality  $\bar{C}_L \leq 2\sqrt{2}$  proven in the previous theorem.

Robustness and exactness of the proposed differentiator follow as a consequence of the differentiation error bound shown in Theorem 5.11. In particular, the differentiator is shown to be exact from the beginning and robust almost from the beginning. Given that it is impossible to achieve both properties from the beginning according to Proposition 3.11, these are the best possible exactness and robustness features that a differentiator can achieve.

**Theorem 5.13** *Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}$  with output  $y = \mathcal{D}u$  defined by (30). Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  is robust almost from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$  and exact from the beginning over  $\mathcal{F}_L$ .*

**PROOF.** If there is no noise present, then  $\hat{N}(t) = N = 0$  due to Lemma 5.3 and hence  $\hat{T}(t) = 0$  and  $u(t) = f(t)$  for all  $t$ . Consequently, for  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{D}u](t) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(t) - u(t-T)}{T} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(t) - f(t-T)}{T} = \dot{f}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

proving exactness from the beginning, i.e.,  $M_0^{L,R}(t) = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ .

For robustness, fix  $t > 0$  and set  $\epsilon = t$  in Theorem 5.11. For all  $N \in [0, Lt^2/8]$ , then  $\mathcal{T}(R, N) = t$  in that theorem and hence

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_L^R} Q_N^f(t) \leq M_N^{L,R}(t) + M_0^{L,R}(t) \leq 2\sqrt{2NL}, \quad (79)$$

which implies  $Q^{L,R}(t) = 0$ . ■

## 6 Discrete-Time Implementation

Consider that only sampled measurements of  $u = f + \eta$  are available, at times  $t_k = k\Delta$ , where  $\Delta > 0$  is the sampling

period and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Next, it will be shown that sampled versions of the proposed differentiators achieve the best possible accuracies.

The sampled version of (30) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{N}_k &= \max \left\{ 0, \sup_{\substack{T=\ell\Delta, \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \sigma=j\Delta, j \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}}} \frac{|Q(t_k, T, \sigma)|}{2} - \frac{L\sigma(T-\sigma)}{4} \right\} \\ \hat{T}_k &= \begin{cases} \Delta & \text{if } 2\sqrt{\frac{\hat{N}_k}{L}} \leq \Delta, \\ 2\gamma_k \sqrt{\frac{\hat{N}_k}{L}} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ y_k &= \frac{u(t_k) - u(t_k - \hat{T}_k)}{\hat{T}_k} \end{aligned}$$

with  $Q$  as defined in (30e) and  $\gamma_k \in [1, 1 + \sqrt{2}]$  such that  $\hat{T}_k/\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ . This differentiator, which takes the samples  $u(t_j)$  from  $j = 0$  to  $j = k$  as input to produce the estimate  $y_k$  of the derivative  $\dot{f}(t_k)$  is hereafter denoted by  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta$ , so that  $[\mathcal{D}_\Delta u](t_k) = y_k$ . Comparing  $\hat{N}_k$  with  $\hat{N}(t)$  as defined in (30d), it follows that  $\hat{N}_k \leq \hat{N}(t_k) \leq N$  because the set over which the supremum is taken for obtaining  $\hat{N}_k$  is contained in that for  $\hat{N}(t_k)$ .

When only sampled information is available, the worst-case error between any estimate and the true derivative can never be better than if measurements are available continuously over time. Therefore, some degree of error additional to that obtained in the continuous-time case is to be expected. Note also that any reasonable estimate of the derivative must take into account at least two samples of the measured signal. Therefore,  $\hat{T}_k$  can never be taken smaller than one sampling period,  $\Delta$ .

Given the noise bound  $N$  and  $L > 0$ , let  $\bar{N}$  denote the smallest real value such that

$$\bar{N} \geq N \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sqrt{2\bar{N}}}{\Delta\sqrt{L}} \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (80)$$

The following lemma is analogous to Theorem 5.11 for the case of sampled measurements.

**Lemma 6.1** *Let  $L, \Delta > 0$ ,  $N \geq 0$  and consider  $\bar{N}$  as in (80). Let  $u = f + \eta$  with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ ,  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta$  given as above. If  $t_k \geq 2\sqrt{2\bar{N}}/L$ , then*

$$\left| [\mathcal{D}_\Delta u](t_k) - \dot{f}(t_k) \right| \leq 2\sqrt{2\bar{N}L}. \quad (81)$$

**PROOF.** Completely analogous to that of Theorem 5.11. ■

The accuracy bound given by Lemma 6.1 can be improved further, as follows.

**Theorem 6.2** Let  $L, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $N \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Let  $u = f + \eta$  with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ ,  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_N$  and consider the differentiator  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta$  given as above. Let  $t_k \geq \sqrt{2N/L}$ . Then,

$$\left| [\mathcal{D}_\Delta u](t_k) - \dot{f}(t_k) \right| \leq 2\sqrt{2NL} + L\frac{\Delta}{2}. \quad (82)$$

**PROOF.** Distinguish the cases  $N < L\hat{T}_k^2/2$  and  $N \geq L\hat{T}_k^2/2$ . In the first case,  $\hat{T}_k > \sqrt{2N/L}$  and either  $\hat{T}_k \leq 2\gamma_k\sqrt{N/L}$  or  $\hat{T}_k = \Delta$ , where the inequality  $\hat{N}_k \leq N$  is taken into account, which follows from Lemma 5.3 and the fact that  $N_k \leq N(t_k)$ . According to Lemma 5.1,

$$\left| y_k - \dot{f}(t_k) \right| \leq \frac{2N}{\hat{T}_k} + \frac{L\hat{T}_k}{2}$$

and if  $\hat{T}_k \leq 2\gamma_k\sqrt{N/L}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2N}{\hat{T}_k} + \frac{L\hat{T}_k}{2} &\leq \max\left\{ \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{1}{\gamma_k} + \gamma_k \right\} \sqrt{NL} \\ &\leq \frac{1 + (1 + \sqrt{2})^2}{1 + \sqrt{2}} \sqrt{NL} = 2\sqrt{2NL}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

then holds. If  $\hat{T}_k = \Delta$ , then

$$\frac{2N}{\hat{T}_k} + \frac{L\hat{T}_k}{2} \leq \frac{2N}{\sqrt{2N/L}} + L\frac{\Delta}{2} = \sqrt{2NL} + L\frac{\Delta}{2}$$

In the second case, we have  $\hat{T}_k \leq \sqrt{2N/L}$  and, by definition of  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta$ ,  $\hat{T}_k \geq 2\sqrt{\hat{N}_k/L}$  always holds. Define  $\ell = \sqrt{2N/L}$  and let  $x \in [0, \Delta]$  be such that  $\hat{\sigma} := \ell + x$  satisfies  $\hat{\sigma}/\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ . By definition of  $\hat{N}_k$ , then

$$\left| a_{\hat{\sigma}}(\hat{T}_k) \right| \leq 2\hat{N}_k + \frac{L\hat{T}_k(\hat{\sigma} - \hat{T}_k)}{2}$$

holds because  $\hat{T}_k \leq \hat{\sigma} \leq t_k$  and  $\hat{\sigma}/\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using Lemma 5.7, then (66) holds with  $t = t_k$  and  $\sigma = \hat{\sigma}$ . The result then follows from Lemma 5.9.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 6.3** The theorem reveals that the differentiation error has the same asymptotic behavior

$$2\sqrt{2NL} + L\frac{\Delta}{2} \leq (2\sqrt{2L} + L/2) \max\{\sqrt{N}, \Delta\} \quad (84)$$

with respect to the sampling period  $\Delta$  and the noise amplitude  $N$  as existing robust exact differentiators with sampled measurements, see e.g., (Livne and Levant, 2014, Theorems 1 and 3).

The bound (82) shows that for sufficiently small  $N$ , the impact of the sampling period on the accuracy approaches  $L\Delta/2$ , corresponding to the noise-free case. This noise-free accuracy bound is tight and cannot be improved. The latter assertion can be easily seen by noting that piecing together parabola arcs with second derivative alternately equal to  $\pm L$  on time intervals of length  $\Delta$  may give rise to a signal  $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$  satisfying  $f(k\Delta) = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\dot{f}(k\Delta) = \mp L\Delta/2$ . In addition, it is clear that the bound (82) approaches the continuous-time optimal one  $2\sqrt{2NL}$  as the sampling period becomes arbitrarily small.

## 7 Conclusion

A first-order differentiator that is exact and robust over a wide class of signals, and that achieves optimal accuracy bounds is proposed for the first time. This differentiator is based on the structure of a linear differentiator with a parameter that adapts based on a suitable estimate of noise amplitude. It is shown that the accuracy bounds achieved by this differentiator are the best ones possible. A discrete-time implementation of the differentiator is also provided and shown to achieve the best possible accuracy, both as the noise amplitude tends to zero and as the sampling period tends to zero.

## Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Rodrigo Aldana-López, University of Zaragoza, Spain and David Gómez-Gutiérrez, Tecnológico de Monterrey, Mexico for several valuable discussions.

## References

- B. Andritsch, M. Horn, S. Koch, H. Niederwieser, M. Wetzlinger, and M. Reichhartinger. The robust exact differentiator toolbox revisited: Filtering and discretization features. In *IEEE International Conference on Mechatronics (ICM)*, 2021. doi: 10.1109/ICM46511.2021.9385675.
- J.-P. Barbot, A. Levant, M. Livne, and D. Lunz. Discrete differentiators based on sliding modes. *Automatica*, 112 (108633):1–12, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2019.108633.
- S. P. Bhat and D. S. Bernstein. Finite-time stability of continuous autonomous systems. *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, 38(3):751–766, 2000.
- J. E. Carvajal-Rubio, J. D. Sánchez-Torres, M. Defoort, M. Djemai, and A. G. Loukianov. Implicit and explicit discrete-time realizations of homogeneous differentiators. *Int. Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 31:3606–3630, 2021. doi: 10.1002/rnc.5505.
- E. Cruz-Zavala, J. A. Moreno, and L. Fridman. Uniform robust exact differentiator. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 56(11):2727–2733, 2011.

- L. Fraguera, M. T. Angulo, J. A. Moreno, and L. Fridman. Design of a prescribed convergence time uniform robust exact observer in the presence of measurement noise. In *Proc. 51st IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control, Maui, Hawaii, USA*, pages 6615–6620, 2012.
- M. Ghanes, J.-P. Barbot, L. Fridman, A. Levant, and R. Bois-liveau. A new varying-gain-exponent-based differentiator/observer: An efficient balance between linear and sliding-mode algorithms. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 65(12):5407–5414, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TAC.2020.2973609.
- H. Haimovich, R. Seeber, R. Aldana-López, and D. Gómez-Gutiérrez. Differentiator for noisy sampled signals with best worst-case accuracy. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6:938–943, 2022. doi: 10.1109/LCSYS.2021.3087542.
- A. Hanan, A. Levant, and A. Jbara. Low-chattering discretization of homogeneous differentiators. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 2021. doi: 10.1109/TAC.2021.3099446. Early access.
- H. K. Khalil and L. Praly. High-gain observers in nonlinear feedback control. *Int. Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 24:993–1015, 2014. doi: 10.1002/rnc.3051.
- A. N. Kolmogorov. On inequalities between the upper bounds of the successive derivatives of an arbitrary function on an infinite interval. *Amer. Math. Soc. Translations Series 1*, 2:233–243, 1962.
- A. Levant. Robust exact differentiation via sliding mode technique. *Automatica*, 34(3):379–384, 1998.
- A. Levant. Higher-order sliding modes, differentiation and output-feedback control. *International Journal of Control*, 76(9/10):924–941, 2003. doi: 10.1080/0020717031000099029.
- A. Levant. Finite differences in homogeneous discontinuous control. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 52(7):1208–1217, 2007.
- A. Levant. Digital sliding-mode-based differentiation. In *12th IEEE Workshop on Variable Structure Systems, VSS'12, Mumbai*, pages 319–324, 2012.
- A. Levant and M. Livne. Robust exact filtering differentiators. *EJC*, 55:33–44, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ejcon.2019.08.006.
- A. Levant and X. Yu. Sliding-mode-based differentiation and filtering. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 63(9):3061–3067, 2018. doi: 10.1109/TAC.2018.2797218.
- A. Levant, M. Livne, and X. Yu. Sliding-mode-based differentiation and its application. In *20th IFAC World Congress*, pages 1699–1704. Elsevier, 2017.
- M. Livne and A. Levant. Proper discretization of homogeneous differentiators. *Automatica*, 50:2007–2014, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2014.05.028.
- M. Mboup, C. Join, and M. Fliess. Numerical differentiation with annihilators in noisy environment. *Numerical Algorithms*, 50:439–467, 2009. doi: 10.1007/s11075-008-9236-1.
- M. R. Mojallizadeh, B. Brogliato, and V. Acary. Time-discretizations of differentiators: Design of implicit algorithms and comparative analysis. *Int. Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 31:7679–7723, 2021. doi: 10.1002/rnc.5710.
- I. J. Schoenberg and A. Cavaretta. Solution of Landau’s problem concerning higher derivatives on the halfline. Tech. rep., Winsconsin Univ Madison Mathematics Research Center, 1970.
- R. Seeber, H. Haimovich, M. Horn, L. Fridman, and H. De Battista. Robust exact differentiators with predefined convergence time. *Automatica*, 134(109858), 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.automatica.2021.109858.
- L. K. Vasiljevic and H. K. Khalil. Error bounds in differentiation of noisy signals by high-gain observers. *Systems & Control Letters*, 57(10):856–862, 2008.
- X. Yu and J.-X. Xu. Nonlinear derivative estimator. *Electronics Letters*, 32(16), 1996.