

Date of publication xxxx 00, 0000, date of current version xxxx 00, 0000.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.DOI

# A Survey on Fractional Order Control Techniques for Unmanned Aerial and Ground Vehicles

**RICARDO CAJO<sup>1,2,6</sup>, THI THOA MAC<sup>3</sup>, DOUGLAS PLAZA<sup>2</sup>, COSMIN COPOT<sup>4</sup>, ROBAIN DE KEYSER<sup>1,6</sup>, AND CLARA IONESCU<sup>1,5,6</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electrical Energy, Systems and Automation, Ghent University, Technologiepark 125, 9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium (e-mail: RicardoAlfredo.CajoDiaz@UGent.be, Robain.DeKeyser@UGent.be, ClaraMihaela.Ionescu@UGent.be)

<sup>2</sup>Facultad de Ingeniería en Electricidad y Computación, Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral, ESPOL, Campus Gustavo Galindo Km 30.5 Vía Perimetral, P.O. Box 09-01-5863, Guayaquil, Ecuador (e-mail: rcajo@espol.edu.ec, douplaza@espol.edu.ec)

<sup>3</sup>School of Mechanical Engineering, Hanoi University of Science and Technology, Dai Co Viet street 1, Hanoi, Vietnam (e-mail: thoa.macthi@hust.edu.vn)

<sup>4</sup>Department of Electromechanics, University of Antwerp, Groenenborgerlaan 171, 2020 Antwerp, Belgium (e-mail: cosmin.copot@uantwerpen.be)

<sup>5</sup>Department of Automatic Control, Technical University of Cluj Napoca, Memorandumului Street no 28, Cluj, Romania

<sup>6</sup>EEDT Core Lab on Decision and Control, Flanders Make consortium, Tech Lane Science Park 131, 9052 Ghent

Corresponding author: Ricardo Cajo (e-mail: RicardoAlfredo.CajoDiaz@UGent.be).

This work was supported in part funded by National Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation of Ecuador (SENESCYT) and by Ghent University, BOF Starting ZAP Grant nr. STG020-18.

**ABSTRACT** In recent years, numerous applications of science and engineering for modeling and control of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and Unmanned Ground Vehicles (UGVs) systems based on fractional calculus have been realized. The extra fractional order derivative terms allow to optimize the performance of the systems. The review presented in this paper focus on the control problems of UAVs and UGVs that have been addressed by fractional order techniques over last decade.

**INDEX TERMS** Fractional calculus, fractional order control techniques, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), unmanned ground vehicles (UGVs).

## I. INTRODUCTION

**N**OWADAYS, the research interests of UAVs and UGVs is growing rapidly due to their potential in usage for a countless number of applications. UAVs are suitable to perform important tasks, among which are surveillance, reconnaissance, agricultural imaging, search and rescue, etc [1], [2]. There are many types of UAVs used in mentioned applications such as single rotor helicopters, multi rotorcrafts, fixed wing planes and hybrid combinations [3]. Each platform has its particular advantages and disadvantages. Similarly, UGVs also have arisen the interests of many researchers and organizations, especially the military, since the 1960s [4]. This has conducted to the development of different models of UGVs, which can be distinguished in wheeled mobile robots (WMRs) and legged mobile robots (LMRs) depending on the locomotion mechanism. Currently, UAVs and UGVs are used in many applications both individually and collectively including reconnaissance, surveillance, combat, rescue, agriculture, etc [5]. Because various applications in which UAVs and UGVs are involved, the need of solving various problems in their control has occurred.

In recent years, the research community has addressed several control problems in UAVs using integer order control (IOC) techniques, e.g trajectory tracking [6]–[11], attitude control [12]–[16], path planning [17]–[22], state estimation [23]–[27], formation control [28]–[32], fault tolerant control (FTC) [33]–[37], fault detection and diagnosis (FDD) [38]–[42], and collision avoidance [43]–[47]. Similarly, the control issues which have been studied in UGVs are: trajectory tracking [48]–[52], path planning [53]–[57], state estimation [58]–[62], formation control [63]–[67], fault tolerant control (FTC) [68]–[72], fault detection and diagnosis (FDD) [73]–[75], and collision avoidance [76]–[78].

Many scientists are widely using fractional controllers to achieve more robust performance in many control systems some of which are servo-mechanisms, water tank system and other industrial applications [79]–[84]. Compared with the traditional integer order controllers, fractional order control (FOC) techniques have achieved more impressive results of UAVs and UGVs system in term of improving the robustness during wind gusts, payload variations, and friction, and modeling uncertainties [85]–[88]. Because of the FOC techniques

permit to consider more efficient constraints such as phase margin, gain crossover frequency, complementary sensitivity, energy efficiency and isodamping behavior for tuning the controllers. Additionally, it is indicated that fractional calculus has the capacity to configure the phase and gain of the frequency response in a system independently and get the Bode ideal transfer function [89]. Therefore, this paper reviews and highlights the existing work using the fractional order control (FOC) techniques as the best solutions for the control problems of UAVs and UGVs.

This review is structured as follows. In section II, the mathematical fundamental of fractional calculus used in control theory is introduced. FOC techniques of UAVs and UGVs are respectively described in the section III and section IV. Finally, concluding remarks are presented in section V.

## II. BASICS OF THE FRACTIONAL CALCULUS

Fractional calculus corresponds to the generalization of the classical operation of derivation and integration to orders other than integer. Since the last decades, several applications in the science and engineering areas have been developed (modeling, control theory, mechanical and dynamic systems, signal and image processing, etc.) based on fractional calculus theory [90]–[94].

### A. FRACTIONAL ORDER DERIVATE DEFINITIONS

Three important approaches of fractional derivatives used extensively in the field of control theory are introduced by Grünwald-Letnikov, Riemann-Liouville and Caputo [95], [96].

#### 1) Grünwald-Letnikov definition

The Grünwald-Letnikov (G-L) definition of fractional derivate is defined as:

$${}_a D_t^\alpha = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-a}{h} \rfloor} (-1)^j \binom{\alpha}{j} f(t-jh) \quad (1)$$

where  $\lfloor \frac{t-a}{h} \rfloor$  is an integer amount,  $a$  and  $t$  are the limits of the operator,  $\alpha > 0$ . The binomial coefficient  $\binom{\alpha}{j}$  is defined as:

$$\binom{\alpha}{j} = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(j+1)\Gamma(\alpha-j+1)} \quad (2)$$

$\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the gamma function defined as:

$$\Gamma(n) = \int_0^\infty t^{n-1} e^{-t} dt \quad (3)$$

The G-L definition is a discrete form of the fractional derivative and it is primarily used in numerical solutions of fractional-order differential equations [79], [97].

#### 2) Riemann-Liouville definition

The Riemann-Liouville (R-L) definition of fractional derivate is defined as:

$${}_a D_t^\alpha = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \right)^n \int_a^t \frac{f(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{\alpha-n+1}} d\tau \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a real value,  $n$  is an integer value with the condition  $n-1 < \alpha < n$ ,  $t$  and  $a$  are the limits of integration.

The R-L definition is an integral form of the fractional derivative and it is appropriate for finding the analytical solution of simple functions ( $e^t$ ,  $t^b$ ,  $\cos(t)$ , etc.) [98].

#### 3) Caputo definition

The Caputo definition of fractional derivate is defined as:

$${}_a^C D_t^\alpha = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_a^t \frac{f^{(n)}(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{\alpha-n+1}} d\tau \quad (5)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a real value,  $n$  is integer value with the condition  $n-1 < \alpha < n$ ,  $t$  and  $a$  are the limits of integration.

The Caputo derivate has advantages over R-L definition, due to the consideration of initial conditions of integer order such as  $y(0)$ ,  $\dot{y}(0)$ , which are interpretable with real physical phenomena [98].

The three definitions presented, G-L and Caputo definitions are the most used for their aforementioned characteristics. Caputo derivate is used because of practical application and G-L definition for its representation discrete suitable to numerical solutions. However, the analytical methods are very complicated and should be limited the number of coefficients because of the limited available memory of the microcontrollers [79]. Because of this difficulty, the existing literature prefers continuous or discrete approximation methods by ease implementation. Nevertheless, when accuracy is increased in these methods, high-order transfer functions are obtained. The approximation methods purpose is expressing the fractional term  $s^\alpha$ , obtained by the Laplace transform taking to the G-L or Caputo definitions, in a rational approximation function in the  $s$ ,  $z$  or  $\delta$  domain. The digital implementations are achieved by the discrete approximation methods ( $z$ ,  $\delta$ ) and can be implemented directly to any microprocessor based devices like as PIC, PLC, FPGA, etc. One of the methods of discrete approximation is based on G-L definition aforementioned. More details about the study of rational approximation functions of  $s^\alpha$  can be found in [89].

## III. FRACTIONAL ORDER CONTROL TECHNIQUES APPLIED TO THE CONTROL PROBLEMS IN UAVS

In this section, FOC approaches of UAVs are introduced. The UAVs applications such as trajectory tracking control, path planning, collision avoidance, attitude control, state estimation, formation control and fault tolerant control are investigated.

### A. TRAJECTORY TRACKING CONTROL

A fractional order derivative (FOD) controller which is also called the first generation of the CRONE (Commande Robuste d'Ordre Non Entier) strategy for the trajectory tracking control of a rotary-wing aircraft is proposed [99]. Its structure is given by:

$$C(s) = ks^\alpha, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad k \in \Re. \quad (6)$$

The controller of the UAV is designed, by assuming a constant phase margin around the gain-crossover frequency. The effectiveness of the controller without considering the external disturbances is shown by simulation. In addition, the Bode plots of the closed-loop control system with a constant phase margin around the gain-crossover frequencies are presented. It demonstrates that the FOC controller eliminates the nonlinear effects and parameter uncertainties. However, there is no comparison with any type of IOC controller. An application of an analogical fractional order proportional-integral-derivative (FOPID) controller emulated by a neural network based approximator is proposed in [100]. The analogical FOPID controller is given in (7).

$$C(s) = k_p + \frac{k_i}{s^\lambda} + k_d s^\mu \quad (7)$$

where,  $k_p$ ,  $k_i$  and  $k_d$  are the proportional, integral and derivative terms, respectively.  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are the fractional orders integral and derivative terms. It consists of two sections: a neural network and a Finite Impulse Response (FIR) filter, which permits to approximate the response obtained by the analogical FOPID controller sampled to 1ms (see Fig. 1(a) and Fig. 1(b) respectively).




FIGURE 1: Neural network based approximator. (a) neural network structure. (b) neural network assisted FIR approximator [100].

The neural network structure contains 20 neurons with hyperbolic tangent type neuronal activation function, which is trained to provide the coefficients to the FIR approximator ( $A_0 = \{a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ ), varying the action coefficients and differintegration orders ( $A_i = \{k_p, k_d, k_i, \lambda, \mu\}$ ) of the fractional controller. In this work, the range of the controller parameters are  $k_p \in (0, 3)$ ,  $k_d \in (0, 0.5)$ ,  $k_i \in (0, 1)$  and  $\lambda, \mu \in (0, 1)$ . The simulation results show that the presented

structure successfully emulates the analogical FOPID controller under the wind disturbances, powering uncertainties and measurement noises. Moreover, the proposed scheme has a very low computational complexity, which allows to use for real-time applications based on microprocessor or FPGA.

A novel FOPID controller based on modified Black-Nichols method is proposed in [101], whose transfer function is defined as:

$$C(s) = k_p \left( \frac{1 + T_i s^\lambda}{T_i s^\lambda} \frac{1 + T_d s^\mu}{1 + T_f s} \right), \quad \lambda, \mu \in (0, 2). \quad (8)$$

where  $k_p$  is the proportional term,  $T_i$  is the integration time,  $T_d$  is the derivative time,  $T_f$  is filter time term,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are the fractional orders integral and derivative terms respectively. The results are compared with an integer order PID (IOPID) control, Fuzzy-PID hybrid control and a backstepping approach (BS) under two realistic scenarios considering the parameters uncertainties, extra payload and sensor noise. The Integral Square Error (ISE) and Integral Squared Control Input (ISCI) indexes are used for the quantification of the results. According to the performance indexes, the FOPID has the best performance in terms of precision and energy consumption in comparison to the other nonlinear techniques. This clearly demonstrates that linear controllers based on FOC techniques can achieve similar or better results than the other traditional nonlinear techniques for UAVs.

An optimal FOPID controller tuned with a genetic algorithm (GA) approach under certain design specifications is presented in [102]. The fitness function used to optimize the parameters  $k_p$ ,  $k_i$ ,  $k_d$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  of the FOPID controller is:

$$f = \beta e_{ss} + \delta e_{st} + \gamma e_{os} \quad (9)$$

where  $e_{ss}$  is steady-state error,  $e_{st}$  is settling time error,  $e_{os}$  is overshoot error,  $\beta$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\gamma$  are weight factors. The proposed strategy is evaluated with MATLAB simulations using a variable set-point and circular trajectory without considering external disturbances, obtaining a good trajectory tracking with both references. Nevertheless, it is necessary to compare the proposed controller against some IOC technique.

In other work, a FOPD controller is designed and applied to AR.Drone 2.0 [103]. The controller parameters are obtained based on the specifications of phase margin, gain crossover frequency and robustness.

$$\angle C(j\omega_{gc})P(j\omega_{gc}) = -\pi + \phi_m$$

$$|C(j\omega_{gc})P(j\omega_{gc})| = 1 \quad (10)$$

$$\left. \frac{d(\angle C(j\omega)P(j\omega))}{d\omega} \right|_{\omega=\omega_{gc}} = 0$$

where,  $C(s)$  is the controller,  $P(s)$  is the process,  $\phi_m$ , is the phase margin desired in closed-loop and  $\omega_{gc}$  is the gain crossover frequency. Additionally, the absolute integral error (IAE) and integral squared error (ISE) indexes are used for choosing the best FOPD controller. The performance of

FOPD controller considering wind disturbances is compared against the controllers based on extended prediction self-adaptive control (EPSAC) approach and integer order PD (IOPD) control. The results show that the FOPD controller has a similar response to the EPSAC method, which is an advanced technique of process control.

A novel fractional-order backstepping sliding mode control (FOBSMC) approach for an UAV is proposed in [104]. The globally asymptotically stability of the proposed controller is achieved using Lyapunov stability theory. Subsequently, the effectiveness and robustness of the controller have been tested by flight trajectories with external disturbances.

Finally, fractional order sliding mode control (FOSMC) strategies are presented in [105], [106]. The trajectory tracking problems are resolved using FOSMC and IOPD controllers [105]. The FOSMC uses a switching function ( $S(t)$ ) and a double power reaching law ( $\dot{S}(t)$ ) to avoid the chattering problem, which are described as:

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) &= \dot{e}(t) + k_p e(t) + D^\alpha e(t) \\ \dot{S}(t) &= -k_1 \|S(t)\|^\gamma \text{sign}(S(t)) - k_2 \|S(t)\|^{\gamma+1} \text{sign}(S(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $e(t) = \{e_\phi, e_\theta, e_\psi\}$ , are the errors of attitude tracking,  $k_p = \{k_{p\phi}, k_{p\theta}, k_{p\psi}\}$ ,  $k_1, k_2$  are real constants,  $\text{sign}(\cdot)$  is the signum function and  $\gamma$  the fractional order derivative. For comparison purpose, an integer SMC is developed. The proposed strategy with FOSMC presents a faster response and higher tracking accuracy. Similarly, a FOSMC for a second-order non-linear model of a quadrotor with an unknown additive perturbation term is presented in [106]. Theirs switching function ( $S(t)$ ) and reaching control law ( $\dot{S}(t)$ ) are chosen as:

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) &= \dot{e}(t) + \lambda e(t) \\ \dot{S}(t) &= -\sigma D^{-\beta} \text{sign}(S(t)) - \mu S(t) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $e(t)$  is the tracking error,  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\sigma$  are real constants,  $\text{sign}(\cdot)$  is the signum function and  $\beta$  is the fractional order derivative. The performance of the FOSMC is compared against an integer order SMC (IOSMC). The MATLAB simulations demonstrate the robustness of the FOSMC controller under additive perturbations. In addition, the chattering in some of the control signals of the FOSMC is less than the SMC controller.

## B. PATH PLANNING/ COLLISION AVOIDANCE

A fractional order potential field (FOPF) method is applied for path planning and collision avoidance in two cooperative source seeking applications [107], [108]. The method can be used in path planning when UAVs are attracted to the source (attractive potential field) and collision avoidance as each UAV or obstacle are repelled (repulsive potential field). The FOPF is obtained based on the definition of Coulomb electric field as:

$$V_n(r) = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{\Gamma(2-n)}{r^{2-n}}, \quad \forall n \in (0, 2)(2, +\infty) \quad (13)$$

where  $q$  is the source point charge,  $\epsilon_0$  is the permittivity vacuum,  $r$  is the distance to the charge,  $n$  can be an integer or non-integer greater than zero and  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the gamma function. In order to implement the FOPF, the function  $V_n(r)$  can be normalized to a value between  $(0, 1)$ , using the maximum distance ( $r_{\max}$ ) and minimum distance ( $r_{\min}$ ). The repulsive FOPF is given as:

$$U_{rep}(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{r^{n-2} - r_{\max}^{n-2}}{r_{\min}^{n-2} - r_{\max}^{n-2}}, & \forall n \in (0, 2)(2, +\infty) \\ \frac{\ln r - \ln r_{\max}}{\ln r_{\min} - \ln r_{\max}}, & n = 2 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

while, the attractive FOPF is  $U_{att}(r) = -U_{rep}(r)$ . FOPF evaluation with  $1 \leq n \leq 5$  for repulsive and attractive potential fields are shown in Fig. 2.




FIGURE 2: FOPF. (a) repulsive field. (b) attractive field [107].

Contrarily, the FOPF method allows to use different level of potential fields, which can be useful in dangerous cases. This is an advantage of the FOPF with regard to the integer order potential field (IOPF). From Fig. 2(a), it can be seen that more force can be applied with the greater  $n$  than a FOPF



with the smaller  $n$ . It shows that FOPF and extended Kalman filter (EKF) achieved suitable results.

### C. ATTITUDE CONTROL

An application of FOSMC and neural networks to attitude control of a quadrotor is proposed [109]. The switching function ( $S(t)$ ) and a reaching law ( $\dot{S}(t)$ ) in FOSMC method are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) &= e(t)^{(1+\beta)} + \lambda e(t) \\ \dot{S}(t) &= -QD^\beta \text{sign}(S(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $e(t)$  is the tracking error,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  is the fractional order derivate and  $\lambda, Q$  are real constants. The neural networks approach is applied to compensate the power loss in the battery of the quadrotor. Two neural networks create the maps to provide the relation at the pulse-width modulation (PWM) signal level between the controller and UAV dynamics. The scheme is given in Fig.3.




FIGURE 3: Neural network components for the relation in PWM level [109].

where  $V_b$  is the battery voltage,  $\Omega_{ic}$  is the angular speed at  $i$ th motor specified by the controller,  $\Omega_i$  is the angular speed at  $i$ th motor,  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are low pass filters. The strategy is evaluated by simulation, where FOSMC and neural networks present the feasibility under the effect of wind disturbances, measurement noise and during the voltage loss in the battery, when it discharges from 11.1V to 9.9V in 130s. A fractional-order control structure that enforces finite-time convergence of the sliding surface is proposed [111]. The model-free fractional-order control law is given by:

$$\tau_i(t) = -k_{t_{ni}} I_t^\nu \text{sign}(S_{qi}(t)) + \tau_i(t_{ni}) \quad (16)$$

where  $k > 0$  is the feedback gain,  $\tau_i$  is the  $i$ th component of the control torque vector  $\tau = [\tau_\phi, \tau_\theta, \tau_\psi]^T$ ,  $S_{qi}$  is the sliding error manifold,  $\nu$  is the fractional order integral term and  $t_{ni}$  is the sequence of instants at which  $S_{qi}(t_{ni}) = 0$ . The performance of the scheme proposed is evaluated experimentally by using the AR.Drone 2.0 quad-rotor. Two trajectories (a circle and a sine function) for attitude tracking control are chosen to validate. The results show that the quad-rotor effectively achieves the angular positions with a minimum tracking error without chattering. This work is extended in [112], where the problem of underactuation to control the

translational coordinates ( $x, y$ ) is addressed and a solution based on a virtual position control approach is proposed. In the similar approach, the performance of AR.Drone 2.0 is validated through both simulations and real-experiments. Two order of integration values are implemented, with which the classical integer SMC and FOSMC for attitude control are considered. For both cases the same position is obtained based on the virtual control. However, adjusting the value of integration obtains more precise results. A novel robust FOSMC combined with a state constrained controller is presented in [113]. The inner-loop controllers are based on FOSMC for the attitude control, while outer-loop controllers use the state constrained control for the translational movements ( $x, y, z$ ). The fractional order slide mode surface is defined as:

$$S(t) = D^{\alpha+1}e(t) + m_1e(t) + n_1\beta(e(t)) \quad (17)$$

where  $e(t)$  is the respective orientation error ( $\phi, \theta, \psi$ ),  $m_1, n_1$  are positive constants,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is the fractional order derivative term. The function  $\beta(e(t))$  is defined as:

$$\beta(e(t)) = \begin{cases} e(t)^{\frac{p_1}{q_1}}, & \text{if } \bar{S}(t) = 0 \text{ or } \bar{S}(t) \neq 0, |e(t)| > u \\ e(t), & \text{if } \bar{S}(t) \neq 0, |e(t)| \leq u \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where  $u$  is the small positive threshold,  $p_1, q_1$  are positive odd integers with condition  $1 < q_1/p_1 < 2$  and  $\bar{S}(t) = D^{\alpha+1}e(t) + m_1e(t) + n_1e(t)^{\frac{p_1}{q_1}}$ . For the comparison purpose, two additional integer SMC controllers are designed. The simulations and experiments are implemented by using the Quanser QBall 2 quadrotor driven by MATLAB. In addition, lumped disturbances approximated by a sum of sinusoidal functions are considered. Finally, the results demonstrate that FOSMC has lower values of overshoot and convergence time in comparison to the other controllers.

A FOSMC via disturbance observer for attitude control of a quadrotor is presented [114]. Firstly, the estimation of the fractional order derivative of the external disturbance is realized by using a new fractional order disturbance observer (FODOB), whose representation is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} D^{1+\alpha-\beta}p(t) &= -LB_d(D^{\alpha-\beta}p(t) + LD^\alpha\dot{x}(t)) \\ &\quad -L(AD^{\alpha-\beta}x(t) + BD^{\alpha-\beta}u(t)) \\ D^{1+\alpha-\beta}\hat{d}(t) &= D^{1+\alpha-\beta}p(t) + LD^\alpha x(t) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  is the system order,  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state variable,  $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the control signal,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the state matrix,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is the control matrix,  $B_d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$  is the disturbance matrix,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$  is the output matrix,  $\hat{d}(t)$  is the estimated disturbance of  $d(t)$ ,  $p(t)$  is an auxiliary vector,  $\alpha \in (0, \lambda)$  depends on the order of FOSMC and  $L$  is the observer gain matrix. Subsequently, a FOSMC for the attitude control is designed, whose switching function ( $S(t)$ ) and reaching law ( $\dot{S}(t)$ ) are defined as:




FIGURE 4: Filter type 2DOF-FOPID control structure [110].

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(t) &= a_1 e_y(t) + a_2 D^\alpha e_y(t) \\
 \dot{S}(t) &= -a_1 \dot{e}_y(t) + a_2 D^{1+\alpha-\beta} C(Ax(t) + Bu(t) + B_d d(t)) \\
 &\quad - a_2 D^\alpha \dot{y}_d(t)
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where  $a_1, a_2$  are real constants,  $\alpha$  is the fractional order of the sliding surface and  $e_y(t) = y(t) - y_d(t)$  is the tracking error of the output. The FOSMC with FODOB is compared with a SMC-DOB. The numerical simulations show that the proposed method decreases the tracking error to high speed and suppresses the chattering problem.

In contrast to the work presented in [111], a novel FOSMC with a nonlinear PI nonlinear structure is proposed in [115]. The proportional term acts as a nonlinear dissipater, while the fractional integral part removes the chattering effect out of the control signal. The fractional-order control law is given by:

$$\tau_i(t) = -k_1 |S_i(t)|^\alpha \text{sign}(S_i(t)) - k_2 t_{ni} I_t^\beta \text{sign}(S_i(t)) + \tau_i(t_{ni}) \tag{21}$$

where  $k_1 > 0, k_2 > 0$  are the feedback gains,  $\tau_i$  is the  $i$ th component of the control torque vector  $\tau = [\tau_\phi, \tau_\theta, \tau_\psi]^T$ ,  $S_i$  is the sliding error manifold,  $\alpha, \beta$  are the fractional order terms and  $t_{ni}$  is the sequence of instants at which  $S_i(t_{ni}) = 0$ . The simulations and real-experiments are executed by using MATLAB and the AR.Drone 2.0 quad-rotor. Four different controllers are used for the comparison purpose: fractional sliding mode PI nonlinear controller, first-order sliding mode controller, sliding mode PI-like controller and a second-order sliding mode super-twisting controller. All the angle references are considered as sinusoidal functions. The results show a similar attitude tracking with all the controllers. However, when the quaternion error vector and the control signals are compared between the controllers, it is easy seen that the fractional controller has less tracking error and smaller

control effort signal than the other methods. Likewise, the chattering phenomenon is lesser than in the conventional controllers.

A fractional order filter with two-degrees-of-freedom PID controller for the pitch control of a UAV is presented [110]. The structure is given in Fig. 4 and it consists of a filter and a FOPID controller, which can be independently tuned to ensure the disturbance rejection and trajectory tracking performance. Firstly, the FOPID controller is tuned by using the follow specifications: phase and gain margins, robustness to variations in the gain of the system, robustness to high-frequency noise and disturbance rejection. The controller parameters ( $K_P, K_D, T_I, \lambda$  and  $\mu$ ) are obtained by resolving the set of five nonlinear equations generated with the specifications aforementioned using the optimization toolbox of MATLAB. Finally, the filter parameters  $\alpha \in [0, 1], \beta \in [1, 2], \gamma \in [0, 2]$  are computed by using a particle swarm optimization (PSO) method to satisfy some performance criteria such as rise time ( $t_r$ ), settling time ( $t_s$ ), steady-state error ( $E_{ss}$ ), overshoot ( $M_p$ ) and integral absolute error (IAE). The fitness function used to optimize is:

$$J(k) = w_1 M_p + w_2 t_r + w_3 t_s + w_4 E_{ss} + w_5 IAE \tag{22}$$

where  $k = [\alpha \ \beta \ \gamma]$  are the parameters to be optimized and  $w = [w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5]$  are the inertia weights. The proposed controller presents a good disturbance rejection and command tracking according to the MATLAB simulations.

Subsequently, a robust FOPID controller for the pitch angle control of a Fixed-Wing UAV based on multi-objective bat algorithm (MOBA) and multi-objective genetic algorithm (MOGA) are presented in [116] and [117], respectively. The objective functions used to optimize in both works are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 J_1 &= \|S(j\omega)\|_\infty \\
 J_2 &= \|T(j\omega)\|_\infty
 \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where  $\|S(j\omega)\|_\infty$  is the infinity norm of the sensitivity function and  $\|T(j\omega)\|_\infty$  is the complementary sensitivity function. In MOBA approach, a combined objective function  $J(k)$  is obtained by summing the objective functions given in (23), using weighted-sum method.

$$J(k) = \sum_{k=1}^2 J_k w_k, \quad w_1, w_2 > 0, \quad w_1 + w_2 = 1 \quad (24)$$

The MOGA approach uses each objective function individually to find a set of solutions with a different trade-off (the so-called Pareto front). Then a solution is selected with the desired balance between conflicting design objectives. The results show that the FOPID controllers track the trajectory and satisfy the designed conditions of the objective function. At the same time, they have a better performance than the IOPID controllers.

A new method to obtain a flat phase margin with FOPID controller is proposed [118]. This method is applied for the roll control of a UAV using the specifications: gain margin, phase margin and robustness to gain variations of the system with two different approaches. The first approach consists in a limited number of frequency samples of  $G(s)$  around of its crossover frequency for the controller design. This approach allows greater computational efficiency than the classical method, which uses a first order plus time delay (FOPTD) model. In the second approach, an approximated open loop system ( $G'(s)$ ) with the same amplitude of  $G(s)$  and different phase curve is used. Moreover, two additional controllers are used: an IOPID controller and a classical FOPID. For the performance evaluation of the controllers, uncertainties in the aerodynamic parameters of the UAV are added. The simulation results in MATLAB demonstrate that the new FOPID controller is more robust than the other controllers in closed loop.

A fractional order proportional-integral (FOPI) controller design for the roll-channel or lateral direction control of a fixed-wing UAV is presented [85]. The transfer function of the controller is:

$$C(s) = k_p \left( 1 + \frac{k_i}{s^\lambda} \right) \quad (25)$$

where,  $k_p$  and  $k_i$  are the proportional and integral terms respectively,  $\lambda \in (0, 2)$  is the fractional order integral term. Firstly, the roll-channel model of the UAV is obtained using closed-loop system identification, which requires a rough PID tuning to determine  $C_0(s)$ . Once the roll-channel model is obtained, it is necessary to approximate a FOPTD system. The outer loop FOPI controller is tuned based on the performance specifications described in (10). The proposed FOPI controller is compared with an integer order PI (IOPID) controller through simulation and real flight experiments, by considering the effect of wind gust disturbances and payload variation, which demonstrate the robustness of the FOPI controller with respect to IOPID controller.

A variant of fractional order proportional-integral FO[PI] controller for the roll-channel or lateral direction control of a fixed-wing UAV is presented in [86], whose representation in transfer function is:

$$C(s) = \left( k_p + \frac{k_i}{s} \right)^\lambda \quad (26)$$

where,  $k_p$  and  $k_i$  are the proportional and integral term respectively,  $\lambda \in (0, 2)$  is the fractional order term. For comparison purpose, four controllers are designed: IOPI based on modified Ziegler-Nichols (MZNs) tuning method, IOPID, IOPI and FO[PI] are tuned based on the performance specifications described in (10). These four controllers are evaluated by simulation and real flight experiments under the effect of payload variations. The results show that the designed FO[PI] controller has a better performance than the integer order controllers. The same FO[PI] control structure is used for the pitch control of a vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) UAV [119] and the lateral longitudinal attitude control of a fixed-wing UAV [120]. The controller parameters are obtained based on the performance specifications given in (10). For the VTOL UAV, three additional controllers MZNs IOPI and IOPID are designed to compare the performance with respect to the proposed FO[PI]. The simulation results under effect of wind gust disturbances and payload variations show that the proposed strategy has better transient response and robustness than the other controllers. Similarly, two additional controllers IOPID, FOPI are designed for the fixed-wing aircraft for comparison purpose. The simulation through MATLAB indicates that the FO[PI] has a better performance with respect to the other controls under wind gust disturbances.

#### D. STATE ESTIMATION CONTROL

A new fractional order complementary filters (FOCF) approach for the attitude estimation of small low-cost UAVs is presented [121]. The purpose of complementary filters is to combine the outputs of two or more sensors that complement each other over different parts of the system bandwidth. It means that a sensor has reliable data in high frequencies while the other should has reliable data in low frequencies. Two sensors that satisfy this condition are: a gyroscope and an inclinometer. Fig. 5 shows the idea of the complementary filter in frequency domain and its equivalent representation in a closed-loop system.

where  $\phi_i$ ,  $\phi_g$  are the outputs of the inclinometer and gyroscope respectively.  $G_i(s)$ ,  $G_g(s)$  are the filters for the inclinometer and gyroscope,  $\hat{\phi}$  is the estimation of  $\phi$ . It is important to indicate that the condition for complementary filters is  $G_i(s) + G_g(s) = 1$ . These filters could be chosen as following:

$$G_i(s) = \frac{C(s)}{C(s) + s} \quad G_g(s) = \frac{s}{C(s) + s} \quad (27)$$




FIGURE 5: Complementary Filter. (a) frequency domain. (b) closed-loop [121].

According to the Fig. 5(a) and (27),  $\hat{\phi}$  is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\phi} &= \phi_i \frac{C(s)}{C(s) + s} + \frac{\phi_g}{s} \frac{s}{C(s) + s} \\ \hat{\phi} &= (s\phi_i C(s) + \phi_g - \hat{\phi} C(s)) \frac{1}{s} \\ s\hat{\phi} &= (\phi_i - \hat{\phi})C(s) + \phi_g\end{aligned}\quad (28)$$

From (28), an equivalent representation of the complementary filter in closed loop is obtained and represented in Fig. 5(b). It is important to notice that this scheme permits to use control theory for designing the complementary filter. In this way, three complementary filters are designed with several control structures such as proportional (P), IOPI and fractional order integrator (FOI) whose structure is given as:

$$C(s) = \frac{k}{s^\alpha}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad k \in \mathfrak{R}. \quad (29)$$

For validation of the controller performances, Gaussian and non-Gaussian noise are applied. The numerical simulations show that FOCF presents a better performance than the traditional integer order approach.

## E. FORMATION CONTROL

A research about formation control based on leader-follower approach so-called distributed fractional order finite-time control (DFOFTC) for a group of UAVs is presented [122]. There are two stages during its operation. Firstly, a distributed sliding-mode observer (DSMO) is designed to approximate the tracking error between the leader UAV and its reference. Secondly, a FOSMC is used to ensure the finite-time convergence of the tracking errors between followers and leader, whose switching function ( $S(t)$ ) is chosen as:

$$S(t) = D^{\alpha+1}e(t) + \sigma_1 e(t) + \sigma_2 e(t)^{q/p} \quad (30)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the fractional-order derivative term,  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are positive constants,  $q$  and  $p$  are positive odd integers. These two strategies are implemented in the follower UAVs. The numerical simulations show the efficacy of the presented approaches.

## F. FAULT TOLERANT CONTROL

An adaptive fractional-order fault tolerant control for an UAV under external disturbance and actuator fault is designed [123]. The dynamics of the UAV are separated into two subsystems: velocity and altitude. The actuator fault is considered using the model described as:

$$\delta_e = \rho_f \delta_{e0} + u_f \quad (31)$$

where,  $0 < \rho_f < 1$  is the degrade of the control signal,  $\delta_{e0}$  is the applied control signal and  $u_f$  is the bounded bias fault signal. The fractional-order derivative of the external disturbance and actuator fault are estimated using an adaptive technique, while the virtual control signal and its first derivative are estimated with a high gain observer. It permits to eliminate the problem of explosion of complexity in backstepping technique. Moreover, a fractional order terminal sliding mode control (FOTSMC) to pitch dynamics control is used, whose switching function ( $S(t)$ ) is defined the same as the one presented in (30). The simulations show the effectiveness of the designed control strategy, when external disturbances and actuator faults are presented in the system. The control problems in UAVs analyzed with FOC techniques are summarized in Table 1.

## IV. FRACTIONAL ORDER CONTROL TECHNIQUES APPLIED TO THE CONTROL PROBLEMS IN UGVs

In this section, the literature of last decade regarding control problems in UGV addressed by fractional order control (FOC) techniques is revised. It was found that trajectory tracking control, path planning and collision avoidance are among the problems treated with different FOC approaches.

### A. TRAJECTORY TRACKING CONTROL

The lateral control of a networked UGV based on a fractional order generalized predictive control (FOGPC) is presented in [124]. The cost function of the FOGPC is defined as:

$$J = \int_1^{N_2} D^\alpha [r(t+j|t) - y(t+j|t)]^2 dt + \int_1^{N_u} D^\beta [\Delta u(t+j-1|t)]^2 dt; \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{R} \quad (32)$$

where,  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  are the minimum and maximum prediction horizons,  $N_u$  is the control horizon,  $y(t)$  is the system output and  $r(t)$  is the reference signal. The FOGPC strategy is compared with an integer order GPC (IOGPC) considering two different simulation cases: sensor noise environment and communication network. The results demonstrated that the



TABLE 1: Control problems in UAVs addressed by fractional order control techniques

| Problem                            | Approach       | Authors              | Dynamic Model | Disturbance | Simulation | Real Test | Year |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------|
| Trajectory tracking                | FOD            | A. Monje [99]        | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2008 |
|                                    | FOPID          | E. Mehmet [100]      | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2011 |
|                                    |                | R. Ayad [101]        | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
|                                    |                | H. Maurya [102]      | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2019 |
|                                    | FOPD           | R. Cajo [103]        | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
|                                    | FOBSMC         | X. Shi [104]         | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
|                                    | FOSMC          | Y. Guo [105]         | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2017 |
|                                    |                | A. G. Vargas [106]   | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
| Path planning/ Collision avoidance | FOPF           | A. Jensen [107]      | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2014 |
|                                    |                | J. Han [108]         | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
| Attitude control                   | FOSMC          | E. Mehmet [109]      | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2012 |
|                                    |                | C. Izaguirre [111]   | Y             | Y           | Y          | Y         | 2016 |
|                                    |                | C. Izaguirre [112]   | Y             | Y           | Y          | Y         | 2018 |
|                                    |                | C. Hua [113]         | Y             | Y           | Y          | Y         | 2019 |
|                                    |                | Jing Wang [114]      | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
|                                    | FOPID          | F. Oliva [115]       | Y             | Y           | Y          | Y         | 2019 |
|                                    |                | F. Geng [110]        | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2012 |
|                                    |                | N. Katal [116]       | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2015 |
|                                    |                | P. Kumar [117]       | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2016 |
|                                    |                | S. Seyedtabaai [118] | Y             | N           | Y          | N         | 2017 |
|                                    | FOPI<br>FO[PI] | H. Chao [85]         | Y             | Y           | Y          | Y         | 2010 |
|                                    |                | Y. Luo [86]          | Y             | N           | Y          | Y         | 2011 |
|                                    |                | J. Han [119]         | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2014 |
|                                    |                | C. Wang [120]        | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2014 |
| State estimation                   | FOCF           | C. Coopmans [121]    | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2014 |
| Formation control                  | FOSMC          | Z. Yu [122]          | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2018 |
| Fault tolerant control             | FOTSMC         | Z. Yu [123]          | Y             | Y           | Y          | N         | 2017 |




FIGURE 6: Closed-loop structure for tuning FOPID based on PSO algorithm [87].

FOGPC is more robust to sensors noise and communication network, besides it presents lower values of control efforts in the lateral control than the IOGPC. Furthermore, a FOSMC for a four-wheel steering (4WS) vehicle is proposed [125], where a fractional-order sliding surface is used to eliminate the steady-state error produced by the parameter uncertainties of the real vehicle and reference model.

$$S(t) = -\Delta D^{-\alpha} S(t) - \epsilon D^{-\alpha} \text{sign}(S(t)) \quad (33)$$

where  $\Delta$  is a diagonal matrix of positive real values,  $\epsilon$  is a real constant,  $\text{sign}(\cdot)$  is the signum function and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is the fractional order derivative. A group of simulations to analyze the influence of  $\alpha$  and variation of the 4WS parameters on the efficiency and robustness of the system are made. The results indicate that the FOSMC has improved the robustness of the 4WS vehicle.




FIGURE 7: Scheme of the FOPI-based gain-scheduled [126].

In [87], FOPID controllers based on PSO algorithm are designed. The trajectory tracking controllers are tuned and applied for driving each wheel of the UGV as shown in Fig. 6. In which,  $\theta_d$  is the desired orientation,  $v_r$  is the desired velocity,  $\theta_a$  is the actual orientation and  $v_a$  is the actual velocity. The fitness function is based on the *ISE* index:

$$ISE = \left( \int_0^\infty [e_\theta(t)]^2 dt \right) + \left( \int_0^\infty [e_v(t)]^2 dt \right) \quad (34)$$

where  $e_\theta = \theta_d - \theta_a$  is the orientation error and  $e_v = v_r - v_a$  is the velocity error. For comparison purpose, two IOPID controllers are designed using the same scheme as in FOPD.




FIGURE 8: Closed-loop structure for the trajectory control of the WMR [127].

The tracking performance is implemented through the numerical simulation in MATLAB by using a circular and linear trajectory. A notable improvement over the tracking error is obtained with the FOPD for both trajectories. A longitudinal control for an autonomous Citroën vehicle based on a FOPI controller is proposed in [128]. Firstly, the dynamical longitudinal model is obtained by using an identification process in MATLAB based on the frequency domain. Secondly, the FOPI controller is tuned based on the specifications of phase margin, gain crossover frequency and disturbance rejection. Its last specification is defined as a value of the sensitivity function for a determine frequencies range. The performance of the FOPI controller is tested in simulation and real vehicle by considering an environment close to reality. The results show the good performance of the fractional controller during changes in the navigation speed, which is important for the comfort of passengers.

An extension of this work for the case of networked control system is presented in [126]. Where a novelty FOPI-based gain-scheduled controller is designed and Its scheme is show in the Fig.7. In which,  $\tau_{net}$  is the network delay,  $v_{ref}$  is the speed reference of the vehicle and  $\beta$  is the external gain in function of network delay. The local station is responsible for detecting traffic risk situations. The adaptive speeds is applied to avoid or reduce possible accidents in its dangerous area. The results demonstrate that when the FOPI-based gain-scheduled controller is implemented, it produces a better performance with respect to using the traditional one.

In another work, FOPI controllers are designed and applied to the UGV for trajectory tracking [88]. Similarly, IOPI and FOPI controllers for orientation and velocity are designed. The performances of both controllers are evaluated using three different trajectories for the velocity reference and a sinusoidal orientation reference in real experiments. The results indicate that the FOPI has a better performance for control of velocity and orientation of the UGV, considering the trajectory tracking error.

FOPD controllers for a differential drive WMR QBot2 of Quanser Company are designed [127]. The trajectory tracking is based on velocity control of WMR in closed-loop

scheme as shown in Fig. 8.

In Fig. 8,  $v_R$  is the right wheel velocity,  $v_L$  is the left wheel velocity,  $v_c$  is the chassis linear velocity and  $\omega$  is the chassis angular velocity. The inverse and forward kinematics blocks define the relation between the desired linear velocity and angular velocity of the vehicle for a trajectory. Subsequently, an IOPD controller is designed and compared with the FOPD controller on simulation and real application. It shows that the FOPD controller improves the trajectory tracking error with 83% compared to IOPD controller. Nevertheless, this experiment is performed for a straight path without considering a more realistic case of a circular trajectory.

A novel fractional order extremum seeking controller (FOESC) for trajectory tracking of an UGV is presented in [129]. This approach consists in applying fractional order filters instead of integer order filters in a classical extremum seeking controller (ESC). The FOESC scheme is given in Fig. 9.




FIGURE 9: Closed-loop FOESC scheme for UGV [129].

where  $(x, y)$  are the coordinates of the center of the vehicle,  $v$  is the optimal signal estimate,  $\frac{s^q}{(s^q + h)}$  is the fractional order filter,  $q \in (0, 1)$  is the fractional order derivative,  $\sin(\omega t)$  is a periodic perturbation signal,  $a$ ,  $c$ ,  $\omega$  and  $h$  are design parameters,  $J = f(x, y)$  is the nonlinear map defined as:

$$J = f^* - q_x(x - x_d)^2 - q_y(y - y_d)^2 \quad (35)$$




FIGURE 10: Strategic schematic for UGV using FOPF [130].

The extremum seeking algorithm is designed to ensure the output  $J = f(x, y)$  converges to its minimal  $f^*$ , where  $f^* = f(x_d, y_d)$  is the unknown extremum point,  $q_x$  and  $q_y$  are positive constants. Finally, the simulation based on a vehicle model using a FOESC and ESC for performance comparison is presented. The results show that FOESC is more efficient with respect to the rate of convergence and steady-state error than the classical extremum seeking controller.

### B. PATH PLANNING/ COLLISION AVOIDANCE

A strategic schematic to use fractional order potential field (FOPF) method for path planning and collision avoidance of UGV is developed in [130]. The strategies schematic is shown in Fig.10.

The strategic schematic has three stages but only the tactical stage is addressed in this work. This stage uses the attractive and repulsive forces of the FOPF method to avoid the obstacles and to move toward the target. A simple model permits to calculate the position, velocity and acceleration. The repulsive FOPF is described in (14) and its resultant force is given by:

$$\vec{F}_{rep} = -\nabla(U_{rep}(r)) \quad (36)$$

The attractive FOPF is designed as:

$$\vec{F}_{att} = \alpha_p(\vec{x}_{target} - \vec{x}) + \alpha_v D^n(\vec{v}_{target} - \vec{v}) \quad (37)$$

where  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{x}_{target}$  are the particle and target positions,  $\alpha_p$  and  $\alpha_v$  are weighting coefficients,  $\vec{v}$  and  $\vec{v}_{target}$  are the particle and target velocities and  $n$  is the fractional order derivative term. For the attractive FOPF, a limitation of vehicle acceleration is imposed to avoid an uncomfortable trip to the passengers. The performance of the FOPF is compared with the classical IOPE. The results show that the FOPF does not present phase variations around the gain cross-over frequency during the mass variations in the vehicle. The control problems in UGVs analyzed with FOC techniques are summarized in Table 2.

### V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The FOC techniques are analyzed according to the control problems of trajectory tracking, attitude control, path planning, state estimation, formation control, fault tolerant control, collision avoidance, fault detection and diagnosis present in UAVs and UGVs. The results of the study indicate that FOD, FOPD, FOPI, FO[PI], FOPID, FOBSMC, FOSMC, FOPF, FOGPC, FOESC and FOTSMC are the fundamental control techniques applied to UAVs and UGVs in the last decade.

In addition, the FOC techniques present some advantages. Firstly, FOC techniques are more flexible in tuning the parameters of the controller as order derivative terms are not restricted to integer. Secondly, it has improvement in robustness of closed loop systems under disturbances such as wind gusts, payload variations, friction, manufacturing variations, modeling uncertainties, etc. [85]–[88], [99]–[110], [114], [116]–[125], [127], [129], [130]. Finally, FO controllers can be compensate certain nonlinearities in the systems some of which are hysteresis, dead zone, backlash, etc. [89].

However, very few controllers have been implemented and embedded in the limited control units of the UAVs or UGVs by using continuous or discrete approximation methods. Most of these controllers have been used in trajectory tracking or attitude control, because these problems present in the autonomous vehicles require a robust and fast controller.

Contrarily, a serious drawback in FOC techniques is the approximation of the fractional operator  $D^\beta$  in continuous or discrete time form, which requests a high-order approximation [89]. It increases the computational complexity and may generates in a complicate transfer function to implement by numerical issues. Therefore, an adequate and efficient discrete-time approximation or direct method is required for a practical implementation on limited control units.

Recently, an novel discretization method that produces low integer order discrete-time transfer functions and computationally efficient is developed in [131]. Furthermore, a

TABLE 2: Control problems in UGVs addressed by fractional order control techniques

| Problem                               | Approach | Authors         | Kinematic Model | Dynamic obstacle | Static obstacle | Disturbance | Simulation | Real Test | Year |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------|
| Trajectory tracking                   | FOGPC    | M.Romero [124]  | Y               | N                | N               | Y           | Y          | N         | 2009 |
|                                       | FOSMC    | J.Tian [125]    | Y               | N                | N               | N           | Y          | N         | 2014 |
|                                       | FOPID    | Al-Mayyahi [87] | Y               | N                | N               | Y           | Y          | N         | 2016 |
|                                       | FOPI     | I.Tejado [128]  | Y               | N                | N               | N           | Y          | Y         | 2011 |
|                                       |          | I.Tejado [126]  | Y               | N                | N               | N           | Y          | Y         | 2013 |
|                                       |          | K.Orman [88]    | Y               | N                | N               | Y           | Y          | Y         | 2016 |
|                                       | FOPD     | A. Rojas [127]  | Y               | N                | N               | N           | Y          | Y         | 2017 |
|                                       | FOESC    | S.Dadras [129]  | Y               | N                | N               | N           | Y          | N         | 2017 |
| Path planning/<br>Collision avoidance | FOPF     | J.Moreau [130]  | Y               | Y                | N               | Y           | Y          | N         | 2017 |

methodology to emulate FOPID using a linear model based on artificial neural network is presented, whose purpose is to reduce the computational complexity for a real-time embedded implementation on commercial microcontrollers [100].

In the last decade, a significant advance in the development of new FOC techniques has been realized. This survey has studied the current state of FOC techniques applied to UAVs and UGVs to address their different control problems. The presented studies for both types of vehicles are given in the table 1 and table 2 respectively.

In the future, the development of efficient methods to implement the FOC techniques with a lower computational complexity will be a necessity with respect to commercial applications.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part funded by National Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation of Ecuador (SENESCYT), National Foundation for Science and Technology Development of Vietnam NAFOSTED, Vietnam under project number 107.01-2018.331 and by Ghent University Special Research Grant 'MIMOPREC', STG020-18.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Mellinger and V. Kumar, "Minimum snap trajectory generation and control for quadrotors," in *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2011, pp. 2520–2525.
- [2] K. P. Valavanis, *Advances in Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: State of the Art and the Road to Autonomy*, 1st ed. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2007.
- [3] C. Kanellakis and G. Nikolakopoulos, "Survey on computer vision for UAVs: Current developments and trends," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 87, no. 1, pp. 141–168, Jul 2017.
- [4] D. W. Gage, "UGV history 101: A brief history of unmanned ground vehicle (UGV) development efforts," *Unmanned Systems*, vol. 13, pp. 9–32, 1995.
- [5] P.-N. Nguyen-Huu, J. Titus, T. Dawn, G. Prof, and Ulsoy, "Reliability and failure in unmanned ground vehicle (UGV)," *Digital Equipment Corporation*, MA, Tech. Rep. GRR-TR 2009-01, Feb 2009.
- [6] H. Lee and H. J. Kim, "Trajectory tracking control of multirotors from modelling to experiments: A survey," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 281–292, Feb 2017.
- [7] T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. H. McClamroch, "Geometric tracking control of a quadrotor UAV on se(3)," in *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Dec 2010, pp. 5420–5425.
- [8] F. Goodarzi, D. Lee, and T. Lee, "Geometric adaptive tracking control of a quadrotor unmanned aerial vehicle on se(3) for agile maneuvers," *Journal of Dynamic Systems Measurement and Control*, vol. 137, 06 2015.
- [9] Z. Zuo and S. Mallikarjuna, "L<sub>1</sub> adaptive backstepping for robust trajectory tracking of UAVs," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 2944–2954, April 2017.
- [10] M. Z. Shah, R. Samar, and A. I. Bhatti, "Guidance of air vehicles: A sliding mode approach," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 231–244, Jan 2015.
- [11] T. T. Mac, C. Copot, T. T. Duc, and R. De Keyser, "AR.Drone UAV control parameters tuning based on particle swarm optimization algorithm," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Automation, Quality and Testing, Robotics (AQTR)*, May 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [12] O. Spinka, O. Holub, and Z. Hanzalek, "Low-cost reconfigurable control system for small UAVs," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 880–889, March 2011.
- [13] A. Salih, M. Moghavi, M. Haf, and K. Gaeid, "Flight PID controller design for a UAV quadrotor," *Scientific research and essays*, vol. 5, pp. 3660–3667, 12 2010.
- [14] T. Lee, "Robust adaptive attitude tracking on SO(3) with an application to a quadrotor UAV," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 1924–1930, Sep. 2013.
- [15] W. MacKunis, Z. D. Wilcox, M. K. Kaiser, and W. E. Dixon, "Global adaptive output feedback tracking control of an unmanned aerial vehicle," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1390–1397, Nov 2010.
- [16] B. Erginer and E. Altuğ, "Design and implementation of a hybrid fuzzy logic controller for a quadrotor VTOL vehicle," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 61–70, Feb 2012.
- [17] C. Goerzen, Z. Kong, and B. Mettler, "A survey of motion planning algorithms from the perspective of autonomous UAV guidance," *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems*, vol. 57, no. 1, p. 65, Nov 2009.
- [18] N. Dadkhah and B. Mettler, "Survey of motion planning literature in the presence of uncertainty: Considerations for UAV guidance," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 233–246, Jan 2012.
- [19] X. Ming Cheng, D. Cao, and C. Tao Li, "Survey of cooperative path planning for multiple unmanned aerial vehicles," *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, vol. 668, no. 1, pp. 388–393, 10 2014.
- [20] L. Yang, J. Qi, J. Xiao, and X. Yong, "A literature review of UAV 3D path planning," in *Proceeding of the 11th World Congress on Intelligent Control and Automation*, June 2014, pp. 2376–2381.
- [21] T. T. Mac, C. Copot, R. De Keyser, and C. M. Ionescu, "The development of an autonomous navigation system with optimal control of an UAV in partly unknown indoor environment," *Mechatronics*, vol. 49, pp. 187 – 196, 2018.
- [22] C. Copot, A. Hernandez, T. T. Mac, and R. D. Keyse, "Collision-free path planning in indoor environment using a quadrotor," in *2016 21st*



- International Conference on Methods and Models in Automation and Robotics (MMAR), Aug 2016, pp. 351–356.
- [23] J. N. Gross, Y. Gu, M. B. Rhudy, S. Gururajan, and M. R. Napolitano, "Flight-test evaluation of sensor fusion algorithms for attitude estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 2128–2139, JULY 2012.
  - [24] A. Bry, A. Bachrach, and N. Roy, "State estimation for aggressive flight in GPS-denied environments using onboard sensing," in 2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, May 2012, pp. 1–8.
  - [25] H. G. de Marina, F. J. Pereda, J. M. Giron-Sierra, and F. Espinosa, "UAV attitude estimation using unscented kalman filter and TRIAD," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 4465–4474, Nov 2012.
  - [26] P. Marantos, Y. Koveos, and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "UAV state estimation using adaptive complementary filters," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 1214–1226, July 2016.
  - [27] X. Jing, J. Cui, H. He, B. Zhang, D. Ding, and Y. Yang, "Attitude estimation for UAV using extended kalman filter," in 2017 29th Chinese Control And Decision Conference (CCDC), May 2017, pp. 3307–3312.
  - [28] X. Dong, B. Yu, Z. Shi, and Y. Zhong, "Time-varying formation control for unmanned aerial vehicles: Theories and applications," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 340–348, Jan 2015.
  - [29] S. Kang, M. Park, and H. Ahn, "Distance-based cycle-free persistent formation: Global convergence and experimental test with a group of quadcopters," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 380–389, Jan 2017.
  - [30] Y. Kuriki and T. Namerikawa, "Formation control of UAVs with a fourth-order flight dynamics," in 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Dec 2013, pp. 6706–6711.
  - [31] S. Rao and D. Ghose, "Sliding mode control-based autopilots for leaderless consensus of unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1964–1972, Sep. 2014.
  - [32] A. T. Hafez, A. J. Marasco, S. N. Givigi, M. Iskandarani, S. Yousefi, and C. A. Rabbath, "Solving Multi-UAV dynamic encirclement via model predictive control," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 2251–2265, Nov 2015.
  - [33] A. B. Milhim, Y. Zhang, and C.-A. Rabbath, "Gain scheduling based PID controller for fault tolerant control of a quad-rotor UAV," in AIAA Infotech@Aerospace, 2010, pp. 1–13.
  - [34] A. Freddi, A. Lanzon, and S. Longhi, "A feedback linearization approach to fault tolerance in quadrotor vehicles," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 5413–5418, 2011, 18th IFAC World Congress.
  - [35] M. H. Amoozgar, A. Chamseddine, and Y. Zhang, "Fault-tolerant fuzzy gain-scheduled PID for a quadrotor helicopter testbed in the presence of actuator faults," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 282–287, 2012, 2nd IFAC Conference on Advances in PID Control.
  - [36] I. Sadeghzadeh and Y. Zhang, "Actuator fault-tolerant control based on gain-scheduled PID with application to fixed-wing unmanned aerial vehicle," in 2013 Conference on Control and Fault-Tolerant Systems (SysTol), Oct 2013, pp. 342–346.
  - [37] Z. Liu, C. Yuan, and Y. Zhang, "Adaptive fault-tolerant control of unmanned quadrotor helicopter using linear parameter varying control technique," in 2016 International Conference on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS), June 2016, pp. 980–985.
  - [38] Y. Zhang, A. Chamseddine, C. Rabbath, B. Gordon, C.-Y. Su, S. Rakheja, C. Fulford, J. Apkarian, and P. Gosselin, "Development of advanced FDD and FTC techniques with application to an unmanned quadrotor helicopter testbed," *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, vol. 350, no. 9, pp. 2396–2422, 2013.
  - [39] Z. Cen, H. Noura, T. B. Susilo, and Y. A. Younes, "Robust fault diagnosis for quadrotor UAVs using adaptive thau observer," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 573–588, Jan 2014.
  - [40] M. Saied, H. Shraim, C. Francis, I. Fantoni, and B. Lussier, "Actuator fault diagnosis in an octocopter UAV using sliding modes technique: Theory and experimentation," in 2015 European Control Conference (ECC), July 2015, pp. 1639–1644.
  - [41] E. Baskaya, M. Bronz, and D. Delahaye, "Fault detection and diagnosis for small UAVs via machine learning," in 2017 IEEE/AIAA 36th Digital Avionics Systems Conference (DASC), Sep. 2017, pp. 1–6.
  - [42] H. Basak and E. Prempain, "Switched fault tolerant control for a quadrotor UAV," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 10363–10368, 2017, 20th IFAC World Congress.
  - [43] H. Pham, S. Smolka, S. Stoller, D. Phan, and J. Yang, "A survey on unmanned aerial vehicle collision avoidance systems," in arXiv e-prints, 08 2015, pp. 1–6.
  - [44] N. Gageik, P. Benz, and S. Montenegro, "Obstacle detection and collision avoidance for a UAV with complementary low-cost sensors," *IEEE Access*, vol. 3, pp. 599–609, 2015.
  - [45] X. Qian, C. Peng, C. Nong, and Z. Xiang, "Dynamic obstacle avoidance path planning of UAVs," in 2015 34th Chinese Control Conference (CCC), July 2015, pp. 8860–8865.
  - [46] D. Zhang, Y. Xian, J. Li, G. Lei, and Y. Chang, "UAV path planning based on chaos ant colony algorithm," in 2015 International Conference on Computer Science and Mechanical Automation (CSMA), Oct 2015, pp. 81–85.
  - [47] T. T. Mac, C. Copot, A. Hernandez, and R. De Keyser, "Improved potential field method for unknown obstacle avoidance using UAV in indoor environment," in 2016 IEEE 14th International Symposium on Applied Machine Intelligence and Informatics (SAMi), Jan 2016, pp. 345–350.
  - [48] J. Villagra and D. Herrero-Perez, "A comparison of control techniques for robust docking maneuvers of an AGV," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1116–1123, July 2012.
  - [49] M. Bahadorian, B. Savkovic, R. Eaton, and T. Hesketh, "Robust model predictive control for automated trajectory tracking of an unmanned ground vehicle," in 2012 American Control Conference (ACC), June 2012, pp. 4251–4256.
  - [50] J. A. Broderick, D. M. Tilbury, and E. M. Atkins, "Supervisory traction control for a slipping UGV," in 2013 American Control Conference, June 2013, pp. 4350–4355.
  - [51] C. M. Filho and D. F. Wolf, "Dynamic inversion-based control for front wheel drive autonomous ground vehicles near the limits of handling," in 17th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), Oct 2014, pp. 2138–2143.
  - [52] C. Hwang, C. Yang, and J. Y. Hung, "Path tracking of an autonomous ground vehicle with different payloads by hierarchical improved fuzzy dynamic sliding-mode control," *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 899–914, April 2018.
  - [53] J. A. Broderick, D. M. Tilbury, and E. M. Atkins, "Optimal coverage trajectories for a UGV with tradeoffs for energy and time," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 257–271, Mar 2014.
  - [54] J. Li, G. Deng, C. Luo, Q. Lin, Q. Yan, and Z. Ming, "A hybrid path planning method in unmanned air/ground vehicle (UAV/UGV) cooperative systems," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 9585–9596, Dec 2016.
  - [55] T. T. Mac, C. Copot, D. T. Tran, and R. De Keyser, "Heuristic approaches in robot path planning: A survey," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 86, pp. 13–28, 2016.
  - [56] E. Magid, R. Lavrenov, and I. Afanasyev, "Voronoi-based trajectory optimization for UGV path planning," in 2017 International Conference on Mechanical, System and Control Engineering (ICMSC), May 2017, pp. 383–387.
  - [57] M. Elhoseny, A. Shehab, and X. Yuan, "Optimizing robot path in dynamic environments using genetic algorithm and bezier curve," *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 2305–2316, 09 2017.
  - [58] V. Malyavej, P. Torteeka, S. Wongkham, and T. Wangtong, "Pose estimation of unmanned ground vehicle based on dead-reckoning/GPS sensor fusion by unscented kalman filter," in 2009 6th International Conference on Electrical Engineering/Electronics, Computer, Telecommunications and Information Technology, vol. 01, May 2009, pp. 395–398.
  - [59] E. Shi, Z. Wang, X. Huang, and Y. Huang, "Study on AGV posture estimating based on distributed Kalman fusion for multi-sensor," in 2009 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO), Dec 2009, pp. 1219–1223.
  - [60] G. Rigatos, P. Siano, and G. Ingenito, "Kalman filter-based compensation of disturbance forces and torques for AGVs," in 2013 IEEE International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Virtual Environments for Measurement Systems and Applications (CIVEMSA), July 2013, pp. 150–155.
  - [61] P. Thulasiraman, G. A. Clark, and T. M. Beach, "Mobility estimation using an extended Kalman filter for unmanned ground vehicle networks," in 2014 IEEE International Inter-Disciplinary Conference on Cognitive Methods in Situation Awareness and Decision Support (CogSIMA), March 2014, pp. 223–229.
  - [62] G. Yamauchi, D. Suzuki, and K. Nagatani, "Online slip parameter estimation for tracked vehicle odometry on loose slope," in 2016 IEEE Inter-

- national Symposium on Safety, Security, and Rescue Robotics (SSRR), Oct 2016, pp. 227–232.
- [63] L. Barnes, M. Fields, and K. Valavanis, “Unmanned ground vehicle swarm formation control using potential fields,” in 2007 Mediterranean Conference on Control Automation, June 2007, pp. 1–8.
- [64] H. Lim, Y. Kang, J. Kim, and C. Kim, “Formation control of leader following unmanned ground vehicles using nonlinear model predictive control,” in 2009 IEEE/ASME International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Mechatronics, July 2009, pp. 945–950.
- [65] D. Shen, W. Sun, and Z. Sun, “Adaptive PID formation control of nonholonomic robots without leader’s velocity information,” *ISA Transactions*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 474–480, 2014.
- [66] B. Lantos and G. Max, “Hierarchical control of unmanned ground vehicle formations using multi-body approach,” *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 137–156, 01 2016.
- [67] A. Soni and H. Hu, “Formation control for a fleet of autonomous ground vehicles: A survey,” *Robotics*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 67, 11 2018.
- [68] M. Koh, M. Norton, and S. Khoo, “Robust fault-tolerant leader-follower control of four-wheel steering mobile robots using terminal sliding mode,” *Australian Journal of Electrical and Electronics Engineering*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 247–253, 2012.
- [69] D. Rotondo, V. Puig, F. Nejjari, and J. Romera, “A fault-hiding approach for the switching quasi-lpv fault-tolerant control of a four-wheeled omnidirectional mobile robot,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3932–3944, June 2015.
- [70] G. Fournas, G. C. Karras, and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, “Fault tolerant control for a 4-wheel skid steering mobile robot,” in *Proceedings of the 26th International Workshop on Principles of Diagnosis*, 2015, pp. 177–183.
- [71] T. Kim, J. Park, and H. J. Kim, “Actuator reconfiguration control of a robotic vehicle with four independent wheel driving,” in 2015 15th International Conference on Control, Automation and Systems (ICCAS), Oct 2015, pp. 1767–1770.
- [72] R. R. Nair, H. Karki, A. Shukla, L. Behera, and M. Jamshidi, “Fault-tolerant formation control of nonholonomic robots using fast adaptive gain nonsingular terminal sliding mode control,” *IEEE Systems Journal*, pp. 1–12, 2018.
- [73] S. Lee, S. Yang, and B. Song, “Hierarchical fault detection and diagnosis for unmanned ground vehicles,” in 2009 7th Asian Control Conference, Aug 2009, pp. 881–886.
- [74] M. H. Amoozgar, “Development of fault diagnosis and fault tolerant control algorithms with application to unmanned systems,” August 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/974548/>
- [75] E. Khalastchi and M. Kalech, “On fault detection and diagnosis in robotic systems,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 9:1–9:24, Jan. 2018.
- [76] T. Choe, J. W. Hur, J. S. Chae, and Y. Park, “Real-time collision avoidance method for unmanned ground vehicle,” in 2008 International Conference on Control, Automation and Systems, Oct 2008, pp. 843–846.
- [77] C. Zhuge, Y. Cai, and Z. Tang, “A novel dynamic obstacle avoidance algorithm based on collision time histogram,” *Chinese Journal of Electronics*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 522–529, 2017.
- [78] M. C. De Simone, Z. B. Rivera, and D. Guida, “Obstacle avoidance system for unmanned ground vehicles by using ultrasonic sensors,” *Machines*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2018.
- [79] C. A. Monje, Y. Chen, B. M. Vinagre, D. Xue, and V. Feliu, *Fractional-order Systems and Controls: Fundamentals and Applications*, 1st ed., ser. *Advances in Industrial Control*. Springer-Verlag London, 2010.
- [80] A. V. Fabrizio Padula, *Advances in Robust Fractional Control*, 1st ed. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [81] J. Sabatier, P. Lanusse, P. Melchior, and A. Oustaloup, *Fractional Order Differentiation and Robust Control Design: CRONE, H-infinity and Motion Control*, 1st ed., ser. *Intelligent Systems, Control and Automation: Science and Engineering 77*. Springer Netherlands, 2015.
- [82] R. De Keyser, C. I. Muresan, and C. M. Ionescu, “A novel auto-tuning method for fractional order PI/PD controllers,” *ISA Transactions*, vol. 62, pp. 268–275, 2016.
- [83] C. I. Muresan, E. H. Dulf, C. Copot, R. De Keyser, and C. Ionescu, “Design and analysis of a multivariable fractional order controller for a non-minimum phase system,” *Journal of Vibration and Control*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 2187–2195, 2016.
- [84] Y. Luo and Y. Chen, “Fractional order [proportional derivative] controller for a class of fractional order systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 2446–2450, 2009.
- [85] H. Chao, Y. Luo, L. Di, and Y. Q. Chen, “Roll-channel fractional order controller design for a small fixed-wing unmanned aerial vehicle,” *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 761–772, 2010.
- [86] Y. Luo, H. Chao, L. Di, and Y. Q. Chen, “Lateral directional fractional order (PI)<sup>λ</sup> control of a small fixed-wing unmanned aerial vehicles: controller designs and flight tests,” *IET Control Theory Applications*, vol. 5, no. 18, pp. 2156–2167, December 2011.
- [87] A. Al-Mayyahi, W. Wang, and P. Birch, “Design of fractional-order controller for trajectory tracking control of a non-holonomic autonomous ground vehicle,” *Journal of Control, Automation and Electrical Systems*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 29–42, February 2016.
- [88] K. Orman, A. Basci, and A. Derdiyok, “Speed and direction angle control of four wheel drive skid-steered mobile robot by using fractional order PI controller,” *Elektronika ir Elektrotechnika*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 14–19, 2016.
- [89] A. A. Dastjerdi, B. M. Vinagre, Y. Chen, and S. H. HosseinNia, “Linear fractional order controllers; a survey in the frequency domain,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, 2019.
- [90] R. Caponetto, G. Dongola, L. Fortuna, and I. Petrás, *Fractional Order Systems*. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 2010.
- [91] T. Q. Hu Sheng, YangQuan Chen, *Fractional Processes and Fractional-Order Signal Processing: Techniques and Applications*, 1st ed., ser. *Signals and Communication Technology*. Springer-Verlag London, 2012.
- [92] Q. Yang, D. Chen, T. Zhao, and Y. Chen, “Fractional calculus in image processing: A review,” *Fractional Calculus and Applied Analysis*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 1222–1249, 08 2016.
- [93] I. Birs, C. Muresan, I. Nascu, and C. Ionescu, “A survey of recent advances in fractional order control for time delay systems,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 30951–30965, 2019.
- [94] H. Sun, Y. Zhang, D. Baleanu, W. Chen, and Y. Chen, “A new collection of real world applications of fractional calculus in science and engineering,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 64, pp. 213–231, 2018.
- [95] K. B. Oldham and J. Spanier, *The fractional calculus. Theory and applications of differentiation and integration to arbitrary order*, 1st ed., ser. *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1974.
- [96] S. D. (auth.), *Functional Fractional Calculus*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
- [97] I. Petrás, “Tuning and implementation methods for fractional-order controllers,” *Fractional Calculus and Applied Analysis*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 282–303, Jun 2012.
- [98] P. Shah and S. Agashe, “Review of fractional PID controller,” *Mechatronics*, vol. 38, pp. 29–41, 2016.
- [99] C. A. Monje, E. Liceaga-Castro, and J. Liceaga-Castro, “Fractional order control of an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV),” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 15285–15290, 2008.
- [100] M. Efe, “Neural network assisted computationally simple PI<sup>λ</sup>D<sup>μ</sup> control of a quadrotor UAV,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 354–361, May 2011.
- [101] R. Ayad, W. Nouibat, M. Zareb, and Y. Bestaoui Sebanne, “Full control of quadrotor aerial robot using fractional-order FOPID,” *Iranian Journal of Science and Technology, Transactions of Electrical Engineering*, 11 2018.
- [102] H. Lal Maurya, L. Behera, and N. K. Verma, “Trajectory tracking of quad-rotor UAV using fractional order pi<sup>μ</sup>d<sup>λ</sup> controller,” *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, vol. 798, pp. 171–186, 01 2019.
- [103] R. Cajo, C. Copot, C. M. Ionescu, R. De Keyser, and D. Plaza, “Fractional order PD path-following control of an AR. Drone Quadrotor,” in 2018 IEEE 12th International Symposium on Applied Computational Intelligence and Informatics (SACI), May 2018, pp. 291–296.
- [104] X. Shi, B. Hu, C. Yin, Y. Cheng, and X. Huang, “Design of trajectory tracking controller with fractional-order backstepping sliding mode method for quadrotor UAV,” in 2018 Chinese Control And Decision Conference (CCDC), June 2018, pp. 5960–5965.
- [105] Y. Guo, Z. Deng, L. Zu, and Y. Lv, “Trajectory tracking control of a quadrotor using fractional-order sliding mode,” in 2017 36th Chinese Control Conference (CCC), July 2017, pp. 6414–6419.
- [106] A. Govea-Vargas, R. Castro-Linares, M. A. Duarte-Mermoud, N. Aguila-Camacho, and G. E. Ceballos-Benavides, “Fractional order sliding mode control of a class of second order perturbed nonlinear systems: Application to the trajectory tracking of a quadrotor,” *Algorithms*, vol. 11, no. 11, 2018.

- [107] A. M. Jensen, D. K. Geller, and Y. Chen, "Monte carlo simulation analysis of tagged fish radio tracking performance by swarming unmanned aerial vehicles in fractional order potential fields," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 287–307, Apr 2014.
- [108] J. Han, "Small unmanned aircraft systems for cooperative source seeking with fractional order potential fields," in *2018 Chinese Control And Decision Conference (CCDC)*, June 2018, pp. 6677–6683.
- [109] M. Efe, "Battery power loss compensated fractional order sliding mode control of a quadrotor UAV," *Asian Journal of Control*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 413–425, 2012.
- [110] F. Geng and X. Zhu, "Research on fractional order two-degrees-of-freedom flight control technology of unmanned air vehicle," in *2012 International Conference on Computer Science and Information Processing (CSIP)*, Aug 2012, pp. 807–812.
- [111] C. Izaguirre-Espinosa, A. J. Muñoz-Vázquez, A. Sánchez-Orta, V. Parra-Vega, and P. Castillo, "Attitude control of quadrotors based on fractional sliding modes: theory and experiments," *IET Control Theory Applications*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 825–832, 2016.
- [112] C. Izaguirre-Espinosa, A. J. Muñoz-Vázquez, A. Sánchez-Orta, V. Parra-Vega, and I. Fantoni, "Fractional-order control for robust position/yaw tracking of quadrotors with experiments," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, pp. 1–6, 2018.
- [113] C. Hua, J. Chen, and X. Guan, "Fractional-order sliding mode control of uncertain QUAVs with time-varying state constraints," *Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 95, no. 2, pp. 1347–1360, Jan 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11071-018-4632-0>
- [114] J. Wang, C. Shao, and Y.-Q. Chen, "Fractional order sliding mode control via disturbance observer for a class of fractional order systems with mismatched disturbance," *Mechatronics*, vol. 53, pp. 8 – 19, 2018.
- [115] F. Oliva-Palomo, A. J. Muñoz-Vázquez, A. Sánchez-Orta, V. Parra-Vega, C. Izaguirre-Espinosa, and P. Castillo, "A fractional nonlinear pi-structure control for robust attitude tracking of quadrotors," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, pp. 1–1, 2019.
- [116] N. Katal, P. Kumar, and S. Narayan, "Design of  $PI^{\lambda}D^{\mu}$  controller for robust flight control of a UAV using multi-objective bat algorithm," in *2015 2nd International Conference on Recent Advances in Engineering Computational Sciences (RAECS)*, Dec 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [117] P. Kumar and S. Narayan, "Optimal design of robust FOPID for the aircraft pitch control system using multi-objective GA," in *2016 IEEE Students' Conference on Electrical, Electronics and Computer Science (SCEECS)*, March 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [118] S. Seyedtabaai, "New flat phase margin fractional order pid design: Perturbed UAV roll control study," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 96, pp. 58 – 64, 2017.
- [119] J. Han, L. Di, C. Coopmans, and Y. Chen, "Pitch loop control of a VTOL UAV using fractional order controller," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 187–195, Jan 2014.
- [120] C. Wang, J. Li, Y. Liu, and M. Li, "Research on UAV attitude control based on fractional order proportional integral controllers," in *Proceedings of the 33rd Chinese Control Conference*, July 2014, pp. 3552–3557.
- [121] C. Coopmans, A. M. Jensen, and Y. Chen, "Fractional-order complementary filters for small unmanned aerial system navigation," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 429–453, Jan 2014.
- [122] Z. Yu, Y. Qu, C. Su, and Y. Zhang, "Distributed fractional-order finite-time control for multiple unmanned aerial vehicles," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*, Aug 2018, pp. 1058–1063.
- [123] Z. Yu, Y. Zhang, Y. Qu, and Z. Xing, "Adaptive fractional-order fault-tolerant tracking control for UAV based on high-gain observer," in *13th ASME/IEEE International Conference on Mechatronic and Embedded Systems and Applications*, vol. 9, 08 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [124] M. Romero, I. Tejado, J. I. Suarez, B. M. Vinagre, and A. P. de Madrid, "GPC strategies for the lateral control of a networked AGV," in *2009 IEEE International Conference on Mechatronics*, April 2009, pp. 1–6.
- [125] J. Tian, N. Chen, J. Yang, and L. Wang, "Fractional order sliding model control of active four-wheel steering vehicles," in *ICFDA'14 International Conference on Fractional Differentiation and Its Applications 2014*, June 2014, pp. 1–5.
- [126] I. Tejado, V. Milanés, J. Villagrà, and B. M. Vinagre, "Fractional network-based control for vehicle speed adaptation via vehicle-to-infrastructure communications," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 780–790, May 2013.
- [127] A. Rojas-Moreno and G. Perez-Valenzuela, "Fractional order tracking control of a wheeled mobile robot," in *2017 IEEE XXIV International Conference on Electronics, Electrical Engineering and Computing (INTERCON)*, Aug 2017, pp. 1–4.
- [128] I. Tejado, V. Milanés, J. Villagrà, J. Godoy, H. HosseinNia, and B. M. Vinagre, "Low speed control of an autonomous vehicle by using a fractional pi controller," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 15 025 – 15 030, 2011, 18th IFAC World Congress.
- [129] S. Dadras, "Path tracking using fractional order extremum seeking controller for autonomous ground vehicle," in *SAE Technical Paper*. SAE International, 03 2017.
- [130] J. Moreau, P. Melchior, S. Victor, F. Aioun, and F. Guillemard, "Path planning with fractional potential fields for autonomous vehicles," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 14 533 – 14 538, 2017.
- [131] R. De Keyser, C. I. Muresan, and C. M. Ionescu, "An efficient algorithm for low-order direct discrete-time implementation of fractional order transfer functions," *ISA Transactions*, vol. 74, pp. 229 – 238, 2018.



**RICARDO CAJO** received the B.Eng. degree in telecommunications engineering and his M.Sc. degree in industrial automatic control from the Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral (ESPOL) in Guayaquil-Ecuador. He is currently a Ph.D. Researcher with the Department of Electrical Energy, Systems, and Automation, Ghent University. His topics of research are focused on fractional order control, identification and optimization control for autonomous vehicles.



**THI THOA MAC** received the B.Eng. degree in mechatronics engineering from Hanoi University of Science and Technology, Vietnam, in 2006. She obtained her M.Sc. degree in 2009 at National Taiwan University of Science and Technology in Faculty of Engineering, Taiwan. In 2017, She received Ph.D. degree from Ghent University, Belgium. She also is a lecturer at Hanoi university of science and technology. Her interests include fuzzy logic control, neural networks, path planning and optimization control for autonomous robot.



**DOUGLAS PLAZA** received the M.Sc. degree in industrial control engineering from Universidad de Ibagué, Ibagué-Colombia, in 2008, and the Ph.D. in electromechanical engineering from Ghent University, Ghent-Belgium, in 2013. His current research interests are related to Kalman filtering and smoothing, sequential Monte Carlo methods, hydrologic modeling, hydrologic data assimilation, model predictive control and nonlinear control applied to power electronics.





**COSMIN COPOT** received his M.Sc. and M.E. degrees in systems engineering from Gheorghe Asachi Technical University of Iasi, Romania, in 2007, and 2008, respectively. In 2011 he received Ph.D. degree from the same university on control techniques for visual servoing systems. He is currently a postdoctoral research at Ghent University. His research interests include robotics, visual servoing systems, identification and control.



**ROBAIN DE KEYSER** received the M.Sc. degree in electromechanical engineering and the Ph.D. degree in control engineering from Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium, in 1974 and 1980, respectively. He is currently a Emeritus Professor of control engineering with the Faculty of Engineering, Ghent University. He is the author or co-author of over 300 publications in journals, books, and conference proceedings. He has acted as an external review expert in several European

Commission Research Programs and is one of the pioneers who produced the original concepts of predictive control during the 1980s. The research is application-driven, with many pilot implementations in technical and nontechnical systems, amongst others in the chemical, steel, marine, mechatronic, semiconductor, power electronics, and biomedical spheres. His current research interests include model predictive control, auto-tuning and adaptive control, modeling and simulation, and system identification.



**CLARA IONESCU** is a professor at Ghent University, Dynamical Systems and Control research group. She obtained her doctoral degree in 2009 from the same university on the application of fractional calculus tools to model and diagnose respiratory lung function by means of fractional order impedance models. She has also performed initial closed loop hypnosis regulation tests with predictive control strategies and further improved modeling and control aspects in the depth of anesthesia regulatory paradigm. Between 2011-2017 she was the recipient of prestigious post-doctoral fellowship grant from Flanders Research Center, Brussels, Belgium. Currently, her research interests focus on novel tools for modeling and control of dynamical systems with fractional calculus tools.

...