ME 599/699 Robot Modeling & Control
Fall 2021

Robust and Adaptive Inverse Dynamics

Hasan A. Poonawala

Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of Kentucky

Email: hasan.poonawala@uky.edu
Web: https://www.engr.uky.edu/~hap

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

What happens when $\hat{M}(q) \neq M(q)$, $\hat{C}(q, \dot{q}) \neq \hat{C}(q, \dot{q})$, $\hat{G}(q) \neq G(q)$?

Our closed-loop under inverse dynamics control is

$$M(q)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + G(q) = \hat{M}(q)a_q(t) + \hat{C}(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + \hat{G}(q)$$

Rewrite above as

$$M(q)\ddot{q} = \hat{M}(q)a_q(t) + \hat{C}(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} - C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + \hat{G}(q) - G(q)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M(q)\ddot{q} &= M(q)a_q(t) + \left(\hat{M}(q) - M(q)\right) a_q(t) \\ &\quad + \left(\hat{C}(q, \dot{q}) - C(q, \dot{q})\right) \dot{q} + \left(\hat{G}(q) - G(q)\right) \\ &= M(q)a_q(t) + \tilde{M}a_q(t) + \tilde{C}\dot{q} + \tilde{G} \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \ddot{q} = a_q(t) + M^{-1}(q)\left(\tilde{M}a_q(t) + \tilde{C}\dot{q} + \tilde{G}\right)$$

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\ddot{q} = a_q(t) + M^{-1}(q)\left(\tilde{M}a_q(t) + \tilde{C}\dot{q} + \tilde{G}\right) \quad (1)$$

$$= a_q + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q) \quad (2)$$

If we had perfect knowledge of the model parameters, $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q) = 0$, because $\tilde{M} = \hat{M}(q) - M(q) = 0$ and so on.

To account for non-zero $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$, we choose a_q as

$$a_q(t) = \ddot{q}_d(t) + K_P\left(q_d(t) - q(t)\right) + K_D\left(\dot{q}_d(t) - \dot{q}(t)\right) + \delta a$$

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\ddot{q} = a_q(t) + M^{-1}(q)\left(\tilde{M}a_q(t) + \tilde{C}\dot{q} + \tilde{G}\right) \quad (1)$$

$$= a_q + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q) \quad (2)$$

If we had perfect knowledge of the model parameters, $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q) = 0$, because $\tilde{M} = \hat{M}(q) - M(q) = 0$ and so on.

To account for non-zero $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$, we choose a_q as

$$a_q(t) = \ddot{q}_d(t) + K_P\left(q_d(t) - q(t)\right) + K_D\left(\dot{q}_d(t) - \dot{q}(t)\right) + \delta a$$

Let $e(t) = \begin{bmatrix} q(t) - q_d(t) \\ \dot{q}(t) - \dot{q}_d(t) \end{bmatrix}$. Our closed-loop is now

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta) \quad (3)$$

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \left(\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)\right)$$

We can now easily see why the new term δa is what we use to account for non-zero $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q))$$

We can now easily see why the new term δa is what we use to account for non-zero $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$.

Remember that we can't compute $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$, because it depends on the true model, which we assume we don't know.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q))$$

We can now easily see why the new term δa is what we use to account for non-zero $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$.

Remember that we can't compute $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$, because it depends on the true model, which we assume we don't know.

How do we choose δa ?

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q))$$

We can now easily see why the new term δa is what we use to account for non-zero $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$.

Remember that we can't compute $\eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q)$, because it depends on the true model, which we assume we don't know.

How do we choose δa ? Lyapunov methods

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q))$$

Suppose we can bound η as

$$\|\eta\| \leq \rho(e, t),$$

we can then design δa to guarantee ultimate $e(t) \to 0$.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q))$$

Suppose we can bound η as

$$\|\eta\| \leq \rho(e, t),$$

we can then design δa to guarantee ultimate $e(t) \to 0$.

Let $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix}$, and $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix}$. $\dot{e} = Ae + B(\delta a + \eta)$.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

$$\dot{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix} e + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\delta a + \eta(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, a_q))$$

Suppose we can bound η as

$$\|\eta\| \leq \rho(e, t),$$

we can then design δa to guarantee ultimate $e(t) \to 0$.

Let $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -K_P & -K_D \end{bmatrix}$, and $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix}$. $\dot{e} = Ae + B(\delta a + \eta)$.

Let $V = e^T P e$ where $A^T P + PA = -Q$. Since A can be made Hurwitz by choosing K_P and K_D, we know that for each $Q > 0$ there exists $P > 0$ that satisfies the Lyapunov equation $A^T P + PA = -Q$.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= e^T P A e + e^T A^T P e + 2e^T P B(\delta a + \eta)\\ &= -e^T Q e + 2e^T P B(\delta a + \eta)\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We choose

$$\delta a = \begin{cases} -\rho(e,t)\frac{B^T P e}{\|B^T P e\|} & , \quad \text{if } \|B^T P e\| \neq 0 \\ 0 & , \quad \text{if } \|B^T P e\| = 0 \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Let $w = B^T P e$. Then the second term in (4) is then

$$\begin{aligned} w^T\left(-\rho\frac{w}{\|w\|} + \eta\right) &\leq -\rho\|w\| + \|w\|\|\eta\| \quad (w^T\eta \leq \|w\|\|\eta\|) \\ &\leq \|w\|(-\rho + \|\eta\|) \\ &\leq 0, \qquad\qquad (\|\eta\| \leq \rho(e,t)) \end{aligned}$$

when $e \neq 0$.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= -e^T Q e + 2 w^T (\delta a + \eta) \\ &\le -e^T Q e + 0 && \text{(from previous slide)} \\ &< 0 && (Q > 0)\end{aligned}$$

In summary, if we can bound η (see notes Section 5.5),

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} &= -e^T Q e + 2w^T(\delta a + \eta) \\
&\leq -e^T Q e + 0 && \text{(from previous slide)} \\
&< 0 && (Q > 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

In summary, if we can bound η (see notes Section 5.5), which depends on our model errors,

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} &= -e^T Q e + 2w^T(\delta a + \eta) \\
&\leq -e^T Q e + 0 && \text{(from previous slide)} \\
&< 0 && (Q > 0)
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, if we can bound η (see notes Section 5.5), which depends on our model errors, we can achieve $e(t) \to 0$ using the robust version of the inverse dynamics control.

Robust Inverse Dynamics Control

So,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{V} &= -e^T Qe + 2w^T(\delta a + \eta) \\
&\leq -e^T Qe + 0 && \text{(from previous slide)} \\
&< 0 && (Q > 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

In summary, if we can bound η (see notes Section 5.5), which depends on our model errors, we can achieve $e(t) \to 0$ using the robust version of the inverse dynamics control.

Issues:

- If the bound ρ is large (due to large errors η), then the demanded control u becomes larger than motor capacity
- The control is discontinuous at $w = 0$, which is tricky to implement; overheats electric motors.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

- The error in model estimate affects $\rho(\epsilon, t)$ which ruins the lowest achievable error in continuous robust inverse dynamics control.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

- The error in model estimate affects $\rho(\epsilon, t)$ which ruins the lowest achievable error in continuous robust inverse dynamics control.
- Ideally, we want smaller model errors to achieve lower error.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

- The error in model estimate affects $\rho(\epsilon, t)$ which ruins the lowest achievable error in continuous robust inverse dynamics control.
- Ideally, we want smaller model errors to achieve lower error.
- Luckily, we can learn models on-the-fly using adaptive control theory.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Key idea: EL model is linear in parameters!

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Key idea: EL model is linear in parameters!

$$M(q)\ddot{q} + C(q,\dot{q})\dot{q} + g(q) \to Y(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q})\Theta$$

- Θ: a vector function that depend on link masses, lengths, g
- $Y(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q})$ a vector function that DOES NOT DEPEND on robot parameters

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Key idea: EL model is linear in parameters!

$$M(q)\ddot{q} + C(q,\dot{q})\dot{q} + g(q) \to Y(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q})\Theta$$

- Θ: a vector function that depend on link masses, lengths, g
- $Y(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q})$ a vector function that DOES NOT DEPEND on robot parameters

We don't know true parameters Θ.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Key idea: EL model is linear in parameters!

$$M(q)\ddot{q} + C(q,\dot{q})\dot{q} + g(q) \rightarrow Y(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q})\Theta$$

- Θ: a vector function that depend on link masses, lengths, g
- $Y(q,\dot{q},\ddot{q})$ a vector function that DOES NOT DEPEND on robot parameters

We don't know true parameters Θ.

We have a guess $\hat{\Theta}$ (which we may convert into $\hat{M}(q)$, $\hat{C}(q,\dot{q})$, $\hat{G}(q)$).

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

We would hope $\hat{\Theta} = \Theta$.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

We would hope $\hat{\Theta} = \Theta$.

Since guessing right is unlikely, we design a continuous update rule for $\hat{\Theta}(t)$.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

We would hope $\hat{\Theta} = \Theta$.

Since guessing right is unlikely, we design a continuous update rule for $\hat{\Theta}(t)$.

KEY ADAPTIVE CONTROL BEHAVIOR:
This update rule WILL NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$, but it ensures that

$$e(t) \to 0.$$

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

We would hope $\hat{\Theta} = \Theta$.

Since guessing right is unlikely, we design a continuous update rule for $\hat{\Theta}(t)$.

KEY ADAPTIVE CONTROL BEHAVIOR:
This update rule WILL NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$, but it ensures that

$$e(t) \to 0.$$

This update rule relies on the linearity in parameters property.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Let $\tilde{q} = q - q_d$, $\dot{\tilde{q}} = \dot{q} - \dot{q}_d$
Choosing $u = Y(q, \dot{q}, a_q)\hat{\Theta}$, where $a_q = \ddot{q}_d(t) - K_P\tilde{q} - K_D\dot{\tilde{q}}$ we get

$$\ddot{\tilde{q}} + K_1\dot{\tilde{q}} + K_0\dot{\tilde{q}} = M^{-1}Y(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q})\tilde{\Theta} = \Phi\tilde{\Theta}, \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{\Theta} = \hat{\Theta} - \Theta$.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Let $\tilde{q} = q - q_d$, $\dot{\tilde{q}} = \dot{q} - \dot{q}_d$
Choosing $u = Y(q, \dot{q}, a_q)\hat{\Theta}$, where $a_q = \ddot{q}_d(t) - K_P\tilde{q} - K_D\dot{\tilde{q}}$ we get

$$\ddot{\tilde{q}} + K_1\dot{\tilde{q}} + K_0\dot{\tilde{q}} = M^{-1}Y(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q})\tilde{\Theta} = \Phi\tilde{\Theta}, \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{\Theta} = \hat{\Theta} - \Theta$.

Let $e = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{q} \\ \dot{\tilde{q}} \end{bmatrix}$. We get the ODE

$$\dot{e} = Ae + B\Phi\tilde{\theta} \tag{7}$$

which is effectively the same ODE as in the robust case, but without δa.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Consider a function of $e, \tilde{\Theta}$ given by

$$V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = e^T P e + \tilde{\Theta}^T \Gamma \tilde{\Theta}. \tag{8}$$

For $P > 0$ and $\Gamma > 0$, $V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = 0$ when $e = 0$ and $\Theta = \hat{\Theta}$.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Consider a function of $e, \tilde{\Theta}$ given by

$$V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = e^T P e + \tilde{\Theta}^T \Gamma \tilde{\Theta}. \tag{8}$$

For $P > 0$ and $\Gamma > 0$, $V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = 0$ when $e = 0$ and $\Theta = \hat{\Theta}$.
Again, we know there exists $Q > 0$ such that $A^T P + PA = -Q$.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Consider a function of $e, \tilde{\Theta}$ given by

$$V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = e^T P e + \tilde{\Theta}^T \Gamma \tilde{\Theta}. \tag{8}$$

For $P > 0$ and $\Gamma > 0$, $V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = 0$ when $e = 0$ and $\Theta = \hat{\Theta}$.
Again, we know there exists $Q > 0$ such that $A^T P + PA = -Q$.

We have

$$\dot{V}(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = -e^T Q e + 2\tilde{\Theta}^T \left(\Phi^T B^T P e + \Gamma \dot{\hat{\Theta}} \right) \tag{9}$$

If we knew Θ the second term is made zero by choosing $\hat{\Theta} = \Theta$.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Consider a function of $e, \tilde{\Theta}$ given by

$$V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = e^T P e + \tilde{\Theta}^T \Gamma \tilde{\Theta}. \tag{8}$$

For $P > 0$ and $\Gamma > 0$, $V(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = 0$ when $e = 0$ and $\Theta = \hat{\Theta}$.
Again, we know there exists $Q > 0$ such that $A^T P + PA = -Q$.

We have

$$\dot{V}(e, \tilde{\Theta}) = -e^T Q e + 2\tilde{\Theta}^T \left(\Phi^T B^T P e + \Gamma \dot{\hat{\Theta}} \right) \tag{9}$$

If we knew Θ the second term is made zero by choosing $\hat{\Theta} = \Theta$.
Since we don't, we instead choose

$$\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1} \Phi^T B^T P e \tag{10}$$

$$(\implies \dot{V} \leq 0, \text{ and } \dot{V} < 0 \text{ when } e \neq 0) \tag{11}$$

It's like a nonlinear integral control!

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \not< 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \not< 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)
- DOES NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ ...

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \not< 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)
- DOES NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ ...
- ...unless a condition known as Persistence of Excitation holds.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \not< 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)
- DOES NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ ...
- ...unless a condition known as Persistence of Excitation holds.
  - when $e = 0$, $\dot{\Theta} = 0$. Update stops.

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \not< 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)
- DOES NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ ...
- ...unless a condition known as Persistence of Excitation holds.
  - when $e = 0$, $\dot{\Theta} = 0$. Update stops.
  - Some disturbances keep pushing $e(t)$ away from zero in a way that allows update to continue while e stays small

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \not< 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)
- DOES NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ ...
- ...unless a condition known as Persistence of Excitation holds.
  - when $e = 0$, $\dot{\Theta} = 0$. Update stops.
  - Some disturbances keep pushing $e(t)$ away from zero in a way that allows update to continue while e stays small
  - PoE: says when $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ as opposed to $\|\hat{\Theta}(t)\| \to \infty$

Adaptive Inverse Dynamics Control

Summary:

- Parameter update: $\dot{\hat{\Theta}} = -\Gamma^{-1}\Phi^T B^T P e$
- Ensures that $e(t) \to 0$ for any initial guess $\Theta(0)$
  Analysis uses Barbalat's Lemma to handle $\dot{V} \nless 0$.
  (ME 699 in Fall 2020)
- DOES NOT ensure that $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ ...
- ...unless a condition known as Persistence of Excitation holds.
  - when $e = 0$, $\dot{\Theta} = 0$. Update stops.
  - Some disturbances keep pushing $e(t)$ away from zero in a way that allows update to continue while e stays small
  - PoE: says when $\hat{\Theta}(t) \to \Theta$ as opposed to $\|\hat{\Theta}(t)\| \to \infty$
  - PoE rule is important. Bad updates caused the NASA X-15 to crash in 1967.
    (Mathematical analysis is sometimes not optional).