Friction Compensation and Limit Cycle Suppression at Low Velocities Based on Extended State Observer
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Abstract: This paper investigates the extended state observer (ESO) based friction compensation at low velocities with only the position measurement. ESO is an effective model-free friction compensation technique and thus is employed in this paper. Based on the describing function analysis, it is revealed that the higher the observer bandwidth is, the larger the velocity feedback gain should be to suppress the limit cycle. However, the available damping provided by the derivative control is restricted when the signal-to-noise ratio of the velocity is low. Under such a condition, the observer bandwidth cannot be high and the friction compensation performance is thus limited. To solve this conflict, a switching control law based on the ESO is proposed to compensate the friction in a fast manner and suppress the limit cycle simultaneously. The switching strategy aims to determine when the disturbance compensation should be added in the control signal to eliminate the friction induced oscillations without making the system response become sluggish. Such an idea is enlightened by the fact that nonlinear modifications to the integral action are always needed in practice. Hardware experiments are performed on a brushless DC motor to validate the effectiveness of the proposed compensation scheme.
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1. INTRODUCTION

When mechanical systems execute the positioning or low-velocity tracking tasks, the effect of friction is dominant and is the main cause of performance degradation. Therefore, the friction compensation at low velocities is critical to achieve high-precision position control.

Much effort has been devoted to the friction compensation. Armstrong et al. (1994) performed a thorough and detailed survey about the compensation methods. In general, the investigations can be classified into two categories: the friction-model based compensation (FMC) and the non-friction-model based compensation (NFMC). In the FMC framework, a parametric friction model with fixed or adaptive parameters should be established first (Garagić and Srinivasan (2004); Huang and Tan (2012); Xia et al. (2013)). Since the friction models are all dependent on the velocity, the quality of the velocity signal is significant especially for the low-velocity scenario wherein the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) is relatively low (Armstrong et al. (1994)). Although the command velocity can be used instead for the low velocities, the approximation error may degrade the compensation performance greatly. Thus, the NFMC scheme is more favorable when the quality of the velocity signal is not good enough.

Within the NFMC framework, the high-gain proportional-derivative (PD) control is the most popular approach that has been used in industry. The tracking error can be reduced by designing high feedback gains, while the measurement noise will be amplified and the robustness to the high-frequency unmodeled dynamics (like the flexible dynamics) will be deteriorated in this way. When the PD control cannot realize the desired precision, the integral action is almost always introduced. By using the accumulative effect of the error, the need for the high PD gains can be alleviated. However, the undesirable limit cycle may be generated and the integral windup tends to happen when there is a velocity reversal. Armstrong et al. (1994) summarized many modification methods of the integral control based on the practical experiences of engineers. With the development of the uncertainty and disturbance estimation and attenuation (DUEA) technique (Chen et al. (2016)), the disturbance observer has become a popular approach in the NFMC scheme (Lee and Tomizuka (1996); Friedland and Park (1997); Ishikawa and Tomizuka (1998); Jamaludin et al. (2009); Huang et al. (2009); Ahmed-Ali et al. (2009); Sun et al. (2013); Wang et al. (2016); Ren et al. (2019)). The disturbance observer can be combined with a fixed friction model to tackle the unmodeled friction (Lee and Tomizuka (1996); Jamaludin et al. (2009)) or employed to estimate the friction without any model information (Sun et al. (2013); Wang et al. (2016)). An extended state observer (ESO) (Han (2009); Gao (2003)) was employed by Sun et al.
(2013) to attenuate the aftereffect of the friction on the output of a traditional PD control system. The ESO was first proposed by Han (2009) in his effort to develop an alternative approach, active disturbance rejection control (ADRC), to the classic PID control. Different from other disturbance observers, only the relative degree and the control gain are required for the ESO design. All the internal uncertainties and external disturbances that affect the controlled output can be regarded as an extended state and estimated by the ESO. As can be seen from the equivalent form of the control law based on the ESO, there exists the integral effect and the limit cycle may be generated in the presence of the Coulomb and static frictions (Armstrong and Amin (1996)). When the SNR of the velocity is very low, the feedback gain of the velocity is restricted and the limit cycle suppression can only be achieved by reducing the observer bandwidth. However, the friction compensation performance will be degraded by a low observer bandwidth. Consequently, how to solve the conflict between the friction compensation and limit cycle is critical when employing the ESO under such a scenario. Although many applications of the ESO on the friction compensation have been done (Wang et al. (2016); Ren et al. (2019)), the effect of the disturbance observer and the limit cycle is obtained through the experiment to determine when the calculated velocity and acceleration signals are really the reduction ratio, torque constant, back electromotive force constant, and the input gain of the PWM, respectively. The precise modeling of the friction force \( F_f \) is rather difficult, while it is commonly accepted that the friction can be expressed as a static nonlinear function of the velocity and its dominant components include the Coulomb friction, stiction, Stribeck friction, and the viscous friction (Armstrong et al. (2001)).

3. ESO BASED SWITCHING CONTROLLER DESIGN

To achieve the aforementioned control objective, ADRC is designed first to compensate the friction as well as the motor parameter uncertainties and unmodeled dynamics. The motor dynamics in (1) can be reformulated as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{y}_1 &= y_2 \\
\dot{y}_2 &= y_3 \\
\dot{y}_3 &= a y_2 + b y_3 - c_1 (F_f + F_l) - c_2 \left( \dot{F}_f + \dot{F}_l \right) + K \rho
\end{align*}
\] (2)

where

\[
y_1 = y, \quad y_2 = k_\phi \omega, \quad y_3 = k_\phi \dot{\omega}, \quad \alpha = -\frac{k_b}{J L}, \quad b = -\frac{R}{J}, \quad c_1 = \frac{k_b}{J L}, \quad c_2 = \frac{k_b}{J L}, \quad K = \frac{k_\phi k_b}{J L}.
\] (3)

Note that \( \dot{F}_f \) does not exist at the velocity reversal but it is not required for the controller design. Since the qualities of the calculated velocity and acceleration signals are really poor, the nominal dynamics \( a y_2 + b y_3 \) in (2) cannot be compensated in a feedforward way but is regarded as the unknown disturbance. The total disturbance is defined as

\[
f = a y_2 + b y_3 - c_1 (F_f + F_l) - c_2 \left( \dot{F}_f + \dot{F}_l \right)
\] (4)

To eliminate the effect of \( f \) and reduce the phase lag, the following reduced-order ESO (RESO) is designed to provide the disturbance estimation

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{w}_1 &= -\beta_1 w_1 + w_2 + (\beta_2 - \beta_1^2) y_1 \\
\dot{w}_2 &= -\beta_2 w_1 + w_3 + K \rho + (\beta_3 - \beta_1 \beta_2) y_1 \\
\dot{w}_3 &= -\beta_3 w_1 - \beta_1 \beta_2 y_1
\end{align*}
\] (5)

where \( \beta_i (i = 1, 2, 3) \) is the observer gain and can be determined by allocating all the poles at \(-\omega_c \) (Gao (2003)), and \( w_0 \) is the intermediate variable. The estimations of the velocity, acceleration, and total disturbance, \( z_1, z_2, \) and \( z_3 \) are in the form of

\[
\begin{align*}
z_1 &= w_1 + \beta_1 y_1 \\
z_2 &= w_2 + \beta_2 y_1 \\
z_3 &= w_3 + \beta_3 y_1
\end{align*}
\] (6)

Taking the Laplace transformations of (5) and (6) yields

\[
z_3 = \frac{\omega_c^3}{(s + \omega_c)^3} f
\] (7)

It can be seen that the disturbance estimation is the filtered value of the true disturbance. Combined with the PD control, the control law can be established as

\[
\rho = k_p (y_1 - y) - k_d \dot{y}_1 - z_3 / K
\] (8)
where \( y_r \) is the position command, and \( k_p \) and \( k_d \) are the proportional and derivative gains, respectively. Substituting (7) into (8) one can derive the two-degree-of-freedom expression of the control law as

\[
\rho = \left( k_p + \frac{k_p \omega_o F}{3 \cdot s^2} \right) e - \left( k_d \omega_o F \cdot \frac{1}{s^2} + k_d s + \frac{\omega_o F}{3K} s^2 \right) y_1 \tag{9}
\]

where \( e = y_r - y_1 \), and \( F = 3\omega_o^2 / (s^2 + 3\omega_o s + 3\omega_o^2) \) is a low-pass filter. It can be seen that one degree of the controller is a PI-type control law \( \rho_1 \), and the other degree is a state feedback control law \( \rho_2 \). This kind of control structure can well solve the conflict between the tracking and disturbance rejection performances that is intrinsic in the conventional PID control. The value of \( \omega_o \) affects the bandwidth of the low-pass filter, the gain of the integral effect which can eliminate the tracking error and also the gains of the state feedback which can provide the damping. Since the control law contains the integral action \( k_p \omega_o F / (3s) e \), the undesirable limit cycle is prone to occur at low velocities.

When the Coulomb+static friction model is valid, there is no combination of PID parameters that can eliminate the limit cycle. This result makes clear why nonlinear modifications to the PID control are always necessary in practice (Armstrong and Amin (1996)). Inspired by the thought of designing nonlinear or logical integral control (Armstrong et al. (1994)), a switching strategy is proposed based on the above designed nominal controller to suppress the limit cycle. The idea originates from the cause of the limit cycle in the presence of the integral action. Fig. 1 is a rough representation of the generation process of the limit cycle. When the motor is in the stick state, the absolute value of \( z_3 \) keeps increasing until the control force overcomes the maximum stiction. Since the maximum stiction is larger than the Coulomb friction, the sliding motion with a large acceleration is initiated then, and \( z_3 \) begins to decrease at the same time. As the position approaches the command, \( z_3 \) is expected to provide a deceleration to attenuate the overshoot. While it can be seen that the polarity change of \( z_3 \) happens at the time later than that of desire to the observation lag of the ESO. As the decrease of the control force and the increase of the friction force, the motor starts to decelerate and finally stops in a next stick. The alternation between the stick and slip is aroused thus. Considering the adverse effect of the ESO near the command, a switching control law is proposed as

\[
\rho = k_p e - k_d \dot{y}_1 - [1 - \sigma (e, \dot{y}_r)] z_3 / K \tag{10}
\]

where

\[
\sigma (e, \dot{y}_r) = \begin{cases} 
1, & L(e) = 0 \text{ and } |\dot{y}_r| < v_3 \\
0, & \text{else}
\end{cases} \tag{11}
\]

\( v_3 \) is the threshold of the low velocity below which the effect of the friction force is dominant. The sake of brevity, the control signals for \( \sigma (e, \dot{y}_r) = 1 \) and \( \sigma (e, \dot{y}_r) = 0 \) are denoted as \( \rho_1 \) and \( \rho_2 \), respectively. \( L(e) \) is a hysteresis function

\[
L(e) = \begin{cases} 
1, & |e| > e_h \\
0, & |e| < e_l \\
L_{-1} (e), & \text{else}
\end{cases} \tag{12}
\]

Fig. 1. Profile of the generation of the limit cycle.

where \( e_l \) and \( e_h \) are the switch-on and switch-off values, respectively, and \( L_{-1} (e) \) denotes the function value at the last sampling time. The hysteresis function is employed to reduce the effect of the measurement noise on the switching strategy.

The thought behind (11) is quite simple that, when the motor operates within the low-velocity region and the precision requirement is satisfied, the disturbance estimation is abandoned in the control signal to avoid the unnecessary oscillation. The disturbance estimation is employed to reduce the tracking error when the command velocity is high or the tracking error is beyond the deadzone. When the motor enters the precision deadzone from a sliding motion, the switching from \( \rho_2 \) to \( \rho_1 \) is activated and the acceleration with only the PD control becomes much smaller than that with the compensation of \( z_3 \). Thus, the overshoot can be attenuated. The ideal case is that the velocity decreases to zero and the position just stops in the deadzone. Whether the ideal case can happen or not is determined by many factors like the control parameters and also the width of the deadzone. The system with larger PD control gains and a wider deadzone is more likely to achieve this. A similar approach employed in the integral control is resetting the integral term when the motion is detected or during the velocity reversals (Armstrong et al. (1994)).

4. LIMIT CYCLE ANALYSIS

In this section, the effect of the ADRC parameters on the limit cycle is investigated based on the describing function method. It is important to note that the describing function is an effective approach in predicting the limit cycle without the sticking when only the Coulomb friction is considered (Armstrong et al. (1994); Henrik and Aström (2001)). For the case of Coulomb+static friction, the describing function method is not precise since there exists sticking in the resulted limit cycle and the zero velocity maintains not at isolated time instants but for a finite time interval. Only the Coulomb and Stribeck frictions are accounted for and the limit cycle without the sticking is the main concern of this section. The Coulomb and Stribeck frictions can be modeled as (Camadas de Wit et al. (1989))

\[
F_f^c = \begin{cases} 
F_f^c \text{sign}(\omega) + \frac{F_f - F_f^c}{\tau \omega}, & |\omega| \leq \tau \\
F_f^c \text{sign}(\omega), & |\omega| > \tau
\end{cases} \tag{13}
\]

where \( F_f^c, F_f^s \), and \( \tau \) denote the Coulomb friction, the maximum stiction, and the Stribeck velocity, respectively.
Among the ADRC parameters, the proportional gain $k_p$ determines the response speed directly, and it can be designed according to the criteria that the maximum control effectiveness can be utilized when the position error is larger than a specified value. $K$ can be calculated based on the nominal model. Since $\omega_o$ is the cause of the limit cycle and $k_d$ can provide the damping effect to suppress the limit cycle, the effects of these two parameters are investigated in the subsequent analysis. The nominal parameters of the BLDCM are

$$J = 0.00005 \text{kg} \cdot \text{m}^2, \quad R = 0.36 \Omega, \quad L = 2.8 \text{mH}, \quad k_p = 1/280, \quad k_d = 0.19 \text{N} \cdot \text{m/A}, \quad k_e = 0.024 \text{V} \cdot \text{s/} \omega, \quad k_u = 100 \text{ V}, \quad k_i = 0.5 \text{ N} \cdot \text{m}^2/\omega, \quad v_c = 0.1, \quad F_f^1 = 0.48 \text{ V}, \quad F_f^2 = 0.74 \text{ V}$$

The Nyquist plots for different values of $\omega_o$ with $(k_p = 50, k_d = 0.5)$ and $(k_p = 50, k_d = 1.0)$ are shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, respectively. According to Fig. 2, it can be seen that the limit cycle is induced when $\omega_o$ exceeds a certain value. Similar result can be found in the PID control that a large integral gain tends to generate the limit cycle (Townsend and J. Kenneth Salisbury (1987)), $k_d$ has to be increased to provide an adequate damping and eliminate the limit cycle as presented in Fig. 3. The critical parameter combinations $(\omega_o, k_d)$ that do not generate the limit cycle are shown in Table 1. As can be observed, there exists a monotonically increasing relationship between $\omega_o$ and $k_d$, which suggests that a large value of $k_d$ has to be designed when $\omega_o$ is high. Consequently, the selection of $\omega_o$ is restricted when the SNR of the velocity is low and the available $k_d$ is limited due to the noise. Since the conflict between the desired friction compensation capability and elimination of limit cycle cannot be solved in the conventional scheme, the switching strategy is proposed in this paper to improve the upper bound of $\omega_o$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Critical parameter combinations of $(\omega_o, k_d)$ that do not generate the limit cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_o$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_d$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
-1 \frac{N(A)}{D_1 + k_t k_u k_y (K_1 + K_2)} = \frac{D_2}{D_1 + k_t k_u k_y (K_1 + K_2)}
\]

where $K_1 = k_p + k_p \omega_o F/(3s^2)$, $K_2 = k_p k_i \omega_o F/3 + k_d s + 
\omega_c F s^2/(3K)$. It is obvious that $-1/N(A) \rightarrow 0$ when $A \rightarrow 0$. The condition of no limit cycle is that the Nyquist plot does not intersect with the negative real axis.

Fig. 3. Nyquist diagrams for different values of $\omega_o$ $(k_p = 50, k_d = 1.0)$.

Denoting $N(A)$ as the describing function of $F_{sc}^f$ can obtain

\[
N(A) = \frac{4A + \frac{2}{\pi A} \int \frac{(F_f^1 - F_f^2)}{\pi} \sin^{-1}(\pi/2A) + \frac{2}{\pi A} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\pi^2}{2A^2}, \quad A > \tau}}{\frac{2}{\pi A} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\pi^2}{2A^2}}}
\]

The derivative of $N(A)$ with respect to the amplitude can be obtained as

\[
N'(A) = \left\{ \begin{array}{lr}
-\frac{4}{\pi A}, & A \leq \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{A^2 - \pi^2}} \left(\frac{F_f^1 - F_f^2}{\sqrt{A^2 - \pi^2}}\right),
A > \tau
\end{array} \right.
\]

Evidently, $N'(A) < 0$ holds. After obtaining $N(A)$, the open-loop dynamics of the BLDCM can be written as

\[
G = \frac{k_t k_u k_y}{D_1 + N(A) D_2}
\]

where $D_1 = JLs^3 + (JR + v_c k_u L)s^2 + (k_t k_c + v_c k_u R)s + 
k_t k_u Ls + k_t k_y R$, $D_2 = k_y (Ls + R)s$, and $v_c$ is the viscous friction coefficient. Making the denominator of the closed-loop transfer function be zero yields

5. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, experiments are performed to validate the effectiveness of the proposed method. For the sake of brevity, the algorithms with and without the switching strategy are called ADRCs and ADRC, respectively. The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 4. The processor employed is ARM STM32F427. The proposed algorithm was coded in C and the sampling period is 0.25 ms. The position signal is measured by a potentiometric displacement transducer and a second-order digital low-pass filter is used to filter the measurement. The velocity signal is obtained by the numerical differentiation. The specified
be no limit cycle since the critical value for $k_d$ is 0.43. However, the limit cycle can still be observed in the step response of ADRC. This can be interpreted by the fact that the stiction is neglected in the describing function analysis and thus a larger $k_d$ is needed. After adding the switching strategy, the position stops at the first arrival of the deadzone. Both the limit cycle and the overshoot are eliminated and the transient performance is satisfactory. Since the position stops near the boundary of the deadzone in the beginning, there exist several switches in the steady state due to the noise disturbance as shown in Fig. 6. At the sixth second, there is a minor motion towards the command and the actual error becomes less than 0.01. Then, the motor stops completely since the magnitude of the filtered noise is less than 0.02 and the threshold for the next switching is 0.03.

When tracking the ramp command, it is known that the limit cycle happens only when the ramp rate is sufficiently low (Shen and Wang (1964)). The switching logic is unnecessary and may even degrade the tracking performance for the high-velocity case. Through conducting the experiments of tracking ramp commands with different rates, the velocity threshold $v_0$ can be determined by finding the critical velocity above which the advantage of the switching strategy disappears. Five ramp rates, 0.01°/s, 0.02°/s, 0.03°/s, 0.04°/s, and 0.05°/s, respectively, are designed and the experimental results are given in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8. The standard deviations of the tracking errors for these five commands under ADRC are 0.031°, 0.018°, 0.011°, 0.013°, and 0.017°, respectively. For ADRCs, the corresponding errors are 0.024°, 0.026°, 0.025°, 0.028°, and 0.028°, respectively. It can be seen that ADRCs is more advantageous only for the extremely low velocities at which the oscillation exists. $v_0 = 0.01$ can be selected for this BLDCM. The switching signal $\sigma$ and $z_3/K$ for $v_0 = 0.01$ are presented in Fig. 8. Since the switching logic designed only depends on the error information whose precision is much higher, the switching frequency is acceptable.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a friction-model free compensation approach was presented. The extended state observer was employed to estimate the friction and other disturbances. Since the observer can introduce the integral action, the limit cycle may be introduced. To eliminate the limit cycle under the restricted damping, a switching strategy was proposed to determine when the disturbance estimation should be added in the control signal. The switching strategy was enlightened by the fact that nonlinear modifications to the integral action is always necessary in the practical friction compensation. Hardware experiments were conducted to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method.
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Fig. 7. Experiment result of the ramp response.

Fig. 8. Experiment results of the disturbance estimation and switching signal for ADRC_s.


