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Abstract—We propose a control law for stabilization of a bar tethered to two aerial vehicles, and provide conditions on the control law’s gains that guarantee exponential stability of the equilibrium. Given the proposed control law, we analyze the stability of the equilibrium for two cases, specifically, for a bar of known and unknown mass. We provide lower bounds on the attitude gains of the UAVs’ attitude inner loop that guarantee exponential stability of the equilibrium. We also include an integral action term in the control law, so as to compensate for battery drainage and model mismatches, and we provide a lower bound on the integral gain that guarantees stability of the equilibrium. We present an experiment that demonstrates the stabilization and that validates the robustness of the proposed control law.

I. INTRODUCTION

Automated inspection and maintenance of aging infrastructures is a challenging task, and aerial vehicles provide a platform to partially solve and accomplish such task [1]. Vertical take off and landing rotocrafts, with hover capabilities, and in particular quadrotors, form a class of underactuated vehicles whose popularity stems from their ability to be used in relatively small spaces, their reduced mechanical complexity, and inexpensive components [2], [3].

While there is noteworthy research on using quadrotors to perform specific tasks such as vision aided flying [4], arm-endowed aerial control [5] and flying with wind [6], in this paper we focus on transportation with quadrotors. Transportation by aerial vehicles is an important task in the scope of inspection and maintenance of infrastructures, and it forms a class of underactuated systems for which trajectory tracking control strategies are necessary [7]. To be specific, the system we focus on is composed of a one dimensional bar and two quadrotors attached to that bar by cables, and one of the control challenges lies in dampening the sway of the bar pose (position and attitude) with respect to the quadrotors.

Different slug load systems and related control strategies have been studied and proposed. Differential flatness has been explored for the purposes of control and motion planning of a single point mass load [8]–[11], while dynamic programming has also been used for trajectory planning [12], with the goal of minimizing the load swing. Adaptive controllers have been proposed which compensate for different unknown parameters [13]–[15], such as a variable center of gravity, an unknown load mass or a constant input disturbance. Vision has also been used to determine the pendulous mode frequency and thereby the cable length [16]. Load lifting by multiple aerial vehicles is also found in [17]–[20]. In particular, in [17], the relations in static equilibrium for a rigid body tethered to aerial vehicles are analyzed; in [18], [19] a controller is designed for three of more vehicles transporting a rigid body; and in [20] a control platform, including information exchange between the aerial vehicles, is developed and experimentally tested.

In this manuscript, we propose a control law with the objective of steering the bar to a desired pose, i.e., a desired position in the three dimensional space and a desired unit vector attitude. Linearization is used to infer exponential stability of the equilibrium, and conditions on the gains are provided for which exponential stability is guaranteed, in a similar approach to [21], [22]. Our main contributions lie in i) providing tight bounds on the gains such that exponential stability is guaranteed in the case where the aerial vehicles have an attitude inner loop, whose gain we cannot control; ii) in including an integral action term in the control law for compensating for battery drainage and model mismatches (such as an unknown bar mass), and providing tight bounds on the integral gains such that exponential stability is guaranteed; and iii) to experimentally validate the proposed control strategy.

II. NOTATION

The map $S : \mathbb{R}^3 \ni x \mapsto S(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ yields a skew-symmetric matrix and it satisfies $S(a) b = a \times b$, for any $a,b \in \mathbb{R}^3$. $S^2 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^T x = 1\}$ denotes the set of unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The map $\Pi : S^2 \ni x \mapsto \Pi(x) := I_3 - xx^T \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ yields a matrix that represents the orthogonal projection onto the subspace perpendicular to $x \in S^2$. We denote $A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n$ as the block diagonal matrix with block diagonal entries $A_1$ to $A_n$ (square matrices). We denote by $e_1, \cdots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the canonical basis vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$; when clear from the context, $n$ is omitted. For some set $A$, $id_A$ denotes the identity map on that set. Given some normed spaces $A$ and $B$, and a function $f : A \ni a \mapsto f(a) \in B$, $Df : A \ni a \mapsto Df(a) \in \mathcal{L}(A,B)$ denotes the derivative of $f$. Given two matrices $A$ and $B$, $A \simeq B :\iff A = PBP^{-1}$. For some invertible matrix $P$, given a manifold $A$, $T_a A$ denotes the tangent set of $A$ at some $a \in A$. In [23], we provide mathema-tica files, where the reader finds all the details and proofs, some of which we omit in this manuscript due to space constraints.
III. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

Consider the system illustrated in Fig. 1 with two quadrotors, a one dimensional bar and two cables connecting the aerial vehicles to distinct contact points on the bar. Hereafter, and for brevity, we refer to this system as quadrotors-bar system. We denote by $p_i, p_2,p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the quadrotors' and the bar’s center of mass positions; by $v_1,v_2,v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the quadrotors’ and the bar’s center of mass velocities; by $n, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the bar’s orientation and angular velocity; by $r_1,r_2 \in S^2$ the quadrotors’ thrust axes; by $m_1,m_2,m > 0$ the quadrotors’ and bar’s masses; by $J > 0$ the bar’s moment of inertia; by $l_1, l_2 > 0$ the cables’ lengths; and, finally, by $d_1,d_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ the contact points on the bar at which the cables are attached. To finally denote by $u_1,u_2,u \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the inputs on the quadrotors-load system, which one may think of as the quadrotor’s input forces; and by $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ the integral action terms to be used in the respective quadrotor’s control law. Consider then the state space

$$ Z := \{(p,n,p_1,p_2,v,\omega,v_1,v_2,v_3,r_1,r_2,\xi_1,\xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{32} : n^T n = 1, n^T \omega = 0, (p_i - (p + d_i n))^T (p_i - (p + d_i n)) = l_i^2, (v_i - (v + d_i S(\omega) n))^T (p_i - (p + d_i n)) = 0, i \in \{1,2\} \}, \tag{1} $$

which encapsulates the constraints illustrated in Fig. 1 namely, that the bar’s attitude $n$ is given by a unit vector and the bar’s angular velocity $\omega$ is orthogonal to that unit vector (rotations around the bar itself do not affect the bar’s attitude); and that the distance between each contact point on the bar and the corresponding quadrotor is constant and equal to the corresponding cable length. We always decompose a $z \in Z$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^6$ in the same way, namely

$$ z \in Z \Leftrightarrow (p,n,p_1,p_2,v,\omega,v_1,v_2,v_3,r_1,r_2,\xi_1,\xi_2) \in Z, \quad (2) $$

and $u \in \mathbb{R}^6 \Leftrightarrow (u_1,u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$. Moreover, the state space definition in (1) allows for the definition of the cables’ unit vectors (see Fig. 1) and their angular velocity. Namely, for $i \in \{1,2\}$, we define

$$ Z \ni z \mapsto n_i(z) := \frac{p_i - (p + d_i n)}{\|p_i - (p + d_i n)\|} \in S^2, \quad (3) $$

$$ Z \ni z \mapsto \omega_i(z) := S(\frac{u - (v + d_i S(\omega)n)}{l_i}) \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (4) $$

where (3) can be visualized in Fig 1. Given an appropriate $u : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6$, a system’s trajectory $z : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ni t \mapsto z(t) \in Z$ evolves according to

$$ \dot{z}(t) = Z(z(t), u(t)), z(0) \in Z, \quad (5) $$

where the vector field $Z : Z \times \mathbb{R}^6 \ni (z,u) \mapsto Z(z,u) \in \mathbb{R}^{32}$ is given by

$$ Z(z,u) := \begin{bmatrix} Z_1(z) \\ Z_2(z,u) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{kinematics} \\ \text{dynamics} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6) $$

with the kinematics given by

$$ Z_1(z) := \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} T_i(z,u) n_i(z) - ge_3 \\ \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\bar{u}_1}{m_1} T_i(z,u) S(d_i n) n_i(z) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{v} \\ \dot{\omega} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7} $$

with the dynamics given by

$$ Z_2(z,u) := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{S}(k_1 S(r_1) \frac{u_1}{\|u_1\|}) r_1 \\ \bar{S}(k_2 S(r_2) \frac{u_2}{\|u_2\|}) r_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{r}_1 \\ \dot{r}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8) $$

and, finally, with the integrator dynamics given by

$$ Z_3(z,u) := \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e_i^T p_1 - l_1 \\ e_i^T p_2 - l_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (9) $$

Let us provide some details on the vector field $\bar{S}$. The linear and angular accelerations in (7) are written from the Newton-Euler’s equations of motion, considering the net force and torque on each rigid body: the bar is taken as a rigid body (with net force and torque in blue – see Fig. 1); while the quadrotors are taken as point masses (with net forces in orange and green – see Fig. 1). The tensions $T_1,T_2$ constitute internal forces and the Newton-Euler’s equations of motion do not provide any insight into these forces. However, the constraint that the state must remain in the state set $Z$, enforces the vector field $\bar{S}$ to be in the tangent space; this constraint uniquely defines the tensions on the cables, and its explicit expression is found in [23]. The attitude inner loop dynamics in (8) is a simple first order model with attitude gain $k_\delta > 0$. The intuition for (8) is simple: for a constant $u \in \mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \{0\}$, a solution $t \mapsto r(t) \in \mathbb{S}^2$ of $\dot{r}(t) = k_\delta S(r(t)) S(r(t)) \frac{u}{\|u\|}$ converges exponentially fast to $\frac{u}{\|u\|}$, with rate proportional to $k_\delta$ (provided that $r(0) \neq -\frac{u}{\|u\|}$), and thus guarantees that the quadrotor thrust vector aligns itself with the direction of the input force $u$. Note that the model for the attitude inner loop of the quadrotors in (8) is only a possible one, and there are more ways of modeling that inner loop.
Let us define the equilibrium, before explaining the integrator dynamics in \([9]\). For any \(\xi^* := (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) \in \mathbb{R}^2\), define
\[
z^* := (p^*, n^*, p_1^*, p_2^*, v^*, \omega^*, v_1^*, v_2^*, r_1^*, r_2^*, \xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) \in \mathbb{Z}
\]
(10)
\[
\begin{align*}
(0, e_d, e, \frac{1}{2} e_d^2, 0, e_d, e, \frac{1}{2} e_d^2, 0, 0, e_d, e, \frac{1}{2} e_d^2) \\
(0, 0, e_d, e, \frac{1}{2} e_d^2, 0, 0, e_d, e, \frac{1}{2} e_d^2, 0, 0, e_d, e, \frac{1}{2} e_d^2)
\end{align*}
\]
and \(u^* := (u_1^*, u_2^*) \in \mathbb{R}^2\) as
\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{pmatrix}
\xi_1^* & \xi_2^*
\end{pmatrix} = 0, (0) \\
\xi_1^* & \xi_2^*
\end{align*}
\]
Since \(Z(z, t) = 0\), it follows that \(z^*\) (under a constant input \(u^*\)) is an equilibrium of the system. As such, the integral terms \((\xi_1, \xi_2)\) evolving according to the integrator dynamics in \([9]\) represent the \(z\)-position integral error of quadrotors. These integral errors are used in the control law, and provide robustness against disturbances and model uncertainties, as shall be verified in the experiments.

We can now formulate the problem treated in this paper.

**Problem 1**: Given the vector field \(Z \in \mathbb{R}^6\) and the equilibrium \(z^* \in \mathbb{R}^6\) (for \((\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) \in \mathbb{R}^2\)), design a control law \(u^* : Z \to \mathbb{R}^6\) satisfying \(u^*(z^*) = u^*\) and such that \(z^*\) is an exponentially stable equilibrium of \(Z \ni z \to Z(z, u^*(z))\).

**Remark 1**: In general, we may require the bar to stabilize around any point \(p^* \in \mathbb{R}^3\) and any attitude \(n^* \in \mathbb{S}^2\) with \(e_3^T n^* = 0\) \([23]\).

**IV. PID CONTROL LAW**

For each aerial vehicle \(-i \in \{1, 2\}\) consider the PID-like control law \(u_{pid}^i : Z \ni z \to u_{pid}^i(z) \in \mathbb{R}^6\) defined as
\[
u_{pid}^i(z) := \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{m}{k_{p,i}}(p_{i}^* - p_i) + k_{d,i}e_2v_i & \\
\frac{m}{k_{s,i}}e_p & \frac{m}{k_{s,i}}v_i
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(12)
where \(p_i^*, p_2^*\) are given in \([10]\); where \(k_{p,i}\) and \(k_{d,i}\), for \(j \in \{x, y, z\}\), are positive gains related to the position and velocity feedback, respectively; and where \(k_{s,i}\) is positive gain related to the integral feedback. The real control law is subject to saturations \([23]\), which are of practical importance, but which we omit here for brevity. The complete control law is then defined as
\[
u_i^i := Z \ni z \to \nu_{pid}^i(z) := u^* + (u_{pid}^i(z), u_{pid}^i(z)) \in \mathbb{R}^6
\]
and, it follows that for \((\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*) = (0, 0)\) \(\nu_i(z^*) = u^*\). \(\xi^*(\xi_1^**, \xi_2^**) = (0, 0) \Rightarrow \xi^*(\xi_1^**, \xi_2^**) = u^* \).

One of the motivations for adding integral errors to the control law is to guarantee robustness against model uncertainties (such as an unknown bar mass). Denote then \(u_{pid}^i = 0\) as the control law in \([13]\) implemented with \(m = 0\): this represents the control law when the UAVs lift a bar of unknown mass. Then (see Problem 1 and (11))
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\xi_1^* & \xi_2^*
\end{pmatrix} = (0, 0) \Rightarrow \nu_i(z^*) = u^* \]
(4.15)
In the next sections, we study the stability of the equilibrium \(z^*\) (for (14) and (15)) of the closed loop vector field
\[
Z^i : Z \ni z \to Z^i(z) := Z(z, u^*(z)) \in T_zZ
\]
(16)
**V. ROUTH’S CRITERION**

In Section \([7]\) we linearize the closed loop vector field around the equilibrium, and we verify that the Jacobian is similar to a block triangular matrix, whose block diagonal entries are in controllable form. This section provides immediate tools for the analysis of the eigenvalues of those matrices in controllable form. Denote then, for any \(n \in \mathbb{N}\),
\[
C_n : \mathbb{R}^n \ni (a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}) := a \to C(a) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}
\]
defined as
\[
C_n(a) := \begin{pmatrix}
e_2 & \cdots & e_n & -a
\end{pmatrix}^T,
\]
(17)
which yields a matrix in a controllable form, and whose eigenvalues are those in \(\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \sum_{i=0}^n a_i \lambda^i = 0\}\). It follows from the Routh’s criterion that
\[
C_3((a_0, a_1, a_2)) \quad \text{Hurwitz} \iff a_0, a_1, a_2 > 0 \land a_0 < a_1 \quad (18)
\]
which we make use of later on. In what follows, denote \(p := (p_1, p_2, p_3) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^3\) and \(k := (k_1, k_2) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^2\), where, later, \(p\) provides physical constants of interest, and \(k\) provides the controller gains (a proportional and a derivative gain). There are two matrices (in controllable form) that appear several times in Section \([7]\) and therefore we introduce them here. Specifically, for \(\ell \in \{3, 5\}\), we define \(\Gamma_\ell := (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^3 \times (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^2 \ni (p, k) \to C_\ell(p, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}\) as
\[
\Gamma_3(p, k) := C_3((p_1k_1 + p_2, p_1k_2 + p_2, p_3)),
\]
\[
\Gamma_5(p, k) := C_5(p_1e + (p_2)_{0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{12 \times 12},
\]
(19)
(20)
It follows from the Routh’s criterion that the matrices \((19) - (20)\) are Hurwitz if and only if
\[
p_3 > k_p/k_d.
\]
(22)

**VI. STABILITY ANALYSIS OF UNIT VECTOR DYNAMICS**

In Section \([7]\) we look at the kinematics and dynamics of three unit vectors, namely the bar’s unit vector and the cables’ unit vectors. These unit vectors and corresponding angular velocities are constrained in a manifold of dimension 4 and embedded in a Euclidean space of dimension 6, namely \(\Theta := \{(\nu, \varpi) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 : \nu^T \nu = 1, \nu^T \varpi = 0\}\). For this reason, a linearization of a vector field in \(\Theta\) and around an equilibrium in \(\Theta\) always yields a Jacobian with two zero eigenvalues, and thus standard linearization theorems cannot be invoked. In this section, we solve this problem by adding to the above vector field an additional vector field that vanishes at the manifold, and thus does not affect solutions; however, this additional vector field replaces the zero eigenvalues by any desired eigenvalues (which we will pick to be real negative).

From now on, we always decompose a \(\theta \in \mathbb{R}\) as \(\theta \in \Theta := (\nu, \varpi) \in \mathbb{R}\). Let \(\theta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ni t \to (\theta(t)) \in \Theta\) be a trajectory of \(\theta(t) = \Theta(t) \theta(t)\) for all \(t \geq 0\) and \(\theta(0) \in \Theta\), where the vector field \(\Theta_t\) is defined as
\[
\Theta_\ell \ni \theta \to \Theta_t(\theta) := \begin{pmatrix}
S(\varpi) & \nu
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
- k_p \varpi & -k_p S(e_1) \nu
\end{pmatrix} \in T_{\Theta} \Theta
\]
for some positive gains \(k_p\) and \(k_i\); as such, \(\theta^* := (\nu^*, \varpi) \in \Theta\) is an equilibrium since \(\Theta_t(\theta^*) = 0\). We now introduce a
vector field that serves only the purpose of stability analysis. Consider then \( \Theta_2 : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \ni (v, \omega) \mapsto \theta \mapsto \Theta_2(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \) defined as

\[
\Theta_2(\theta) := \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_n(v) \\ \Theta_m(v, \omega) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \nu(1 - \nu^T \nu) \\ -\nu \nu^T \omega \end{bmatrix}, \tag{23}
\]

where we emphasize that \( \Theta_2 \) vanishes at \( \emptyset \), i.e., that \( \Theta_2(\theta) = 0, \forall \theta \in \emptyset \). Given any \( \lambda > 0 \), consider then the new unmodified vector field \( \emptyset \ni \theta \mapsto \Theta_2(\theta) + \lambda \Theta_2(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \), where we emphasize that \( \Theta_2(\theta) = \Theta_2(\theta) \) for all \( \theta \in \emptyset \). The Jacobian of \( \Theta_2 \) around the equilibrium then yields

\[
D\Theta_2(\theta^*) \cong \begin{bmatrix} 0_{3 \times 3} & I_2 \\ -k_p I_2 & -k_d I_2 \end{bmatrix} \oplus (-\lambda I_{2 \times 2}),
\]

which is Hurwitz. As such, introducing \( \Theta_2 \) allows us to conclude that the equilibrium \( \theta^* = (e_1, 0) \in \emptyset \) is (locally) exponentially stable.

VII. COORDINATE TRANSFORMATION TO UNIT VECTORS AND LINEARIZATION

In order to apply the results from Section VI we must perform a coordinate transformation. In the new coordinate system, the state space is

\[
\mathcal{X} := \{ (p, v, n, \omega, n_1, \omega_1, n_2, \omega_2, r_1, r_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (n, \omega) \in \emptyset, (n_1, \omega_1) \in \emptyset, (n_2, \omega_2) \in \emptyset, r_1, r_2 \in S^2 \},
\]

and, hereafter, given an \( x \in \mathcal{X} \), we always decompose it as \( x \in \mathcal{X} \mapsto (p, v, n, \omega, n_1, \omega_1, n_2, \omega_2, r_1, r_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathcal{X} \). Consider then the coordinate transformations \( g^i \) : \( Z \ni z \mapsto g^i(z) \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( g^i : \mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto g^i(x) \in \mathcal{Z} \) defined as

\[
g^i(z) := \begin{bmatrix} v, n, \omega, n_1, \omega_1, n_2, \omega_2, r_1, r_2, \xi_1, \xi_2 \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad g^i(x) := \begin{bmatrix} p, v, n, \omega, n_1, \omega_1, n_2, \omega_2, r_1, r_2, \xi_1, \xi_2 \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathcal{X}, \tag{24}
\]

where it is easy to verify that \( g^i \circ g^i = \text{id}_z \) and that \( g^i \circ g^i = \text{id}_x \) (the functions \( n_i \) and \( \omega_i \) in \( g^i \) are in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \)). Given a solution \( \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ni t \mapsto z(t) \in \mathbb{Z} \) of \( \dot{z} = A(z(t)) \), it then follows that \( \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \ni t \mapsto x(t) := g^i(z(t)) \in \mathcal{X} \) is an equilibrium of \( X_1 : \mathbb{X} \ni x \mapsto X_1(x) := Dg^i(z)Z^i(z)|_{z=g^i(x)} \in T_x \mathcal{X} \), where

\[
X_1 \ni x \mapsto X_1(x) := \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_n(n) \\ \Theta_m(n, \omega) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_2(\theta) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{25}
\]

with \( \Theta_2 \) and \( \Theta_3 \) as in (23) (notice that indeed \( X_2(x) = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{X} \)). Linearization around \( x^* := g^i(z^*) \) yields the Jacobian

\[
A = DX_1(x^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{24 \times 24}, \tag{26}
\]

which is not a diagonal matrix, and thus determining whether it is Hurwitz is not straightforward. For that purpose, we provide a similarity matrix, called \( P \in \mathbb{R}^{22 \times 22} \), such that \( P \dot{A} P^{-1} \) is a block triangular matrix, and where each block diagonal matrix is in controllable form (allowing us to invoke the results from Section VI). Later, we also provide a physical interpretation for the similarity transformation \( P \).

Assumption 2: Hereafter, we assume that \( m_1 = m_2 =: M, \) that \( l_1 = l_2 = l, \) and that \( d_1 = -d_2 = d \). Analysis for the general case is left for future research.

Consider then

\[
P := [P_x, P_y, P_z, P_v, P_\nu, P_\omega]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{22 \times 22},
\]

where (below \( A \) is the Jacobian in (25)

\[
A_x := [A_3 \oplus A_6 \oplus A_7 \oplus A_8 \oplus A_9 \oplus A_{10} \oplus A_{11}] \oplus [-A_{16} \times \mathbb{R}_e \times \mathbb{R}_{m_3}],
\]

and \( [26] \) is a block triangular matrix, with the first block as a diagonal block matrix. Thus \( \text{eig}(A_x) = \{-\lambda \} \cup \text{eig}(A_y) \cup \cdots \cup \text{eig}(A_{15}) \), and, therefore, determining whether the Jacobian \( A \) in (25) is Hurwitz amounts to checking whether each block diagonal matrix in (26) is Hurwitz. Recalling the definitions in Section VI namely (17) and (19)–(20), the matrices in (26) are given by and

\[
\begin{align*}
A_x &= \Gamma_0(p, k) \big|_{p = (\frac{k_p}{k_p}, \frac{k_p}{k_p}, k_p)} \big|_{k_p = (k_{p, x}, k_{p, y})}, \\
A_y &= \Gamma_0(p, k) \big|_{p = (\frac{k_p}{k_p}, \frac{k_p}{k_p}, k_p)} \big|_{k_p = (k_{p, x}, k_{p, y})}, \\
A_v &= \Gamma_0(p, k) \big|_{p = (\frac{k_p}{k_p}, \frac{k_p}{k_p}, k_p)} \big|_{k_p = (k_{p, x}, k_{p, y})}, \\
A_\nu &= \Gamma_0(p, k) \big|_{p = (\frac{k_p}{k_p}, \frac{k_p}{k_p}, k_p)} \big|_{k_p = (k_{p, x}, k_{p, y})}. \tag{27}
\end{align*}
\]

where the matrices (27)–(29) are the same regardless of whether the bar’s mass is know or unknown (i.e., the same for both equilibria satisfying (14) and (15). As concluded in Section VI (see (22)), the matrices in (27)–(29) are Hurwitz if and only if

\[
k_\theta > \max(k_{p, x}, k_{p, y}, k_{p, x}, k_{p, y}). \tag{30}
\]

Since, we do not have control over \( k_\theta \), preserving stability amounts to guaranteeing that \( \frac{k_p}{k_{p, h}} \), for \( h \in \{ x, y \}, \) remains small. Intuitively, this implies that fast \( x \) and \( y \) (position and attitude) motions require a fast attitude inner loop.

Let us now focus on the matrices \( A_x \) and \( A_y \), which are of the form

\[
A_j = C_j \gamma_j(k_{i, x}, k_{i, y}, k_{i, z}, j \in \{ z, \theta \}), \tag{31}
\]

where \( \gamma_j, \gamma_0 \) depend on whether the bar’s mass is known or unknown. When the mass is known, i.e., for the equilibrium
satisfying \( \text{[14]} \). \( \gamma_e = 1 \) and \( \gamma_\phi = \frac{2d^2 M + d^2 m}{2M + m} \); when the mass is unknown, i.e., for the equilibrium satisfying \( \text{[15]} \), \( \gamma_e = \frac{2M}{2M + m} \) and \( \gamma_\phi = \frac{2d^2 M}{2M + m} \). From \( \text{[18]} \), \( A_\phi \) and \( A_\psi \) are Hurwitz if and only if

\[
\kappa_{i, e} < \min(\gamma_e, \gamma_\phi) \kappa_{p, e}, k_{d, e}.
\]  

Intuitively, \( \text{[31]} \) requires the integral gain to be small enough. Also notice that if \( d \) is arbitrarily small, then \( \kappa_{i, e} \) needs also be arbitrarily small; this is motivated by \( \gamma_\phi \) (either \( \frac{2d^2 M + d^2 m}{2M + m} \) or \( \frac{2d^2 M}{2M + m} \), and it agrees with intuition, which suggests that controlling the \( z \)-attitude motion of the bar becomes difficult if the contact points on the bar are too close to its center of mass (see \( \text{[1]} \)).

Let us now provide some intuition into the meaning of the similarity matrix \( P \) and the matrices in \( \text{[26]} \). Recall the decomposition of the state \( z \) in \( \text{[2]} \).

Notice that \( \bar{e}_p^2 P_z = \bar{e}_\phi^2 P_z = \bar{e}_\psi^2 P_z = 2e^2 p = 2p_\phi, \) while \( e^2 P_z = \bar{e}_\phi^2 P_z = -2\delta e^2 \bar{n} = -2d\delta; \) i.e., the sum of the integral errors is related to the \( z \)-position of the bar, while the difference between the integral errors is related to the \( z \)-attitude of the bar. As such, for the linearized motion,

\[
p^c(t) = (A_{x,1})_{x,1} p^{(1)}(t) + (A_{x,2})_{x,1} \theta^{(0)}(t) + (A_{x,1})_{x,1} \int_0^t p^{(1)}(\tau) d\tau
\]

\[
\theta^c(t) = (A_{x,2})_{x,1} \theta^{(0)}(t) + (A_{x,1})_{x,1} \int_0^t \theta^{(0)}(\tau) d\tau.
\]

Since \( P_z e_p \equiv p = p_\phi \) and \( P_z e_\phi = e^{(0)}(n_1 - n_2) = \delta; \) it follows from \( \text{[27]} \) and \( \text{[28]} \) that, for the linearized motion, the bar’s \( x \)-position behaves as a third-order integrator and the cables’ unit vectors displacement from each other in the \( x \)-direction behaves as a third-order integrator, i.e.,

\[
p_e^{(1)}(t) = (A_{x,1})_{x,1} p^{(1)}(t) + \cdots + (A_{x,1})_{x,1} \int_0^t p^{(1)}(\tau) d\tau,
\]

\[
\delta^{(3)}(t) = (A_{x,1})_{x,1} \delta^{(3)}(t) + \cdots + (A_{x,1})_{x,1} \int_0^t \delta^{(3)}(\tau) d\tau.
\]

A similar interpretation may be drawn for \( P_y \) and \( P_z \); for the linearized motion, the bar’s \( y \)-position and the bar’s \( y \)-attitude behave as fifth-order integrators. Finally, \( P_{\phi, e} \) collects all the components along which the eigenvalues would be zero if not for the contribution of the extra term in \( \text{[24]} \).

We state two results, one for when the bar’s mass is known, and another for when it is unknown.

**Theorem 3:** Consider the quadrators-bar system with the open loop vector field \( \text{[9]} \), and the control law \( \text{[13]} \), yielding the closed loop vector field \( Z^{c} \) in \( \text{[16]} \). Then, the equilibrium \( z^* \) in \( \text{[10]} \) of \( Z^{c} \), with \( (\xi^*_p, \xi^*_n) = (0, 0) \), is exponentially stable if and only if \( \text{[30]} \) and \( \text{[31]} \) are satisfied.

**Proof:** The Jacobian in \( \text{[26]} \) is Hurwitz iff all block diagonal matrices in \( \text{[26]} \) are Hurwitz, which in turn are Hurwitz iff \( \text{[30]} \) and \( \text{[31]} \) are satisfied. Then exponential stability of \( x^* := \bar{g}^l(z^*) \) for the nonlinear vector field \( X_\phi \) is guaranteed, and exponential stability of \( z^* \) for the nonlinear vector field \( Z^{c} \) is also guaranteed.

**Theorem 4:** Consider the quadrators-bar system with the open loop vector field \( \text{[6]} \), and assume the control law \( \text{[13]} \) is implemented with \( m = 0 \), yielding the closed loop vector field \( Z^{c} \) in \( \text{[16]} \). Then, the equilibrium \( z^* \) in \( \text{[10]} \) of \( Z^{c} \), with \( (\xi^*_p, \xi^*_n) \) as in \( \text{[15]} \), is exponentially stable iff \( \text{[30]} \) and \( \text{[31]} \) are satisfied.

**VIII. Experimental Results**

A video of the experiment that is described in the sequel is found at [https://youtu.be/ywwPvzUnpFO](https://youtu.be/ywwPvzUnpFO); whose results can be visualized in Fig. 2. A detailed experimental description is found in [23]. For the experiment, two commercial quadrotors were used, weighting \( M = 1.442 \) kg, with a maximum payload of 0.4 kg. The bar weighted \( m = 0.33 \) kg, had a length of 2m, and it was attached to the UAVs by two cables of equal length, specifically \( l = l_1 = l_2 = 1.4 \) m; the contact points between the bar and the cables were at the extremities of the bar, thus \( d = d_1 = d_2 = 1 \) m.

The control law \( \text{[12]} \) was applied with \( m = 0 \) kg; with \( k_{i, e} = 0.5 \) (s\(^{-1}\) with \( k_{p, e} = k_{p, y} = 29 \) s\(^{-2}\); \( k_{d, e} = k_{d, y} = 2.4 \) s\(^{-1}\) and with \( k_{p, s} = 1.0 \) (s\(^{-2}\) \( k_{d, s} = 1.2 \) s\(^{-1}\) (see \( \text{[13]} \) there are saturations, which we omitted here for brevity).

In the beginning of the experiment the system quadrators-bar is required to stabilize around \( z^* \) where \( p^* = 0.4e_1, m \) and \( n^* = e_2 \) (see Remark 1 and see \( \text{[10]} \)), i.e, the bar is required to hover at 0.4m and required to be aligned with the \( y \)-axis. In Fig. 2(d) the bar attitude is parameterized with a pitch and yaw angle, i.e., \( n = (\cos(\theta), \cos(\phi), \sin(\psi)) \in S^2 \), and, as can be seen in Fig. 2(d) the bar is initially aligned with the \( y \)-axis (\( \psi = 90^\circ \)). At around 60 sec, the bar is required to remain in the same position but to align its orientation with the \( x \)-axis (\( n^* = e_1, \psi = 0^\circ \)), which can be seen in Figs. 2(d) and 2(a). At around 70 sec, the bar is required to move 1m in the \( y \)-direction (\( p^* = 0, 1, 0.5 \) m) while keeping the same orientation (\( n^* = e_1, \psi = 0^\circ \)), which can again be seen in Figs. 2(d) and 2(a). During the same experiment, we also tested robustness against impulse disturbances, which illustrate the size of the basin of attraction of the equilibrium. First, at around 90s, we disturbed the bar position in the \( y \)-direction, as can be seen in Fig. 2(a) and, at around 100s, we disturbed the uav 1 position in the \( y \)-direction, as can be seen in Fig. 2(b). In both cases, the system quadrators-bar returns to its equilibrium point.

In Fig. 2(c) the control inputs computed from the control law \( \text{[12]} \) are shown, which are converted into PWM signals: one for the pitch, one for the roll, and another for the throttle (in this paper, we ignored the yaw motion, and requested the uavs to always keep the same yaw position). The pitch and roll PWM signals have neutral values for which the quadrotors do not pitch nor roll, regardless of battery level. While the throttle PWM signal results in a propulsive power which decays as the battery drains. In Fig 2(d) the integral states are shown, There is a trend, where the integral term grows larger while the experiments are running, which stems from the fact that, as the batteries drain, a larger throttle PWM signal needs to be requested from the IRISes+.

**IX. Conclusions**

We proposed a control law for stabilization of a quadrators-bar system, and provided conditions on the control law’s gains that guarantee exponential stability of the equilibrium. The system was modeled assuming that the UAVs have an attitude inner loop, and a lower bound on the attitude gain, for which exponential stability of the equilibrium is preserved, was provided. An integral action term, to
compensate for battery drainage or model mismatches such as an unknown bar mass, was also included, and a bound on the integral gain was provided that guarantees exponential stability is preserved. An experiment demonstrates stabilization around different equilibrium points, and robustness to impulsive disturbances.
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