

RESEARCH ARTICLE

System Structure Based Decentralized Sliding Mode Output Tracking Control for Nonlinear Interconnected Systems[†]

Yueheng Ding¹ | Xinggang Yan¹ | Zehui Mao² | Sarah K. Spurgeon³ | Bin Jiang²

¹School of Engineering, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NT, United Kingdom

²College of Automation Engineering, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 210016, P. R. China

³Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, University College London, London WC1E 7JE, United Kingdom

Correspondence

*Xing-Gang Yan, School of Engineering, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NT, UK. Email: x.yan@kent.ac.uk

Funding information

National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 61922042 and 62020106003; China Scholarship Council for 3 years' study at the University of Kent, and Qing Lan Project.

Summary

In this paper, a decentralized tracking control scheme is proposed for a class of nonlinear interconnected systems with uncertainties using sliding mode technique. Both matched nonlinear uncertainty and mismatched known nonlinear interconnections are considered. Under the condition that the nominal isolated subsystems have relative degrees, a geometric transformation is applied to transfer the interconnected system into a new nonlinear interconnected system with a special structure to facilitate the system analysis and design. Then, a composite sliding surface is designed in terms of tracking errors, and decentralized controllers are proposed to drive the system states to the designed sliding surface in finite time and maintain a sliding motion on it thereafter. A set of conditions are developed to guarantee that the output tracking errors converge to zero asymptotically while all system state variables are bounded. The considered interconnected systems are nonlinear and it is not required that either the isolated subsystems or the isolated nominal subsystems are linearisable. The desired output signals are allowed to be time-varying. Finally, the developed results are applied to an inverted coupled-pendulum system. Simulation demonstrates that the proposed control scheme is effective.

KEYWORDS:

Decentralized control, Nonlinear interconnected systems, Output tracking, Sliding mode control, Robust control.

1 | INTRODUCTION

With the advancement of modern technology, there comes a need to deal with more complex systems, which may be large-scale, meeting practical engineering requirements. Large-scale interconnected systems are usually composed of a set of dynamical subsystems which might be distributed over large space^{2,3}. The communications between those different subsystems may become difficult or expensive due to the data transfer over large distances. In particular, when the data-transformation paths connecting various subsystems are broken or blocked, some data may be lost, or in the worst case, no data from the other subsystems may be available at all. Centralized control will not work in this case. Conversely, decentralized control needs local information only, and it does not require any of the other subsystems' state information. Thus it provides high reliability for the control of large-scale interconnected systems in reality.

[†]The original version of this paper was presented in the 2021 American Control Conference (ACC), Online, USA, May 25-28, 2021. The current version is its modification and extension in which more detailed information, definitions and new discussion/results have been added.

During the past few decades, many results have been obtained for interconnected systems¹. A fuzzy controller based on a reduced-order observer is designed for interconnected systems using integral sliding mode technique in⁵. Mahmoud proposed a decentralized control strategy for interconnected time-delay systems in⁶ where the considered system is linear. A finite-time control strategy is presented for nonlinear interconnected systems with dead-zone input in⁸, and robust controllers are designed for an interconnected multimachine power system using output feedback sliding mode techniques in⁹. Also, a decentralized control scheme is proposed for fully nonlinear interconnected system with time delay in¹⁰. Recently, a decentralized predictor method based controller is designed for large-scale systems in⁴ where the considered interconnected systems are linear and strong limitation on the interconnections between subsystems is required. It should be noted that most of the existing results are focused on stabilisation instead of tracking control using either state feedback or output feedback control. Compared with the stabilisation, tracking problem is more difficult, and thus the results obtained for tracking control are much limited, particularly for the large-scale nonlinear interconnected systems using decentralized control.

It is well known that tracking problem is a very interesting topic in engineering control. Most of existing work related to tracking control is focused on centralized control (see, e.g.^{12, 13, 14}). Although decentralized tracking control for interconnected systems is studied in^{20,11}, and distributed tracking control for interconnected systems with communication constraints is considered in²¹, it is required that the isolated subsystems of the considered interconnected systems are linear in^{20,11,21}. Narendra and Zhang study a class of linear interconnected systems in²² where model reference tracking control is focused. Tracking control for interconnected systems is considered in²³ using integral reinforcement learning. However, it is required that the interconnected terms are matched. More recently, Han and Yan propose an observer-based adaptive tracking control of large-scale stochastic nonlinear systems in²⁴ which increases the dimension of the closed-loop system and thus it will increase the computational load required for implementation. It should be pointed out that most of the existing results about tracking control for interconnected systems are not decentralized, which implies the communication between each controller of one subsystem and all the other subsystems is essential with unobstructed channel for data transfer. This is not convenient for practical implementation. Li, Tong, and Yang proposed a decentralized event-triggered control scheme in¹⁵ using observer based feedback control, which guarantees that both the tracking performance and the stability of the closed-loop interconnected system but may increase the computation load greatly. Decentralized event-triggered tracking control is also designed for nonlinear interconnected systems with unknown interconnections in¹⁶. However, it is required, in^{15,16}, that all of the isolated subsystems have a triangular structure. It should be mentioned that sliding mode control, as a popular method due to its high robustness^{17,18}, has been widely applied to deal with tracking problems (see, e.g.^{25,7, 26 and 27}). However, the results on decentralized tracking control using sliding mode techniques for nonlinear interconnected systems are very few specifically when the desired signal is time-varying, and the tracking errors are convergent to zero asymptotically. An adaptive fuzzy control based on dynamic surface sliding mode technique is designed for prescribed output tracking in¹⁹ which can only be applied to the specific multi-machine power systems and unfortunately the designed controller is not decentralized.

In this paper, a class of nonlinear interconnected systems is considered where both the matched uncertainty in the isolated subsystems and the mismatched interconnections are considered. A nonlinear coordinate transformation is introduced to explore the nominal isolated subsystems' structure, which transfers the interconnected systems to the required form, facilitating the system analysis and control design by using the structure of interconnections. The sliding surface is designed based on the tracking errors, and the sliding mode stability is achieved as well. A decentralized sliding mode control scheme is proposed to drive the nonlinear interconnected systems to the designed sliding surface in finite time. Compared with adaptive-control approaches, there is a less restriction on the uncertainty bound and the structure when using sliding mode control, which means the uncertainty is allowed to have a more general form. The main contributions in this paper can be summarised as follows:

- The designed controller is decentralized and the desired output signals are time-varying. This is in comparison with the existing work for interconnected system which needs either the other subsystems information available for design or the desired signals are constant.
- The developed result guarantees that the system outputs can track the desired outputs asymptotically while the system states are bounded.
- The considered interconnected systems are nonlinear with nonlinear disturbances which are bounded by nonlinear functions. It is not required that the nominal isolated subsystems are linearisable.
- The interconnection terms are mismatched, and the developed results has a high robustness.

Finally, the obtained results are applied to a coupled-pendulums system, and the simulation demonstrates that the method proposed in this paper is effective.

2 | SYSTEM DESCRIPTION AND BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Consider a nonlinear large-scale interconnected system formed by N subsystems as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i &= f_i(x_i) + g_i(x_i)(u_i + \varphi_i(x_i)) + p_i(x_i)\psi_i(x) \\ y_i &= h_i(x_i) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where $x_i \in \Pi_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $u_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are the states, input and output of the i th subsystem respectively, Π_i are neighbourhoods of the origin, $x = \text{col}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in \Pi$, and $\Pi := \Pi_1 \times \dots \times \Pi_N \in \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^N n_i}$. The terms $\varphi_i(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ are matched uncertainties. The terms $p_i(x_i)\psi_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ represent the interconnection of the i th subsystem where $p_i(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ are known used to describe the structure of the interconnections, and the terms $\psi_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ are known which is used to describe the interconnections for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. All of the nonlinear terms are assumed to be smooth enough in their arguments to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the system solutions.

In this paper, the local case will be considered, and the considered domain may not be specified in the subsequence unless it is necessary. It should be noted that each subsystem in system (1) is assumed to be single-input and single-output for simplifying the analysis. The following definitions are introduced firstly for readers' convenience.

Definition 1. Consider system (1). The system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i &= f_i(x_i) + g_i(x_i)(u_i + \varphi_i(x_i)) \\ y_i &= h_i(x_i) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

is called the i th isolated subsystem of the system (1), and the system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i &= f_i(x_i) + g_i(x_i)u_i \\ y_i &= h_i(x_i) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

is called the i th nominal isolated subsystem of the system (1).

Definition 2. Consider system (1) with desired output signals $y_{id}(t)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. If the controller u_i of the i th subsystem depends on the time t , the state x_i and the desired output signal $y_{id}(t)$ of the i th subsystem only, i.e.,

$$u_i = u_i(t, x_i, y_{id}), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (4)$$

then (4) is called decentralized static state feedback tracking control.

The objective of this paper is, for a given desired output signal $y_{id}(t)$, to design a decentralized control such that the output $y_i(t)$ can track the desired signal $y_{id}(t)$ asymptotically, i.e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |y_i(t) - y_{id}(t)| = 0 \quad (5)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, while all the state variables of the interconnected system (1) are bounded.

To deal with the tracking problem stated above, some assumptions on the considered system (1) are introduced at first.

Assumption 1. There exist known continuous functions $\rho_i(x_i)$ in domain Π_i such that for $x_i \in \Pi_i$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

$$|\varphi_i(x_i)| \leq \rho_i(x_i).$$

Remark 1. Assumption 1 implies that the uncertainties $\varphi_i(x_i)$ in the system (1) are required to be bounded for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, and the bounds are known. The bounds on the uncertainties will be used to design a decentralized controller later to cancel the effects of the corresponding uncertainties to enhance the robustness.

Assumption 2. For system (1), the triple (f_i, g_i, h_i) has a uniform relative degree r_i^a in the domain Π_i , the triple (f_i, p_i, h_i) has a uniform relative degree r_i^b in the domain Π_i , and $r_i^a = r_i^b$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Furthermore, both distributions generated by the column vectors of function matrices $g_i(x_i)$ and $p_i(x_i)$ respectively, are involutive in the domain Π_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Remark 2. The definition of the relative degree for a nonlinear control systems is available in²⁸. The uniform relative degree in Assumption 2 implies that, for any point $x_i \in \Pi_i$, the system has relative degree, and the relative degree is independent of $x_i \in \Pi_i$. For further discussion about the relative degree, see²⁸.

Remark 3. Assumption 2 is the limitation to both the structure of the nominal isolated subsystems (3) and the structure of the distribution of the interconnections of system (1). It should be pointed out that the methodology developed in this paper can be directly extended to the case $r_i^a < r_i^b$. Here, the condition $r_i^a = r_i^b$ is imposed on system (1) in Assumption 2 just for simplification of the later analysis and description. Similar limitation has been employed in²⁹.

Assumption 3. The desired output signals $y_{id}(t)$ and their time derivatives up to the r_i^a th order are smooth, known and bounded for all $t \in [0, \infty)$.

Remark 4. Assumption 3 is the limitation to the desired signals. It requires that the ideal output signals $y_{id}(t)$ are differentiable for sufficient times. This assumption is quite standard in tracking control and usually is satisfied in most cases in reality. **However, if the desired signal $y_{id}(t)$ is not continuous in reality due to some engineering limitation, this work may not be applied.**

3 | SYSTEM STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Consider the nonlinear interconnected system in (1). Under Assumption 2, it follows from²⁸ that there exist diffeomorphisms $z_i = T_i(x_i)$ defined in Π_i , described by

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{i,1} \\ x_{i,2} \\ \vdots \\ x_{i,(r_i^a-1)} \\ x_{i,r_i^a} \\ x_{i,(r_i^a+1)} \\ \vdots \\ x_{i,n_i} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{z_i=T_i(x_i)} \begin{bmatrix} z_{i,1} \\ z_{i,2} \\ \vdots \\ z_{i,(r_i^a-1)} \\ z_{i,r_i^a} \\ z_{i,(r_i^a+1)} \\ \vdots \\ z_{i,n_i} \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{i,1} \\ \xi_{i,2} \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{i,(r_i^a-1)} \\ \xi_{i,r_i^a} \\ \eta_{i,(r_i^a+1)} \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{i,n_i} \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

and the feedback transformation

$$u_i = \varpi_i^{-1}(x_i)(-\zeta_i(x_i) + v_i) \quad (7)$$

where $\zeta_i(x_i)$ and $\varpi_i(x_i)$ are defined by

$$\zeta_i(x_i) = L_{f_i}^{r_i^a} h_i(x_i) \quad (8)$$

$$\varpi_i(x_i) = L_{g_i} L_{f_i}^{r_i^a-1} h_i(x_i) \quad (9)$$

where v_i is the new controller to be designed later, and the notation $L_{g_i} L_{f_i}^{r_i^a-1} h_i(x_i)$ denotes Lie derivative (see e.g.²⁸).

In the new coordinates z_i , the terms $\zeta_i(x_i)$ and $\varpi_i(x_i)$ in (8) and (9) are, respectively, denoted by

$$\alpha_i(z_i) = \zeta_i(x_i)|_{x_i=T_i^{-1}(z_i)}$$

$$\beta_i(z_i) = \varpi_i(x_i)|_{x_i=T_i^{-1}(z_i)}.$$

Then, under the diffeomorphism (6) and the feedback transformation (7), it follows from²⁸ that in the new coordinates z_i , the system (1) can be described by

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\xi}_{i,1} &= \xi_{i,2} \\
\dot{\xi}_{i,2} &= \xi_{i,3} \\
&\dots \\
\dot{\xi}_{i,(r_i^a-1)} &= \xi_{i,r_i^a} \\
\dot{\xi}_{i,r_i^a} &= v_i(t) + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i) + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z) \\
\dot{\eta}_{i,(r_i^a+1)} &= q_{i,(r_i^a+1)}(z_i) + \Gamma_{i,(r_i^a+1)}\delta_i(z) \\
&\dots \\
\dot{\eta}_{i,n_i} &= q_{i,n_i}(z_i) + \Gamma_{i,n_i}\delta_i(z) \\
y_i &= \xi_{i,1}
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $z_i := \text{col}(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ with $\xi_i := \text{col}(\xi_{i,1}, \xi_{i,2}, \dots, \xi_{i,r_i^a})$ and $\eta_i := \text{col}(\eta_{i,(r_i^a+1)}, \dots, \eta_{i,n_i})$, $z = \text{col}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N)$, and

$$\tau_i(z_i) = \varphi_i(x_i)|_{x_i=T_i^{-1}(z_i)} \tag{11}$$

$$\gamma_i(z_i) = L_{p_i} L_{f_i}^{r_i^a-1} h_i(x_i)|_{x_i=T_i^{-1}(z_i)} \tag{12}$$

$$\delta_i(z) = \psi_i(x)|_{x=T^{-1}(z)}. \tag{13}$$

The system (10) can be expressed in a compact form as

$$\dot{\xi}_i = A_i \xi_i + B_i [v_i + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i) + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z)] \tag{14}$$

$$\dot{\eta}_i = q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) + \Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)\delta_i(\xi_1, \eta_1, \dots, \xi_N, \eta_N) \tag{15}$$

$$y_i = C_i \xi_i \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \tag{16}$$

where $z_i = \text{col}(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ with $\xi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{r_i^a}$ and $\eta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_i-r_i^a)}$. The triple (A_i, B_i, C_i) with appropriate dimensions has a standard *Brunovsky* form as follows

$$A_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{17}$$

$$C_i = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0] \tag{18}$$

$q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ and $\Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ are the last $n_i - r_i^a$ rows of the vectors

$$\left[\frac{\partial T_i}{\partial x_i} f_i(x_i) \right]_{x_i=T_i^{-1}(z_i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \left[\frac{\partial T_i}{\partial x_i} p_i(x_i) \right]_{x_i=T_i^{-1}(z_i)}$$

respectively.

Remark 5. It should be pointed out that the diffeomorphism $z_i = T_i(x_i) = \text{col}(\xi_i, \eta_i) = \text{col}(\xi_{i,1}, \xi_{i,2}, \dots, \xi_{i,r_i^a}, \eta_{i,(r_i^a+1)}, \dots, \eta_{i,n_i})$ given in (6) is not unique. From²⁸, a way to choose the diffeomorphism can be given as follows: $\xi_i = \text{col}(h_i(x_i), L_{f_i} h_i(x_i), \dots, L_{f_i}^{r_i^a} h_i(x_i))$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. $\eta_i = \text{col}(\eta_{i,(r_i^a+1)}, \dots, \eta_{i,n_i})$ where $\eta_{i,j}$ can be obtained by solving the equations $L_{g_i} \eta_{i,j} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $j = r_i^a + 1, \dots, n_i$.

Remark 6. However, from (14)-(16), it is clear to see that in this paper, it is not required that the nominal subsystems of system (1) are feedback linearizable. If the relative degree $r_i^a = n_i$, then the system (10) will have the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\xi}_{i,1} &= \xi_{i,2} \\
\dot{\xi}_{i,2} &= \xi_{i,3} \\
&\dots \\
\dot{\xi}_{i,(n_i-1)} &= \xi_{i,n_i} \\
\dot{\xi}_{i,n_i} &= v_i(t) + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i) + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z) \\
y_i &= \xi_{i,1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

In this case the nominal isolated subsystem of interconnected system (14) is completely feedback linearisable and thus the nonlinear part relating to the dynamics of variables η_i in system (15) disappears.

4 | DECENTRALIZED OUTPUT TRACKING CONTROL

In the subsequence, the nonlinear interconnected systems (14)-(16) are to be focused. The main results will be presented in this section. Firstly, a sliding surface in terms of tracking errors will be proposed. Then, a decentralized controller based on sliding mode technique will be designed to implement the output tracking, and the boundedness of the considered interconnected system will be discussed.

4.1 | Sliding Surface Design

It is assumed that the desired output signals $y_{id}(t)$ satisfy Assumption 3. For (16), the output tracking errors e_i are defined by

$$e_i = y_i(t) - y_{id}(t). \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (20)$$

The following sliding functions are introduced

$$S_i(\cdot) = e_i^{(r_i^a-1)} + a_{i,1}e_i^{(r_i^a-2)} + \dots + a_{i,(r_i^a-2)}e_i^{(1)} + a_{i,(r_i^a-1)}e_i^{(0)} \quad (21)$$

where $e_i^{(r_i^a-1)}$, $e_i^{(r_i^a-2)}$, \dots , and $e_i^{(1)}$ denote the $(r_i^a - 1)$ th order, $(r_i^a - 2)$ th order, \dots , and the 1st order derivatives of $e_i(t)$ respectively, $e_i^{(0)} := e_i(t)$, and $a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, \dots, a_{i,(r_i^a-1)}$ are a set of design parameters, which are chosen such that the following polynomials

$$\lambda^{r_i^a-1} + a_{i,1}\lambda^{r_i^a-2} + \dots + a_{i,(r_i^a-2)}\lambda + a_{i,(r_i^a-1)} \quad (22)$$

are *Hurwitz* stable for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Then, the composite sliding surface for interconnected system (14)-(16) can be described by

$$\{S = \text{col}(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N) \mid S_i = 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, N\} \quad (23)$$

where S_i are defined in (21). From the design above, it is clear to see that when $S_i = 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |e_i(t)| = 0.$$

This implies that when sliding motion occurs,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |y_i(t) - y_{id}(t)| = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |e_i(t)| = 0 \quad (24)$$

i.e. the outputs $y_i(t)$ of system (1) can track the ideal signal $y_{id}(t)$ asymptotically for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The following result is now ready to be presented:

Theorem 1. Consider the interconnected system (14)-(16). Under Assumption 3, when the system (14)-(16) is limited to moving on the sliding surface (23), the following results hold:

- i). $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |y_i(t) - y_{id}(t)| = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |e_i(t)| = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$
- ii). The state variables ξ_i in (14) are bounded for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$

Proof. The result in i) has been shown above (see (24)). The remains are to prove that the result in ii) holds.

When system (14)-(16) is constrained to the sliding surface (21), it follows that

$$S_i = e_i^{(r_i^a-1)} + a_{i,1}e_i^{(r_i^a-2)} + \dots + a_{i,(r_i^a-2)}e_i^{(1)} + a_{i,(r_i^a-1)}e_i^{(0)} = 0.$$

Then,

$$e_i^{(r_i^a-1)} = -a_{i,1}e_i^{(r_i^a-2)} - \dots - a_{i,(r_i^a-2)}e_i^{(1)} - a_{i,(r_i^a-1)}e_i^{(0)}.$$

Let

$$e_{i,1} \triangleq e_i^{(0)} = e_i.$$

Then, the following error dynamics are obtained

$$\dot{e}_{i,1} = e_i^{(1)} \triangleq e_{i,2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{e}_{i,2} &= e_i^{(2)} \triangleq e_{i,3} \\
&\dots \\
\dot{e}_{i,(r_i^a-2)} &= e_i^{(r_i^a-2)} \triangleq e_{i,(r_i^a-1)} \\
\dot{e}_{i,(r_i^a-1)} &= -a_{i,1}e_{i,(r_i^a-1)} - \dots - a_{i,(r_i^a-2)}e_{i,2} - a_{i,(r_i^a-1)}e_{i,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the sliding mode dynamics of system (14)-(15) are given by the following equation by rewriting the system above in a compact form

$$\dot{\epsilon}_i = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ -a_{i,(r_i^a-1)} & -a_{i,(r_i^a-2)} & -a_{i,(r_i^a-3)} & \dots & -a_{i,1} \end{bmatrix}}_{E_i} \epsilon_i \quad (25)$$

where $\epsilon_i = \text{col}(e_{i,1}, e_{i,2}, \dots, e_{i,(r_i^a-1)})$. It should be noted that the entries of the last row of matrix E_i : $a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, \dots, a_{i,(r_i^a-1)}$ forms the *Hurwitz* polynomial (22). Therefore, system (25) is *Hurwitz* stable which implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\epsilon_i(t)| = 0. \quad (26)$$

Further, from (24) and (26)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{i,1} - y_{id}^{(0)} \\ \xi_{i,2} - y_{id}^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{i,(r_i^a-1)} - y_{id}^{(r_i^a-2)} \\ \xi_{i,r_i^a} - y_{id}^{(r_i^a-1)} \end{bmatrix} \right\| = 0.$$

From Assumption 3, the desired output signal $y_{id}(t)$ and its derivatives: $y_{id}^{(1)}, y_{id}^{(2)}, \dots, y_{id}^{(r_i^a-1)}$ are bounded in $t \in [0, \infty]$. It follows that the state variables $\xi_{i,1}, \xi_{i,2}, \dots, \xi_{i,r_i^a}$ are bounded and thus the states ξ_i in (14) are bounded when the states of the system are limited to the sliding surface (23).

Hence, the result follows. \square

Remark 7. It is well known that the sliding mode is a reduced-order system. Section 4.1 shows that for system (14)-(16) with the sliding surface given in (23), the corresponding sliding mode dynamics are system (25). Theorem 1 shows that the sliding mode is asymptotically stable and the partial of state variable ξ_i is bounded. Next, the decentralized controllers are to be designed to guarantee the reachability, and the boundedness of the partial states η_i will be discussed as well.

4.2 | Decentralized Sliding Mode Controller Design

Now, the objective is to design a decentralized state-feedback controller based on sliding mode technique such that the states of the controlled system (14)-(16) can be driven to the designed sliding surface (21) in finite time.

Since $z_i = T_i(x_i)$ is a diffeomorphism, from Assumption 1 and definitions of $\tau_i(z_i)$ and $\delta_i(z)$ in (11) and (13) respectively, it follows that there are continuous functions $\rho'_i(z_i)$ such that in the considered neighbourhood of the origin

$$|\tau_i(z_i)| \leq \rho'_i(z_i). \quad (27)$$

where $\rho'_i(\cdot)$ depends on the transformation $z_i = T_i(x_i)$ and $\rho_i(\cdot)$ in Assumption 1. Since $\rho_i(\cdot)$ are known, the bound $\rho'_i(\cdot)$ can be obtained from $z_i = T_i(x_i)$.

For system (14)-(16), the following control law is proposed

$$v_i = -\dot{S}_i + y_i^{(r_i^a)} - \left(K_i(z_i) + |\beta_i(z_i)|\rho'_i(z_i) + \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2 \right) \text{sgn}(S_i) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (28)$$

where the function $K_i(z_i)$ is the feedback gain to be designed later. $S_i(\cdot)$ is given in (21) and $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ is the *sign* function. It is clear that the controllers v_i in (28) are decentralized.

Remark 8. From the structure of the control (28), it follows that only the variables $z_i, y_i, y_i^{(r_i^d)}$ and $y_{id}(t)$ are used in the i -th control v_i , which are available locally. Specially from (10), $y_i^{(r_i^d)}$ is actually the first order derivative of the state x_{i,r_i^d} , which totally depends on the local state x_{i,r_i^d} . Therefore, from the coordinate transformation $z_i = T_i(x_i)$ and the relationship between u_i and v_i in (7), it is straightforward to see that the designed controllers are decentralized.

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1 and 3, the nonlinear interconnected system (14)-(16) is driven to the sliding surface (21) in finite time by the controller (28) if the control gain $K_i(z_i)$ satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^N K_i(z_i) > \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N |\delta_i(z)|^2 + \sigma_i \quad (29)$$

where σ_i is a positive constant.

Proof. The closed-loop system obtained by applying control law (28) into system (14)-(16) can be described by

$$\dot{\xi}_i = A_i \xi_i + B_i [-\dot{S}_i + y_i^{(r_i^d)} - (K_i(z_i) + |\beta_i(z_i)|\rho'_i(z_i) + \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2) \text{sgn}(S_i) + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i) + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z)] \quad (30)$$

$$\dot{\eta}_i = q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) + \Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)\delta_i(\xi_1, \eta_1, \dots, \xi_N, \eta_N) \quad (31)$$

$$y_i = C_i \xi_i. \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (32)$$

With the special structure of the triple (A_i, B_i, C_i) in (14)-(16), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= \xi_{i,1} \\ y_i^{(1)} &= \xi_{i,2} \\ &\dots \\ y_i^{(r_i^d-1)} &= \xi_{i,r_i^d} \\ y_i^{(r_i^d)} &= \dot{\xi}_{i,r_i^d} = -\dot{S}_i + y_i^{(r_i^d)} - (K_i(z_i) + |\beta_i(z_i)|\rho'_i(z_i) + \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2) \text{sgn}(S_i) + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i) + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

From the last equation in (33),

$$\dot{S}_i = -\left(K_i(z_i) + |\beta_i(z_i)|\rho'_i(z_i) + \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2\right) \text{sgn}(S_i) + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i) + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z). \quad (34)$$

Then, from (27) - (34), and according to the basic inequality $ab \leq \frac{1}{2}(a^2 + b^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} S^T \dot{S} &= \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \dot{S}_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(-\left(K_i(z_i) + |\beta_i(z_i)|\rho'_i(z_i) + \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2\right) |S_i| + \beta_i(z_i)\tau_i(z_i)S_i + \gamma_i(z_i)\delta_i(z)S_i \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left(-K_i(z_i)|S_i| - \frac{1}{2}|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2 |S_i| + \frac{1}{2}(|\gamma_i(z_i)|^2 + |\delta_i(z)|^2) |S_i| \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(-K_i(z_i) + \frac{1}{2}|\delta_i(z)|^2 \right) |S_i|. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

It follows from (35), (29) and the basic inequality $\left(\sum_{i=1}^N |S_i|\right)^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^N |S_i|^2$ that

$$S^T \dot{S} < -\sigma \sum_{i=1}^N |S_i| \leq -\sigma \|S\| \quad (36)$$

where $\sigma := \min_i \{\sigma_i\} > 0$ due to $\sigma_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, meaning that the reachability condition holds for the closed-loop interconnected system (30)-(31). Hence, the result follows. \square

Remark 9. Based on the analysis above and from the feedback transformation (28), it follows that the decentralized controller

$$u_i = \varpi_i^{-1}(x_i) \left[-\varsigma_i(x_i) - \dot{S}_i + y_i^{(r_i^d)} - \left(K_i(T_i(x_i)) + |\varpi_i(x_i)|\rho_i(x_i) + \frac{1}{2}|L_{p_i}L_{f_i}^{r_i^d-1}h_i(x_i)|^2 \right) \text{sgn}(S_i) \right] \quad (37)$$

can drive the system (1) to the corresponding sliding surface in finite time, where $p_i = p_i(x_i)$, $f_i = f_i(x_i)$ and S_i is defined in (21).

4.3 | The Boundedness of System States

In this subsection, the boundedness of the closed-loop system (30)-(31) is analysed. The following assumptions are needed.

Assumption 4. The functions $q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ in system (30)-(31) satisfy the *Lipschitz* condition with the *Lipschitz* constants L_{q_i} uniformly for η_i in the considered domain. Moreover, there exists a *Lyapunov* function $V_{i0}(\eta_i)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{i1} \|\eta_i\|^2 &\leq V_{i0}(\eta_i) \leq \chi_{i2} \|\eta_i\|^2 \\ \frac{\partial V_{i0}}{\partial \eta_i} q_i(0, \eta_i) &\leq -\chi_{i3} \|\eta_i\|^2 \\ \left\| \frac{\partial V_{i0}}{\partial \eta_i} \right\| &\leq \chi_{i4} \|\eta_i\| \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where χ_{i1} , χ_{i2} , χ_{i3} , and χ_{i4} are positive constants for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Remark 10. The Assumption 4 implies that

$$\|q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) - q_i(0, \eta_i)\| \leq L_{q_i} \|\xi_i - 0\|. \quad (39)$$

Assumption 4 is the limitation to the nonlinear term $q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ in (30)-(31). It also implies that the zero dynamics $\dot{\eta}_i = q_i(0, \eta_i)$ of the nominal system of system (30)-(31) is asymptotically stable.

Assumption 5. There exist positive constants κ_{1j} and κ_{2j} such that

$$\|\Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)\delta_i(\xi_1, \eta_1, \dots, \xi_N, \eta_N)\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^N (\kappa_{1j} \|\xi_j\| + \kappa_{2j} \|\eta_j\|) \quad (40)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Remark 11. Assumption 5 will hold if the inequalities $\|\Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i)\| \leq \kappa_{1i} \|\xi_i\| + \kappa_{2i} \|\eta_i\|$ hold for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Theorem 3. Under Assumptions 3-5, the states of the closed-loop system (30)-(31) are bounded if the matrix $W^T + W$ is positive definite where the matrix W is defined as

$$W := \begin{bmatrix} \chi_{13} - \chi_{14}\kappa_{21} & -\chi_{14}\kappa_{22} & \cdots & -\chi_{14}\kappa_{2N} \\ -\chi_{24}\kappa_{21} & \chi_{23} - \chi_{24}\kappa_{22} & \cdots & -\chi_{24}\kappa_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\chi_{N4}\kappa_{21} & -\chi_{N4}\kappa_{22} & \cdots & \chi_{N3} - \chi_{N4}\kappa_{2N} \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

where χ_{ij} and κ_{lj} satisfy the Assumptions 4 and 5 for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $l = 1, 2$.

Proof. From Theorem 1, it follows that the variables $\xi_i = \text{col}(\xi_{i,1}, \xi_{i,2}, \dots, \xi_{i,r_i^d})$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are bounded when the sliding motion occurs if Assumption 3 holds. Theorem 2 shows that the interconnected system can be driven to the sliding surface in finite time. From Theorems 1 and 2, it follows that the variables $\xi_i = \text{col}(\xi_{i,1}, \xi_{i,2}, \dots, \xi_{i,r_i^d})$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are bounded. Therefore, there exist constants $C_i > 0$ such that in the considered domain,

$$\|\xi_i\| \leq C_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (42)$$

The remain is to prove that the variables η_i in the closed-loop system (30)-(31) are bounded for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

It should be noted that from (42), the variables ξ_i in the system (31) are bounded and can be considered as parameters defined in a compact set. For this system, consider the following *Lyapunov* candidate function

$$V(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N V_{i0}(\eta_i)$$

where $V_{i0}(\eta_i)$ is defined in Assumption 4. Then, the time derivative of the *Lyapunov* function $V(\cdot)$ along the trajectories of system (30)-(31) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{V}(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_N) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial V_{i0}(\eta_i)}{\partial \eta_i} \left[q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) + \Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) \delta_i(\xi_1, \eta_1, \dots, \xi_N, \eta_N) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\partial V_{i0}(\eta_i)}{\partial \eta_i} q_i(0, \eta_i) + \frac{\partial V_{i0}(\eta_i)}{\partial \eta_i} (q_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) - q_i(0, \eta_i)) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial V_{i0}(\eta_i)}{\partial \eta_i} \left[\Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) \delta_i(\xi_1, \eta_1, \dots, \xi_N, \eta_N) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Further, from (44) and Assumptions 4 and 5, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{V}(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_N) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^N (-\chi_{i3} \|\eta_i\|^2 + \chi_{i4} L_{qi} C_i \|\eta_i\| + \left\| \frac{\partial V_{i0}(\eta_i)}{\partial \eta_i} \right\| \|\Gamma_i(\xi_i, \eta_i) \delta_i(\xi_1, \eta_1, \dots, \xi_N, \eta_N)\|) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^N (-\chi_{i3} \|\eta_i\|^2 + \chi_{i4} L_{qi} C_i \|\eta_i\| + \chi_{i4} \|\eta_i\| \sum_{j=1}^N (\kappa_{1j} \|\xi_j\| + \kappa_{2j} \|\eta_j\|)) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^N (-\chi_{i3} \|\eta_i\|^2 + \chi_{i4} L_{qi} C_i \|\eta_i\| + \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} \kappa_{1j} C_i \|\eta_i\| + \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} \kappa_{2j} \|\eta_i\| \|\eta_j\|) \\ & = -\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \chi_{i3} \|\eta_i\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} \kappa_{2j} \|\eta_i\| \|\eta_j\| - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} C_i (L_{qi} + \kappa_{1j}) \|\eta_i\| \right) \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} (\|\eta_1\|, \dots, \|\eta_N\|) (W + W^T) \begin{pmatrix} \|\eta_1\| \\ \|\eta_2\| \\ \vdots \\ \|\eta_N\| \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} C_i (L_{qi} + \kappa_{1j}) \|\eta_i\| \\ & \leq -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(W + W^T) \|\eta\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} C_i (L_{qi} + \kappa_{1j}) \|\eta_i\| \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(W + W^T) \sum_{i=1}^N \|\eta_i\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} C_i (L_{qi} + \kappa_{1j}) \|\eta_i\| \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \lambda_{\min}(W + W^T) \|\eta_i\| - \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} C_i (L_{qi} + \kappa_{1j}) \right\} \|\eta_i\| \\ & \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $\|\eta\| := \|(\|\eta_1\|, \|\eta_2\|, \dots, \|\eta_N\|)^T\|$, if

$$\|\eta_i\| \geq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{i4} C_i (L_{qi} + \kappa_{1j})}{\lambda_{\min}(W)}.$$

Then, from Theorem 4.18 in³⁰, the variables η_i are bounded for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Hence, the result follows. \square

Remark 12. From Remark 6, if $r_i^a = \eta_i$, the considered system can be fully linearised and thus the dynamical equation (31) disappears. In this case, Assumptions 4-5 are unnecessary, and the interconnection terms are completely matched. This can be regarded as a special case of the results developed in this paper.

5 | SIMULATION EXAMPLE

Consider two inverted pendulums connected by a spring as shown in Fig.1. Each pendulum is controlled by a servomotor which




FIGURE 1 Two inverted pendulums connected by a spring

provides a torque input u_i at the pivot. It is assumed that θ_i and $\dot{\theta}_i$ represent the angular position and velocity of the pendulums respectively for $i = 1, 2$. The model which describes the motion of the pendulums is given by (see,³¹)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{1,1} &= x_{1,2} \\ \dot{x}_{1,2} &= \frac{u_1}{J_1} + \beta_1(x_1)\tau_1(x_1) + \gamma_1(x_1)\delta_1(x) + \frac{kr}{2J_1}(l-b) \\ y_1 &= x_{1,1} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{2,1} &= x_{2,2} \\ \dot{x}_{2,2} &= \frac{u_2}{J_2} + \beta_2(x_2)\tau_2(x_2) + \gamma_2(x_2)\delta_2(x) - \frac{kr}{2J_2}(l-b) \\ y_2 &= x_{2,1} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $x_{1,1} = \theta_1$, $x_{2,1} = \theta_2$, $x_{1,2} = \dot{\theta}_1$ and $x_{2,2} = \dot{\theta}_2$ are system states. It is assumed that $x_{1,1}$ and $x_{2,1}$ are measurable, which are system outputs.

It should be pointed out that system (45)-(46) above has already been in the form of system (14) where

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 &= \frac{m_1 gr}{J_1} - \frac{kr^2}{4J_1}, & \beta_2 &= \frac{m_2 gr}{J_2} - \frac{kr^2}{4J_2} \\ \tau_1(x_1) &= \sin(x_{1,1}), & \tau_2(x_2) &= \sin(x_{2,1}) \\ \gamma_1(x_1) &= \frac{kr^2}{4J_1}, & \gamma_2(x_2) &= \frac{kr^2}{4J_2} \\ \delta_1(x) &= \sin(x_{2,1}), & \delta_2(x) &= \sin(x_{1,1}). \end{aligned}$$

From³¹, the parameters are chosen as $m_1 = 2$ kg and $m_2 = 2.5$ kg represent the end masses of the pendulum. $J_1 = 0.5$ kg·m² and $J_2 = 0.625$ kg·m² are the moments of inertia. $g = 9.81$ m/s² is the gravitational acceleration. $k = 100$ N/m is the spring constant of the connecting spring. $r = 0.5$ m is the pendulum height and $l = 0.5$ m is the natural length of the spring. The distance between the pendulum hinges is $b = 0.5$ m, where $b = l$.

By direct calculation

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_1(x_1)| &= |\sin(x_{1,1})| \leq 1 = \rho_1(x_1) \\ |\tau_2(x_2)| &= |\sin(x_{2,1})| \leq 1 = \rho_2(x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Here, both the value of σ_i for $i = 1, 2$ are designed as 0.1. It can be verified that the relative degree $r_i^a = r_i^b = 2$ for $i = 1, 2$. The nominal subsystems can be feedback linearised. For simulation purposes, the initial states are chosen as $x_{1,1}(0) = 1$ and $x_{2,1}(0) = -0.8$. And the desired output signals $y_{id}(t)$ are chosen as

$$y_{1d} = 0.5 \sin(t), \quad y_{2d} = 5e^{-t}. \quad (47)$$

It is clear that Assumption 3 is satisfied. Let

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= y_1 - y_{1d}, & e_2 &= y_2 - y_{2d} \\ \dot{e}_1 &= \dot{y}_1 - \dot{y}_{1d}, & \dot{e}_2 &= \dot{y}_2 - \dot{y}_{2d} \\ S_1 &= \dot{e}_1 + a_1 \cdot e_1, & S_2 &= \dot{e}_2 + a_2 \cdot e_2 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the sliding function parameters are chosen as $a_1 = 2$ and $a_2 = 3$. Then from (28), the control laws can be described by

$$u_1 = J_1 \left(-\dot{S}_1 + y_1^{(2)} - K_1(x_1) \text{sgn}(S_1) \right) \quad (49)$$

and

$$u_2 = J_2 \left(-\dot{S}_2 + y_2^{(2)} - K_2(x_2) \text{sgn}(S_2) \right) \quad (50)$$

where, based on (29), the value of the control gain $K_i(\cdot)$ is chosen as 19.72 for $i = 1, 2$. By direct calculation, Assumptions 4-5 as well as the conditions of Theorems 1-3 are satisfied. Therefore, the outputs of the closed-loop system formed by applying controllers (49)-(50) to the system (45)-(46) can track the desired signals in (47) asymptotically.

The tracking results are shown in Fig.2 with a good tracking performance as expected. Each angular position y_i of the subsystem can track the ideal reference y_{id} for $i = 1, 2$, at around 2 seconds despite the interactions between the subsystems. The time responses of the states of the system (45)-(46) are presented in Fig.3 where the system states are bounded. The simulation demonstrates that the results developed in this paper are effective and in consistency with the theoretical results.




FIGURE 2 Time responses of system's output, the desired output (upper), and controller inputs of system (45)-(46).

6 | CONCLUSIONS

A decentralized sliding mode control scheme for output tracking of a class of nonlinear interconnected systems has been proposed in this paper. The developed results can guarantee asymptotic output-tracking performance while the bounded state variables are maintaining across the closed-loop systems. The designed controllers are decentralized and the desired reference signals are time-varying. **It is not required that either the interconnected system or the isolated subsystems of the interconnected systems are linearisable. Also, the developed results can be extended to the case when the isolated subsystems have multiple-input and multiple-output.** Thus, the method developed in this paper is suitable for a wide class of large-scale nonlinear interconnected systems.




FIGURE 3 Evolution of state variables of system (45)-(46).

References

1. Y.S. Huang, "Robust decentralized adaptive fuzzy control for a class of large-scale MIMO nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 22, pp. 1720-1742, Aug, 2011.
2. M. S. Mahmoud, "Decentralized Systems with Design Constraints," London, UK: Springer, 2011.
3. X. G. Yan, J. J. Wang, X. Y. Lu, and S. Y. Zhang, "Decentralized output feedback robust stabilization for a class of nonlinear interconnected systems with similarity," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 43, issue. 2, pp. 294 - 299, Feb, 1998.
4. Y. Zhu and E. Fridman, "Predictor methods for decentralized control of large-scale systems with input delays," *Automatica*, vol. 116, pp. 108903, Jun, 2020.
5. J. Li and Q. Zhang, "Fuzzy Reduced-Order Compensator-Based Stabilization for Interconnected Descriptor Systems via Integral Sliding Modes," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp.752-765, April, 2019.
6. M. S. Mahmoud and N. B. Almutairi, "Decentralized Stabilization of Interconnected Systems with Time-varying Delays," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 624 - 633, Feb, 2009.
7. M. Van, "Adaptive neural integral sliding-mode control for tracking control of fully actuated uncertain surface vessels," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 29, pp. 1537-1557, Jan, 2019.
8. C. Hua, Y. Li, and X. Guan, "Finite/Fixed-Time Stabilization for Nonlinear Interconnected Systems With Dead-Zone Input," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2554-2560, May, 2017.
9. X. G. Yan, C. Edwards, S. K. Spurgeon, and J. A. M. Bleijs, "Decentralised sliding-mode control for multimachine power systems using only output information," *IEE Proceedings - Control Theory and Applications*, vol. 151, issue. 5, pp. 627-635, Sep, 2004.
10. X. G. Yan, S. K. Spurgeon, and C. Edwards, "Decentralised stabilisation for nonlinear time delay interconnected systems using static output feedback," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 633-641, Oct, 2012.
11. T. Ma, "Decentralized filtering adaptive constrained tracking control for interconnected nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 30, pp. 4652-4675, June, 2020.

12. T. L. Liao, L. C. Fu, and C. F. Hsu, "Output tracking control of nonlinear systems with mismatched uncertainties," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 39 - 47, Nov, 1990.
13. A. Ferrara, G. P. Incremona, and B. Sangiovanni, "Tracking control via switched Integral Sliding Mode with application to robot manipulators," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 90, pp. 257-266, Sep, 2019.
14. Y. Wang and Y. G. Liu, "Global Practical Tracking Via Adaptive Output Feedback for Uncertain Nonlinear Systems Without Polynomial Constraint," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, issue. 4, pp. 1848 - 1855, Apr, 2021.
15. Y. X. Li, S. C. Tong, and G. H. Yang, "Observer-Based Adaptive Fuzzy Decentralized Event-Triggered Control of Interconnected Nonlinear System," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, issue. 7, pp. 3104 - 3112, July, 2020.
16. Y. H. Choi and S. J. Yoo, "Decentralized Event-Triggered Tracking of a Class of Uncertain Interconnected Nonlinear Systems Using Minimal Function Approximators," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 51, issue. 3, pp. 1766 - 1778, Mar, 2021.
17. X. G. Yan, S. K. Spurgeon, and C. Edwards, "Variable Structure Control of Complex Systems," New York, US: Springer, Cham, 2017.
18. V. Utkin, J. Guldner, and M. Shijun, "Sliding mode control in electro-mechanical systems," London, UK: Taylor & Francis, 1999.
19. G. Q. Zhu, L. L. Nie, Z. Lv, L. F. Sun, X. Y. Zhang, and C. L. Wang, "Adaptive fuzzy dynamic surface sliding mode control of large-scale power systems with prescribe output tracking performance," *ISA Transactions*, vol. 99, pp. 305-321, Apr, 2020.
20. P. R. Pagilla, R. V. Dwivedula, and N. B. Siraskar, "A Decentralized Model Reference Adaptive Controller for Large-Scale Systems," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 154-163, April, 2007.
21. X. Ren, G. Yang, and X. Li, "Global Adaptive Fuzzy Distributed Tracking Control for Interconnected Nonlinear Systems With Communication Constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 333-345, Mar, 2019.
22. K. S. Narendra and N. O. Olgun, "Exact output tracking in decentralized adaptive control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 390-395, Aug, 2002
23. C. Liu, H. G. Zhang, G. Y. Xiao, and S. X. Sun, "Integral reinforcement learning based decentralized optimal tracking control of unknown nonlinear large-scale interconnected systems with constrained-input," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 323, pp. 1-11, Jan. 2019.
24. Y. Q. Han and H. S. Yan, "Observer-based multi-dimensional Taylor network decentralised adaptive tracking control of large-scale stochastic nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 93, no. 7, pp. 1605-1618, Jul, 2020.
25. Y. Yan, S. H. Yu, and C. Y. Sun, "Quantization-based event-triggered sliding mode tracking control of mechanical systems," *Information Sciences*, vol. 523, pp. 296-306, Jun, 2020.
26. H. Hou, X. Yu, L. Xu, K. Rsetam, and Z. Cao, "Finite-Time Continuous Terminal Sliding Mode Control of Servo Motor Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 5647-5656, Aug. 2019.
27. D. Yao, H. Li, R. Lu, and Y. Shi, "Distributed Sliding-Mode Tracking Control of Second-Order Nonlinear Multiagent Systems: An Event-Triggered Approach," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 3892-3902, Jan, 2020.
28. A. Isidori, "Nonlinear Control Systems," London, UK: Springer, 1995.
29. K. Zhang, B. Jiang, X. Yan, Z. Mao and M. M. Polycarpou, "Fault-Tolerant Control for Systems with Unmatched Actuator Faults and Disturbances," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, pp. 1725 - 1732, May, 2020.
30. H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems* 3rd ed., New Jersey, US: Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, 2002.
31. J. T. Spooner and K. M. Passino, "Decentralized adaptive control of nonlinear systems using radial basis neural networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2050-2057, Nov, 1999.

