

# A New Methodology for the Design of Adaptive Controllers Using "State-Strict Passivity"

S. Commuri and F.L. Lewis

Automation and Robotics Research Institute  
The University of Texas at Arlington  
7300, Jack Newell Blvd. S  
Fort Worth, Texas 76118-7115  
Tel. (817) 794-5938  
Fax. (817) 794-5972  
email : commuri@arrirs03.uta.edu

## Abstract

The notion of passivity has played an important role in extending stability results to systems based on the input-output properties of the system. This approach was also utilized to study the stability properties of interconnected passive systems. In the control of unknown nonlinear dynamical systems, however, passivity properties were studied only as an off-shoot of the resulting controller. In this paper, it is shown that a stronger form of passivity, namely state-strict passivity, is required to prove guaranteed tracking performance and internal stability for a class of nonlinear systems without standard observability (i.e. "persistence of excitation") conditions. It is shown that this property can be made a design objective in the design of adaptive controllers for the control of unknown nonlinear systems that satisfy certain assumptions on the system structure. This yields "robust" adaptive controllers that do not require persistency of excitation.

## 1. Introduction

Real-time control of nonlinear plants with unknown dynamics remains a very challenging area of research. Traditionally, the plant dynamics were first modeled and verified through off-line experimentation. The control was then designed using linear system design techniques or geometric techniques with linear analogues. Thus, feedback linearization is a first step in controls design for nonlinear systems. The disadvantage, however, is that the method is suitable only for systems described by an accurate model. The results for systems with unknown dynamics were at first limited by-and-large to *ad hoc* techniques and simulations involving assumptions such as certainty equivalence. These

approaches are limited by the complexity of the model and cannot accommodate the variation of system parameters. This has resulted in the development of controllers that can learn the process dynamics, as well as, adapt to parametric changes in the system.

Adaptive feedback linearization plays a very important role in the control of unknown nonlinear systems that are feedback linearizable [1,2]. Since the plant inputs and outputs are used to tune the adaptation parameters, a lot of research was directed towards the study of the convergence of adaptive algorithms based on the input-output properties of the system [1-4]. In this context, Passivity properties of the resulting controller were used to show the convergence of the adaptation algorithm [5-7]. In this paper, it is shown that if the system and the adaptive network satisfy a stronger condition than passivity, namely state-strict passivity, then this guarantees the internal stability of the overall system. This is the first work to our knowledge that brings out this important relationship between the input-out properties and the internal stability of the interconnected system. This result is shown to be of fundamental importance in the development of a new methodology for designing adaptive feedback-linearizing controllers for a class of nonlinear systems. In fact, it allows the design of controllers that do not require persistence of excitation (eg. "observability") conditions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. A brief background on nonlinear dynamical systems is given in Section 2. In Section 3, results from literature on passivity are presented and sufficient conditions derived to prove the stability of the closed-loop system. In Section 4, the formulation of Section 2 is shown to satisfy the "state-strict

passivity" property, and examples presented on designing adaptive controllers and controllers based on neural networks.

## 2. Background on Nonlinear Dynamical Systems

Consider the multi-input multi-output system whose state-space representation is given in the Brunowskii canonical form as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 &= x_3 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{x}_{n_1} &= f_1(\underline{x}) + u_1 + d_1 \\ \dot{x}_{n_1+1} &= x_{n_1+2} \\ \dot{x}_{n_1+2} &= x_{n_1+3} \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{x}_{n_1+n_2} &= f_2(\underline{x}) + u_2 + d_2 \\ \dot{x}_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_{m-1}+1} &= x_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_{m-1}+2} \\ \dot{x}_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_{m-1}+2} &= x_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_{m-1}+3} \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{x}_n &= f_m(\underline{x}) + u_m + d_m \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with the output equation given as

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_{n_1+1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_{m-1}+1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

It is assumed that  $d = [d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m]^T$  is an unknown disturbance with known upper bound so that  $\|d\| < b_d$ ,  $\underline{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^T \in R^n$ , and  $f = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m]^T : R^n \rightarrow R^m$  is a smooth vector function.

**Definition 1** : The solution of the system (1) and (2) is said to be *uniformly ultimately bounded* (UUB) if for any compact subset  $U \subset R^n$ , there exists a domain of attraction  $U_0 \subset U$ , a constant  $\epsilon > 0$  and a number  $T(\epsilon, \underline{x}_0)$  such that for all  $\underline{x}(t_0) \in U_0$ ,  $\underline{x}(t) \in U \forall t$ , and  $\|\underline{x}(t)\| < \epsilon$  for all  $t \geq t_0 + T$ .  $\square$

## 2.1 Output Tracking Problem

Given the system (1) and (2), it is required to manufacture a bounded control input  $u(t) = [u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m]^T$  such that the output  $y(t)$  of the system tracks a specified desired output  $y_d(t) = [y_{d_1}(t), y_{d_2}(t), \dots, y_{d_m}(t)]^T$  while ensuring that the states  $\underline{x}(t)$  are bounded. It is assumed that the desired output is smooth so that derivatives of all orders exist and the desired output and all its derivatives are bounded by a known constant  $\gamma$ , that is

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_d \\ \dot{y}_d \\ \vdots \\ y_d^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix} \leq \gamma, \quad (3)$$

where  $y_d^{(n-1)}$  denotes the  $(n-1)$ -st derivative of  $y_d$ .

Define the tracking error as  $e = y - y_d$ , that is

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= x_1 - y_{d_1} \\ e_2 &= x_{n_1+1} - y_{d_2} \\ &\vdots \\ e_m &= x_{n_1+n_2+\dots+n_{m-1}+1} - y_{d_m} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Then using (1), the error dynamics in (4) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= f_1(\underline{x}) + d_1 + u_1 - y_{d_1}^{(n_1)} \\ e_2 &= f_2(\underline{x}) + d_2 + u_2 - y_{d_2}^{(n_2)} \\ &\vdots \\ e_m &= f_m(\underline{x}) + d_m + u_m - y_{d_m}^{(n_m)} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Define the filtered tracking error  $r(t)$  with components

$$r_i = e_i^{(n_i-1)} + \lambda_{i,1} e_i^{(n_i-2)} + \dots + \lambda_{i,n_i-1} e_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (6)$$

Selecting now the control inputs as

$$u_i = -\hat{f}_i(\underline{x}) - K_{v,i} r_i - \left[ \lambda_{i,n_i-1} e_i + \lambda_{i,n_i-2} \dot{e}_i + \dots + \lambda_{i,1} e_i^{(n_i-1)} \right] + y_{d_i}^{(n_i)}, \quad (7)$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m$

the filtered error system can be expressed in the form

$$\dot{r}_i = -K_{v_i} r_i + \hat{f}_i(\underline{x}) + d_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (8)$$

In (7),  $\hat{f}_i(\underline{x})$  denotes an estimate of  $f_i(\underline{x})$ , to be subsequently provided by a Adaptive network. The functional estimation error is  $\bar{f}_i(\underline{x}) = f_i(\underline{x}) - \hat{f}_i(\underline{x})$ . The coefficients  $\lambda_{i,j}$  in (7) are selected such that

$$\lambda_{i,n_i-1} e_i + \lambda_{i,n_i-2} \dot{e}_i + \dots + \lambda_{i,1} e_i^{(n_i-1)} = 0 \quad (9)$$

is Hurwitz, that is all the roots of (9) have negative real parts. Then, the controller designed in (6), (7) ensures that the filtered tracking error system (8) is stable. This then implies that the tracking error  $e(t)$  remains bounded for all time.

In the implementation of the controller (6), (7) it is assumed that an estimate  $\hat{f}(\cdot)$  of the function  $f(\cdot)$  is available. This estimate is manufactured by an Adaptive Network that can approximate the nonlinear function to any desired degree of accuracy. However, for such a network to ensure small tracking error in closed-loop control, it is necessary to learn the

nonlinear function on-line. The proposed control scheme (7) is shown in Fig. 1. Note that the structure has a nonlinear adaptive inner loop plus a linear outer tracking loop.

### 3. Passivity Properties and Implications for Stability

There are a number of approaches determining the stability of the adaptive control scheme (7),(8). A widely used approach would involve breaking down the system into a number of subsystems and finding a Lyapunov function for each. The gains in (7) and the adaptation scheme can then be selected to ensure stability. This approach has been utilized to control unknown systems of the form (1) and (2) using adaptive, neural, and fuzzy logic controllers. The procedure, however, is cumbersome and depends on finding a suitable Lyapunov function that results in tractable adaptation laws. While these results enable exact calculation of the ultimate bounds on the states of the system, it is illuminating to study the passivity properties of the closed-loop system and its relation to the overall internal stability. Given the controller structure (7), it is natural to view the closed-loop system as an interconnection of the filtered tracking error system and the Adaptive network as shown in Fig. 2.




Fig. 1 Control of an Unknown Nonlinear System Using Adaptive Network




Fig. 2 Interconnected Feedback Structure of the Adaptive Controller

In the following section, we show the relationship between the passivity properties of the interconnected system and the overall internal stability, using this to define a suitable adaptive network. To our knowledge, this is the first time that controller design has been attempted using passivity properties exclusively.

### 3.1 Background on Passivity

The relationship between the input-output properties of a system and its stability has been extensively studied using the theory of dissipative systems. Here a few results from literature [8-13] are first presented, and the results extended to derive conditions for nonlinear systems subjected to bounded disturbances. The relevance is that the Adaptive network used for control purposes herein will be constructed to have an important dissipativity property that makes them robust to disturbances and unmodeled dynamics.

**Assumption 1** [8,11] : Let the system in (1), (2) satisfy

- (i)  $f(0) = y(0) = 0$ ,
- (ii) The system is completely reachable, that is, for a given  $\underline{x}_f$  and  $t_f$  there exists a  $t_0 \leq t_f$  and a locally square integrable  $u(t)$  such that the state can be driven from  $\underline{x}(t_0) = 0$  to  $\underline{x}(t_f) = \underline{x}_f$ ,
- (iii)  $\sigma(t)$  is an energy supply rate associated with this system such that

$$\sigma(t) = y^T Q y + 2y^T S u + u^T R u \quad (10)$$

where  $Q, R, S$  are constant matrices with  $Q$  and  $R$  symmetric.  $\square$

**Definition 2** [8,11] : The system (1), (2) with supply rate (10) is said to be dissipative if for all locally square integrable inputs  $u(t)$  and for all  $t_f > t_0$

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_f} \sigma(t) dt \geq 0 \quad (11)$$

with  $\underline{x}(t_0) = 0$  and  $\sigma(t)$  evaluated along the trajectory of (1),(2).  $\square$

**Lemma 1** [8,11] : The system (1), (2) is dissipative with respect to the supply function (10) if and only if there exist real functions  $\Psi(\cdot)$ ,  $l(\cdot)$  and  $W(\cdot)$  satisfying  $\Psi(\underline{x}) > 0 \forall \underline{x} \neq 0$ ,  $\Psi(0) = 0$ , and

$$\dot{\Psi}(\underline{x}) = \sigma(t) - [l(\underline{x}) + W(\underline{x})u]^T [l(\underline{x}) + W(\underline{x})u]. \quad (12)$$

along the trajectories of (1),(2).  $\square$

The function  $\Psi(\cdot)$  is known as the storage function for the system (1),(2).

### 3.2 Stability Properties of Interconnected Systems based on Passivity

While dissipativity property is a convenient tool for generating Lyapunov functions for autonomous systems, it is not possible to study the internal stability of feedback systems subject to exogenous inputs without stronger conditions on the system like complete state observability. It has been observed only recently [16,17] that using a stronger version of passivity namely, state-strict passivity can overcome this limitation. In this sub-section, this novel concept is first defined and its use in analyzing internal stability of interconnected systems demonstrated.

**Definition 3** : The system (1), (2) is passive if it is dissipative with respect to the supply rate (10) with  $R = 0$  and  $Q = 0$ . A passive system is state-strict passive if it is dissipative with respect to the supply function

$$\sigma(t) = y^T u - \epsilon \underline{x}^T \underline{x}, \quad \epsilon > 0 \quad (13)$$

where  $\underline{x}$  is the state of the system. From Lemma 1, it is clear that any system verifying (13) with  $\sigma(t) = y^T u$  is passive. Under these conditions, that is  $\sigma(t) = y^T u$ , (13) is said to be in power form.  $\square$

**Theorem 2** : Consider the system of the form shown in Fig. 3. Suppose the subsystems  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are state-strict passive with respect to the supply rates

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(t) &= y_1^T u_1 - \epsilon_1 \|\underline{x}_1\|^2 \\ \sigma_2(t) &= y_2^T u_2 - \epsilon_2 \|\underline{x}_2\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|y_1\| \leq \alpha \|\underline{x}_1\|, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (14)$$

Then the feedback system is UUB for all bounded inputs  $\xi(t)$ .

**Remark** : No observability or persistence of excitation conditions are required on subsystem  $H_2$ .

**Proof** : Since  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are state-strict passive, there exist storage functions  $\Psi_1(x_1)$  and  $\Psi_2(x_2)$  satisfying Lemma 1. Taking the Lyapunov function

$$\Psi(x_1, x_2) = \Psi_1(x_1) + \Psi_2(x_2),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Psi}(x_1, x_2) &\leq \sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t) \\ &\leq y_1^T u_1 - \epsilon_1 \|\underline{x}_1\|^2 + y_2^T u_2 - \epsilon_2 \|\underline{x}_2\|^2. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 3 Interconnection of two subsystems in feedback configuration

Substituting (14) and using (12),(13)

$$\dot{\Psi}(x_1, x_2) \leq \alpha \|\xi\| \|x_1\| - \varepsilon_1 \|x_1\|^2 - \varepsilon_2 \|x_2\|^2.$$

Thus, for all bounded inputs the states  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are bounded for all time or the states of the system are UUB. ■

#### 4. Design of Adaptive Controllers

In Section 2 it was shown that the proposed controller (7) could be interpreted as having two parts - a nonlinear adaptive inner loop and a linear outer tracking loop. The results of Section 3 suggest that the stability of the system (1),(2) under the controller (7) can be concluded if the system is state-strict passive and the adaptive network is designed to be state-strict passive. The design of the controller is therefore carried out in two stages. First the dynamics of the filtered error system (8) are shown to be state-strict passive and satisfy condition (14). Then, the adaptation laws for the adaptive network are chosen to make it state-strict passive. The stability of the interconnected system can then be concluded using Theorem 1.

Define  $\xi(t) = \tilde{f}(t) + d$ . Then the filtered error system (8) can be expressed in vector notation as

$$\dot{r}(t) = -K_v r(t) + \xi(t). \quad (15)$$

**Lemma 3:** The dynamics (15) from  $\xi(t)$  to  $r(t)$  are a state-strict passive system.

**Proof:** Consider the Lyapunov function

$$V = \frac{1}{2} r^T r.$$

Differentiating both sides, and substituting (15) results in

$$\dot{V} = -r^T K_v r + r^T \xi. \quad (16)$$

(16) is in power-form (13) with the supply function  $r^T \xi - r^T K_v r$ . From Lemma 1 and Definition 3, it

follows that the dynamics (15) from  $\xi(t)$  to  $r(t)$  are a state-strict passive system. □

In the implementation of the controller (7), the estimate of the nonlinearity  $\hat{f}(\cdot)$  was assumed to be manufactured by an adaptive network to a specified degree of accuracy. Several techniques are now given for selecting the state-strict passive adaptive network.

#### 4.1 Functional Estimation Using Neural Networks

Consider a one layer neural network with input  $r(t)$  and output  $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ . The output of the neural network can be expressed as

$$\hat{f}(x) = \hat{w}^T \phi(x) \quad (17)$$

where  $\phi(\cdot)$  is a vector of activation functions and  $\hat{w}$  is a matrix of the weights associated with each node. The activation functions  $\phi(\cdot)$  form a basis set for a class of functions. That is, there exists a set of ideal weights  $w$  such that any function belonging to this class can be expressed as  $w^T \phi(\cdot) + \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the function reconstruction error. The error in the function estimate is then given by

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \tilde{w}^T \phi(x) + \varepsilon, \quad (18)$$

where  $\tilde{w} = w - \hat{w}$  [5-7].

Let the weight update for the Neural Network be given by

$$\dot{\hat{w}} = -\kappa [r] F \hat{w} + F r \phi^T(x). \quad (19)$$

where  $F$  is a symmetric positive definite matrix.

**Lemma 4:** The weight update law (19) guarantees the neural network to be state-strict passive from input  $r(t)$  to  $\tilde{w}^T \phi(x)$ .

**Proof:** Take the nonnegative function

$$V = \kappa (\tilde{w}^T F^{-1} \tilde{w}).$$

Differentiating both the sides, and substituting (19)

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= tr(\dot{\tilde{w}}^T \varphi(\underline{x}) r^T) + tr(\kappa \tilde{w}^T \|r\| \dot{\tilde{w}}) \\ &= r^T (\dot{\tilde{w}}^T \varphi(\underline{x})) + \kappa \|r\| tr(\tilde{w}^T \dot{\tilde{w}}) \\ &\leq r^T (\dot{\tilde{w}}^T \varphi(\underline{x})) - \kappa \|r\| (\|\tilde{w}\|^2 - w_{\max} \|\tilde{w}\|),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\max(w) = w_{\max}$ .

Since the derivative of  $V$  is in the power form, from Lemma 9 and Definition 7 it follows that the neural network is state-strict passive from input  $r(t)$  to  $\tilde{w}^T \varphi(\underline{x})$ .  $\square$

Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2, and hence the closed-loop system is *Uniformly Ultimately Bounded*.

The structure of the neural network (19) is obtained using a filtered error/passivity approach. This method has several advantages over conventional neural networks based on gradient laws and backpropagation algorithms. Standard backpropagation tuning can result in unbounded weights in the neural network if (a) the network cannot exactly reconstruct a certain required nonlinear function, or (b) there are bounded unknown disturbances in the system dynamics. The novel weight update laws (19) do not require a learning phase. The stability of the closed-loop system can be established without requiring strong observability conditions or persistence of excitation. The algorithm includes correction terms to the backpropagation, plus an additional robustifying signal that guarantees tracking as well as bounded weights.

#### 4.2 Functional Estimation Using Adaptive Networks

The neural network can estimate the unknown function as the activation functions  $\varphi(\cdot)$  form a basis set and it is assumed that the nonlinear function can be expressed as a weighted linear sum of the elements of the basis set to the specified degree of accuracy. For the adaptive estimation of the function however, it is required to compute a regression matrix [15]. Let the regression matrix be  $W(\underline{x})$  and the parameter vector be given by  $\Xi$ . If  $\Xi$  is known then the function can be constructed exactly as

$$f(\underline{x}) = \Xi^T W(\underline{x}). \quad (20)$$

Since  $\Xi$  is unknown, let the estimate of  $\Xi$  be denoted by  $\hat{\Xi}$ . Then the functional estimate error is given by

$$\tilde{f}(\underline{x}) = \hat{\Xi}^T W(\underline{x}), \quad (21)$$

where  $\hat{\Xi}$  is the error in the parameter estimates.

**Lemma 5:** The adaptive update law given by

$$\dot{\hat{\Xi}} = -\dot{\Xi} = -\Gamma r W^T(\underline{x}) + \kappa \|r\| \Gamma \hat{\Xi}, \quad (22)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is a positive definite matrix makes the map from  $r$  to  $\hat{\Xi}^T W(\underline{x})$  state-strict passive.

**Proof:** Take the nonnegative function

$$V = tr(\hat{\Xi}^T \Gamma^{-1} \hat{\Xi}).$$

Differentiating both the sides, and substituting (22)

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= tr(\hat{\Xi}^T W(\underline{x}) r^T) + tr(\kappa \hat{\Xi}^T \|r\| \hat{\Xi}) \\ &= r^T (\hat{\Xi}^T W(\underline{x})) + \kappa \|r\| tr(\hat{\Xi}^T \hat{\Xi}) \\ &\leq r^T (\hat{\Xi}^T W(\underline{x})) - \kappa \|r\| (\|\hat{\Xi}\|^2 - \Xi_{\max} \|\hat{\Xi}\|),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\max(\Xi) = \Xi_{\max}$ .

From Lemma 9 and Definition 7 it follows that the adaptive network is state-strict passive from input  $r(t)$  to  $\hat{\Xi}^T W(\underline{x})$ .  $\square$

It is seen that state-strict passivity is needed to ensure boundedness of all states when the closed-loop system is subjected to bounded disturbances. The choice of the adaptation laws for the network is crucial as this guarantees boundedness of the signals without the requirement of the persistence of excitation (PE) [14] condition required in most adaptive control techniques.

#### 4. Conclusions

A new methodology for the design of stabilizing controllers for a class of unknown nonlinear systems is presented. It is shown that designing the controller in two stages significantly simplifies the overall implementation. The resultant controller has two components: an outer tracking-loop and an inner-loop consisting of an adaptive network for manufacturing the nonlinear elements in the dynamics. It is shown that choosing an adaptation law that makes the network state-strict passive is sufficient to guarantee the closed-loop stability of the overall system. The result is a "robust" adaptive controller that does not require persistence of excitation and learns the nonlinear function on-line.

## References

- [1] P.V. Kokotovic, M. Krstic, and I. Kannelakopoulos, "Backstepping to Passivity : Recursive Design of Adaptive Systems", *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, pp. 3276-3280, Tucson, December 1992.
- [2] C.I. Byrnes, A. Isidori, and J.C. Willems, "Passivity, Feedback Equivalence, and the Global Stabilization of Minimum Phase Nonlinear Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol.36, no. 11, pp. 1228-1240, November 1991.
- [3] I. Kannelakopoulos, P.V. Kokotovic, and A.S. Morse, "Systematic Design of Adaptive Controllers for Feedback Linearizable Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol.36, no. 11, pp. 1241-1253, November 1991.
- [4] D.G. Taylor, P.V. Kokotovic, R. Marino, and I. Kannelakopoulos, "Adaptive regulation of nonlinear systems with unmodeled dynamics", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol.34, no. 4, pp. 405-412, April 1989.
- [5] S. Jagannathan and F.L. Lewis, "Multilayer Discrete-Time Neural Net Controller with Guaranteed Performance", *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, to appear, 1995.
- [6] F.L. Lewis, A. Yesildirek, and K. Liu, "Neural Net Robot Controller : Structure and Stability Proofs", *Journal of Intelligent and Robotic Systems*, to appear 1995.
- [7] F.L. Lewis, K. Liu, and A. Yesildirek, "Neural Net Robot Controller with Guranteed Tracking Performance", *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, to appear, 1995.
- [8] P.J. Moylan, "Implications of Passivity in a class of Nonlinear Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. AC-19, no. 4, pp. 373-381, August 1974.
- [9] D.J. Hill, and P.J. Moylan, "Dissipative Dynamical Systems : Basic Input-Output and State Properties", *Journal of The Franklin Institute*, vol. 309, no.5, pp. 328-357, May 1980.
- [10] G.C. Goodwin, and K.S. Sin, "Adaptive Filtering, Prediction, and Control", Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1984.
- [11] D.J. Hill, and P.J. Moylan, "The Stability of Nonlinear Dissipative Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. AC-21, no. 5, pp. 708-711, October 1976.
- [12] D.J. Hill, and P.J. Moylan, "Stability Results for Nonlinear Feedback Systems", *Automatica*, vol. 13, pp. 377-382, July 1977.
- [13] P.J. Moylan, and D.J. Hill, "Stability Criteria for Large-Scale Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. AC-23, no. 2, pp. 143-149, April 1978.
- [14] K.S. Narendra and A.M. Annaswamy, "A New Adaptive Law for Robust Adaptation Without Persistent Adaptation", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. AC-32, no. 2, pp. 134-145, February 1987.
- [15] K.S. Narendra and A.M. Annaswamy, "Stable Adaptive Systems", Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1989.
- [16] F.L. Lewis, C.T. Abdallah, and D.M. Dawson, "Control of Robot Manipulators", Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1993.