# Closed-loop estimation and detection for quadcopters

Du Ho

Division of Automatic Control Department of Electrical Engineering Linköping University Linköping, Sweden



# Motivation



## Why do we consider multirotors



Wind turbine inspection



Agriculture irrigation



Catch a fixed-wing UAV

Multirotors can be used in many applications



## Motivation

**Goal:** Detect/estimate system changes (process faults) with sensor biases (sensor faults) and actuator faults.



**Typical problem:** Limited sensors for the estimation and detection purposes.

- Disturbances (externals, sensors, model mismatch).
- Correlation between noises and signals due to closed-loop.



#### Can we simply apply a filtering problem?

- Sensors: Orientation measurements from AHRS (Altitude and heading reference system), x y body-fixed velocities.
- Complex: not always ensure an accurate estimation.
- Feedback: noises correlate with control inputs.
- $\rightarrow$  Projection approach applied to the submodels of the quadcopter.

### What kind of sensor information needed?

- IMU
- Command signals
- GPS



## Outline

- 1. Motivation
- 2. Quadcopter modeling
- 3. Estimation
- 4. Detection
- 5. Conclusion



# Quadcopter modeling



## Modeling of an under-actuated quadcopter



 $\boldsymbol{\xi} = [x,\,y,\,z]^T :$  position in inertial frame.

$$\begin{split} \eta &= [\phi, \theta, \psi]^T \colon \text{Euler angles.} \\ V_B &= [u, v, w]^T \colon \text{linear velocities in the} \\ \text{fixed-body frame.} \\ \omega &= [p, q, r]^T \colon \text{angular velocities in the} \\ \text{fixed-body frame.} \end{split}$$

$$m(\dot{V}_B + \omega \times V_B) = R^T mg + T_B + F_d + F_w$$
(1)  
$$I\dot{\omega} + \omega \times (I\omega) = \tau_B - \Delta\omega$$
(2)

 $T_B = [0, 0, T_z]^t$  and  $\tau_B = [\tau_{\phi}, \tau_{\theta}, \tau_{\psi}]^T$  are control quantities.  $F_d$  and  $\Delta \omega$  are linear and angular drag,  $F_w$  is the wind forces.



## Estimation



## Subsystems (1) System change

### Goal: Estimate quadcopter's payload.

Projecting the dynamics onto x-y body-fixed frame



#### Process model

$$\dot{u} = -g\sin\theta - \frac{\lambda_1}{m}u$$
$$\dot{v} = g\cos\theta\sin\phi - \frac{\lambda_1}{m}v$$

Measurement model

$$\begin{aligned} a_x &= \frac{\lambda_1}{m} u + e_{a_x}, \quad a_y &= \frac{\lambda_1}{m} v + e_{a_y} \\ p &= \dot{\phi}, \quad q &= \dot{\theta} \end{aligned}$$

# $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Sensor-to-sensor model} \\ a_{y,s} = \frac{\frac{\lambda_1}{m}g}{p(p+\frac{\lambda_1}{m})}p_s + e \end{array}$



### Experimental data

- Robust to actuator faults and load is fixed.
- Deal with feedback effect and coloured noises using IV-based method.
- Comparison performance with EKF, LS.

$m_{ref}$	$m_c$	$\hat{m}_c$ (LS)	$\hat{m}_c$ (EKF)	$\hat{m}_c$ (IV)
455g	510g	$1362.5\pm54.9g$	$505.6 \pm 258.8g$	$504.1\pm3.9g$
	582g	$2126.2\pm78.9g$	$384.4\pm161.2g$	$580.9 \pm 3.8g$
510g	455g	$170.3\pm6.9g$	$458.9 \pm 234.8g$	$460.3 \pm 3.4g$
	582g	$795.8 \pm 25.7g$	$387.3 \pm 187.3g$	$587.5 \pm 3.2g$
582g	455g	$124.5\pm4.6g$	$689.7\pm289.6g$	$456.1 \pm 3.0g$
	510g	$373.1 \pm 12.1g$	$766.4\pm370.7g$	$505.2\pm2.8g$



## Subsystems (2) Actuator and system change

**Goal: Estimate quadcopter's drag coefficient and mass.** Projecting the dynamics onto z body-fixed frame



**Refined thrust**  
$$a_{z} = \frac{p}{p + \frac{k_{w}g}{m}} \left(\frac{k_{1}}{m}u_{t}^{2} + \frac{k_{2}}{m}u_{t}\right) + \frac{\frac{k_{w}g}{m}}{p + \frac{k_{w}g}{m}} + e_{a_{z}}$$



### Experimental data

- Standard model Hammerstein nonlinear model.
- Unmodeled actuator dynamics.
- Feedback effect, and nonlinear-related and coloured noises

Param		Mass $455g$	Mass $530g$	Mass 586 g	
$k_w$	LS	$0.2590 \pm 0.0848$	$0.3068 \pm 0.1475$	$0.1713 \pm 0.1473$	
	IV	$0.3040 \pm 0.0063$	$0.2904 \pm 0.0083$	$0.3052 \pm 0.0022$	
$k_1$	LS	$0.1217 \pm 0.1298$	$-0.1067 \pm 0.3205$	$0.4957 \pm 0.2078$	
	IV	$0.5198 \pm 0.0482$	$0.5165 \pm 0.0833$	$0.4921 \pm 0.0217$	
$k_2$	LS	$-0.0988 \pm 0.1248$	$0.1870 \pm 0.2326$	$-0.6443 \pm 0.1893$	
	IV	$1.5115 \pm 0.0305$	$1.5574 \pm 0.0565$	$1.5247 \pm 0.0171$	



# Detection



Subsystems (3) Sensor fault and system change

Goal: Detect payload change with wind disturbances and sensor biases.

Consider roll-pitch dynamics under yaw effect.





## Experimental study

### Settings

- Flights: A(slow V, small r), B(fast V, large r), C(fast V, fairly large r)
- $r_{fd}$ ,  $r_{td}$ : false/true detection rate,  $\bar{t}_{td}$ : avarage time-to- detection





### For single flight



#### For multiple flights

Туре	100% CUSUM params		115% CUSUM params			
	$r_{fd}[s^{-1}]$	$r_{td}[s^{-1}]$	$\bar{t}_{td}$ [s]	$r_{fd}[s^{-1}]$	$r_{td}[s^{-1}]$	$ar{t}_{td}$ [s]
A (3)	0	0.0845	9.0609	0	0.0578	11.4482
B (3)	0.0047	0.1646	4.2607	0	0.0980	7.1100
C (5)	0.0082	0.7717	1.0378	0	0.5998	1.3109







### Summary

- Interesting physical coefficients of quadcopters have been estimated using the IV method despite closed-loop and sensor-to-sensor setups (1, 2).
- Sensor bias estimation and system change detection under windy condition is considered (3).

Take-home message: unknown dynamic parameters can be estimated accurately and validated using multiple datasets (with changes of measurable quantities).

### Future work

- Working with (slung) payload detection application in quadcopters.
- Multiple quadcopters application can be studied.



# Thanks for your attention!

