Adaptive backstepping with magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints: Aircraft longitude control

Jay Farrell\textsuperscript{1}, Marios Polycarpou\textsuperscript{1}, and Mamu Sharma\textsuperscript{5}
\textsuperscript{1} Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521 USA
\textsuperscript{2} Dept. of Elect. and Comp. Engineering and Computer Science, Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA
\textsuperscript{3} Barron Associates, Inc., 1160 Pepsi Place, Suite 300, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Abstract
This article presents an adaptive backstepping approach to the longitudinal ($\gamma$, $\alpha$, $Q$) control of an aircraft that directly accommodates magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints on the aircraft states and the actuator signals. The article includes design of the control law, Lyapunov analysis of the stability properties of the closed loop system, and simulation based analysis of the performance.

1 Introduction
The introduction of uninhabited combat air vehicles (UCAV's) has generated interest in adaptive control for aircraft that are capable of maintaining trajectory following control even subsequent to faults or battle damage. In addition, physical limitations impose magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints on the control surface deflections and the aircraft states. In this article, we present analysis and simulation results for an adaptive backstepping approach that is designed to accommodate magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints on the actuator signals as well as the intermediate control variables used in the backstepping control approach. Adapative control has been applied to aircraft in, for example \cite{2, 3, 4, 14, 15, 18}. Piloted hardware in the loop simulation and flight testing is described in \cite{2, 4, 18}. The approach of \cite{3, 4} used a dynamic inversion based nonlinear controller with a neural network approximating the error in the inversion process. Adaptive backstepping has been applied to aircraft in for example \cite{15}. That article did not consider the effects of saturation on the closed loop performance.

Control signal rate and amplitude constraints in adaptive control are addressed in, for example, \cite{1, 7, 9, 10, 17}. The first type of method is to completely stop adaptation under saturation conditions. This ad-hoc method does prevent the tracking errors induced by actuator constraints from corrupting the parameter adaptation, but is undesirable as it does not allow any theoretical stability guarantees. The second set of approaches (training signal hedging (TSH)), see e.g. \cite{1, 9}, corrects the tracking error only where it is used in the parameter adaptation laws. It does not directly change the reference input to the control loop. The third set of of techniques, referred to as pseudo-control hedging (PCH) \cite{7, 10}, only alters the commanded input to the loop. The goal in PCH is to decrease the command to the loop to a point where it is implementable without saturation. PCH does not directly change the signal used in the parameter adaptation laws. The work in \cite{7} develops and analyzes the PCH method to extend the control approach of \cite{3, 14} to accommodate magnitude and rate limits on the commanded surface deflections. Although the second and third approaches start with radically different philosophies, for first order systems, it can be shown that these two approaches are identical. For higher order or nonlinear systems, the comparison is not as straightforward.

This article presents an adaptive backstepping approach for longitudinal control of an aircraft that has state and actuator constraints. Both theoretical and simulation analyses are included. A novel aspect of this approach is the ability to accommodate magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints on the actuator signals and each of the intermediate control variables used in the backstepping control approach. Adaptive control has been applied to aircraft in for example \cite{15}. That article did not consider the effects of saturation on the closed loop performance.

Control signal rate and amplitude constraints in adaptive control are addressed in, for example, \cite{1, 7, 9, 10, 17}. The first type of method is to completely stop adaptation under saturation conditions. This ad-hoc method does prevent the tracking errors induced by actuator constraints from corrupting the parameter adaptation, but is undesirable as it does not allow any theoretical stability guarantees. The second set of approaches (training signal hedging (TSH)), see e.g. \cite{1, 9}, corrects the tracking error only where it is used in the parameter adaptation laws. It does not directly change the reference input to the control loop. The third set of techniques, referred to as pseudo-control hedging (PCH) \cite{7, 10}, only alters the commanded input to the loop. The goal in PCH is to decrease the command to the loop to a point where it is implementable without saturation. PCH does not directly change the signal used in the parameter adaptation laws. The work in \cite{7} develops and analyzes the PCH method to extend the control approach of \cite{3, 14} to accommodate magnitude and rate limits on the commanded surface deflections. Although the second and third approaches start with radically different philosophies, for first order systems, it can be shown that these two approaches are identical. For higher order or nonlinear systems, the comparison is not as straightforward.

This article presents an adaptive backstepping approach for longitudinal control of an aircraft that has state and actuator constraints. Both theoretical and simulation analyses are included. A novel aspect of this approach is the ability to accommodate magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints on the actuator signals and each of the intermediate control variables used in the backstepping control approach. Adaptive control has been applied to aircraft in for example \cite{15}. That article did not consider the effects of saturation on the closed loop performance.

2 Problem Formulation
Due to space limitations, the discussion of this article will focus on a simplified aircraft model with the same structure as the linearized, rigid body, aircraft longitudinal dynamics \cite{16}. The model is just complex enough to allow a presentation and analysis of the control design approach. Since the model has the same structure as aircraft longitudinal dynamics, the approach can be extended to a realistic nonlinear aircraft model. This extension is discussed further in the conclusions section.
Adaptive backstepping with magnitude, rate, and bandwidth constraints: Aircraft longitude control
The model that we will consider has the form

\[
\dot{\gamma} = L_o + L_o \alpha \\
\dot{\alpha} = Q - (L_o + L_o \alpha) \\
\dot{Q} = M_o + M_o Q + M_3 \delta,
\]

where the (normalized\(^1\)) lift force is modeled as \(L_o + L_o \alpha\) and the (normalized\(^2\)) pitch moment is modeled as \(M_o + M_o Q + M_3 \delta\). In this expression, \(\gamma\) is the flight path angle, \(\alpha\) is the angle of attack, \(Q\) is the pitch rate, and \(\delta\) is the control surface deflection. At an operating point, \(L_o, L_o, M_o, M_Q, M_3\) are known, constant, scalar parameters. Additional terms can be added to the lift or moment models without changing the theoretical approach. Most importantly, the approach directly extends to the case where multiple independent surfaces are available. These generalizations are not included here due to space limitations.

The corresponding tracking error dynamic equations are

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\tilde{\gamma}} &= L_o + L_o (\alpha_c + \tilde{\alpha}) - \tilde{\gamma}_c \\
\dot{\tilde{\alpha}} &= -(L_o + L_o \alpha) + Q_c + \tilde{Q} - \tilde{\alpha}_c \\
\dot{\tilde{Q}} &= M_o + M_o Q + M_3 \tilde{\delta} - \tilde{Q}_c,
\end{align*}
\]

where the tracking errors are defined as \(\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma - \gamma_c\), \(\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha - \alpha_c\), \(\tilde{Q} = Q - Q_c\).

Our goal is to generate a backstepping controller that will cause \(\gamma\) to track an input signal \(\gamma_c\). We assume that \(\gamma_c\) is smooth and that \(\tilde{\gamma}_c\) is known. In the backstepping approach, the \(\gamma\) controller will generate a commanded value \(\alpha^0\) for \(\alpha\). An \(\alpha\) controller will generate a \(Q^0\) command for \(Q\). The \(Q\) controller will generate the control surface command \(\delta^0\) to achieve the \(Q\) command.

Since an aircraft operating envelope includes constraints on both actuators and states, the controller must work in the presence of magnitude, rate, and bandwidth limits on \(\delta\) as well as operating envelope constraints on \(Q\) and \(\alpha\). In the formulation to follow, we will treat \((L_o, L_o, M_o, M_Q, M_3)\) as parameters to be identified. Therefore, we are implementing adaptive backstepping with control variable and state constraints. In the actual application, this set of linearization ‘parameters’ is a function of the operating conditions. Since the operating condition is slowly time varying, the adaptive laws would be required to adapt the parameters to match the local model. In the final full vehicle implementation, these ‘linearized parameters’ would be approximated as a function of the flight condition.

---

1 To simplify the notation, the \(\frac{1}{\rho V}\) factor at the operating point is included in the lift function.

2 To simplify the notation, the \(\frac{1}{\rho V^2}\) factor is included in the moment function.

3 Adaptive Backstepping with Saturation

The backstepping control laws are summarized below. The operating envelope requires \(\alpha\) to remain in the interval \([\alpha^L, \alpha^U]\) and \(Q\) to remain in the interval \([Q^L, Q^U]\).

The actuator design requires \(\delta\) to remain in the interval \([\delta^L, \delta^U]\). In addition, the actuator design will impose rate and bandwidth limitations on \(\delta\), which in turn will result in rate and bandwidth limitations on the intermediate variables \(Q_c\) and \(\alpha_c\). The above operating envelope and surface deflection constraints are assumed to be known and fixed.

The nominal backstepping commands are

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha^0_c &= \frac{1}{L_o} \left( -\dot{L}_o + \dot{\gamma}_c - k_\gamma \dot{\gamma}_c + \eta_\gamma \right) - \chi_\alpha \\
Q^0_c &= \left( \hat{\dot{L}}_o + \dot{\alpha}_c \right) - k_\alpha \alpha + \eta_\alpha + \dot{\alpha}_c - \gamma \dot{L}_o - \chi_Q \\
\delta^0_c &= \frac{1}{M_3} \left( -\dot{M}_o - \dot{M}_Q Q - k_Q \dot{Q} + \eta_Q - \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{Q}_c \right)
\end{align*}
\]

with \(k_\gamma, k_\alpha, k_Q > 0\). The robustifying terms \((\eta_\gamma, \eta_\alpha, \eta_Q)\) are motivated in the proof of the theorem to follow. The amplitude, rate, and bandwidth limited control signals can be defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
e_{\alpha} &= \left( \text{sat} \left( \alpha^0_c, \alpha^L_c, \alpha^U_c \right) - x_{\alpha1} \right) \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{x}_{\alpha1} \\
\dot{x}_{\alpha2}
\end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
0 & -2\zeta_\alpha \omega_\alpha
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
x_{\alpha1} \\
x_{\alpha2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\omega^2_\alpha
\end{bmatrix} \text{sat}(e_{\alpha}, -L_\alpha, L_\alpha) \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_c \\
\dot{\alpha}_c
\end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
x_{\alpha1} \\
x_{\alpha2}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

where the parameters of this filter are defined below. In this filter, \(e_{\alpha}\) is the error between the first filter state and the magnitude limited filter input. Since the first state of the filter is used in the computation of \(e_{\alpha}\), the characteristic equation of the filter is \(s^2 + 2\zeta_\alpha \omega_\alpha s + \omega^2_\alpha = 0\), in the linear portion of the two \text{sat} functions. The \text{sat} function in the second equation enforces the rate limit. At the filter output, \(\alpha_c\) is magnitude, rate, and bandwidth limited. The command filters for \(Q_c\) and \(\delta_c\) are defined similarly as

\[
\begin{align*}
e_Q &= \left( \text{sat} \left( Q^0_c, Q^L_c, Q^U_c \right) - x_{Q1} \right) \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{x}_{Q1} \\
\dot{x}_{Q2}
\end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
0 & -2\zeta_Q \omega_Q
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
x_{Q1} \\
x_{Q2}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\omega^2_\omega
\end{bmatrix} \text{sat}(e_Q, -L_Q, L_Q) \\
\begin{bmatrix}
Q_c \\
\dot{Q}_c
\end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
x_{Q1} \\
x_{Q2}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]
The parameter adaptation laws are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon_\delta &= (\text{sat}(\delta_0^c, \delta_t^c, \delta_U^c) - x_{\delta_1}) \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\delta}_1 \\
\dot{\delta}_2
\end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
0 & -2\zeta_0 \omega_{ns}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\delta_1 \\
\delta_2
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\omega_{ns}^2
\end{bmatrix} \text{sat}(\varepsilon_\delta, -L_\delta, L_\delta)
\end{align*}
\]

In these expressions, \(L_\alpha = \frac{2\zeta_0 R_\alpha}{\omega_{ns}^2}\), \(L_Q = \frac{2\zeta_0 R_Q}{\omega_{ns}^2}\), \(L_\delta = \frac{2\zeta_0 R_\delta}{\omega_{ns}^2}\) and \((R_\alpha, R_Q, R_\delta)\) are rate limits on \((\alpha, Q, \delta)\), respectively; \((\omega_{ns}, \omega_{n\alpha}, \omega_{n\delta})\) are bandwidth limits on \((\alpha, Q, \delta)\); \((\alpha_U^c, Q_U^c, \delta_U^c)\) are upper limits on \((\alpha, Q, \delta)\); \((\alpha_L^c, Q_L^c, \delta_L^c)\) are lower limits on \((\alpha, Q, \delta)\), and \(\text{sat}\) denotes the saturation function that is linear with unity slope between its lower and upper limits. This paragraph has presented one command filter approach, many other filters are possible without affecting the validity of the stability proofs. If the surface position can be measured, then the last filter is not required. Also the parameters of the above filters are not completely independent. For example, since the derivative of \(\alpha\) is closely related to \(Q\), the rate limit \(R_\alpha\) should be less than or equal to the magnitude limit \(Q_U^c\).

The vector \(\chi = [\chi_\gamma(t), \chi_\alpha(t), \chi_Q(t)]\) is generated by

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\chi}_\gamma &= -k_\gamma \chi_\gamma + \hat{L}_\alpha (\alpha_c - \alpha_0^c) \\
\dot{\chi}_\alpha &= -k_\alpha \chi_\alpha + (Q_c - Q_0^c) \\
\dot{\chi}_Q &= -k_Q \chi_Q + \hat{M}_\delta (\delta_c - \delta_0^c).
\end{align*}
\]

These signals are filtered versions of the effect of state and control rate, bandwidth, and magnitude constraints on the variable that is being controlled. Finally, we define the vector of modified tracking errors \(\bar{\varepsilon} = [\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{Q}]\) as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\gamma} &= \gamma - \chi_\gamma \\
\dot{\alpha} &= \alpha - \chi_\alpha \\
\dot{Q} &= Q - \chi_Q.
\end{align*}
\]

When there is no control variable saturation, \(\bar{\varepsilon}\) converges to \(\bar{\varepsilon}\). In the presence of state and control variable constraints, the signal \(\chi\) is used to remove the effects of the saturation from \(\bar{\varepsilon}\) to generated \(\bar{\varepsilon}\), which will be used in the parameter adaptation laws. The parameter adaptation laws are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\hat{M}}_\alpha &= \Gamma_3 \hat{Q} \\
\dot{\hat{L}}_\alpha &= \Gamma_1 (\hat{\gamma} - \hat{\alpha}) \\
\dot{\hat{M}}_Q &= \Gamma_4 \hat{Q} \hat{Q} \\
\dot{\hat{L}}_\alpha &= \Gamma_2 (\hat{\gamma} - \hat{\alpha}) \alpha \\
\dot{\hat{M}}_\delta &= \Gamma_5 \hat{Q} \delta,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\Gamma_i\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, 5\) are positive adaptation gains. The subsequent sections will show that the above control laws are stable even in the presence of state and control rate, bandwidth, and magnitude constraints. In an implementation, deadzones should be used to avoid parameter drift due to noise; and, projection methods must be used to ensure that the estimation transient does not cause \(L_\alpha\) or \(M_\delta\) to change sign.

### 4 Tracking Error Dynamics

Representing the actual parameters as the estimated parameter minus parameter estimation error: \(L_\alpha = \hat{L}_\alpha - L_\alpha, M_\alpha = \hat{M}_\alpha - M_\alpha, M_Q = \hat{M}_Q - M_Q, M_\delta = \hat{M}_\delta - M_\delta\); the dynamics of the modified tracking errors are

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\hat{\gamma}} &= \hat{\gamma} - \chi_\gamma \\
\dot{\hat{\alpha}} &= \hat{\alpha} - \chi_\alpha \\
\dot{\hat{Q}} &= \hat{Q} - \chi_Q.
\end{align*}
\]

The final numbered equations will be used in the subsequent stability analysis.

### 5 Lyapunov Analysis

The objective of this section is to prove the stability of the closed loop system using Lyapunov-like methods. The results are summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1** The closed loop system with dynamics described in Section 2 and controller described in Section 3 has the following properties:

1. \(\hat{L}_\alpha, \hat{L}_\alpha, \hat{M}_\alpha, \hat{M}_Q, \hat{M}_\delta \in \mathcal{L}_\infty\)
2. \(\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\alpha}, \text{ and } \bar{Q} \in \mathcal{L}_\infty\)
3. \(\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\alpha}, \text{ and } \bar{Q} \text{ converge to zero with } \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\alpha}, \text{ and } \bar{Q} \in \mathcal{L}_2\).

In addition, although we do not show it here, it is possible to show that given certain persistence of excitation conditions, the parameter errors converge exponentially to zero.

**Proof:** Define the \(\gamma\)-Lyapunov function as

\[
V = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^2 + \alpha^2 + \bar{Q}^2) + \frac{1}{2} \Theta^T \Gamma^{-1} \Theta
\]

where \(\Theta^T = [\hat{L}_\alpha, \hat{L}_\alpha, \hat{M}_\alpha, \hat{M}_Q, \hat{M}_\delta]\), \(\hat{\Theta}\) is the estimate of \(\Theta\), and \(\hat{\Theta} = \Theta - \Theta\). Taking the time derivative of \(V\) using eqns. (4-6) to eliminate \((\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{Q})\), and using eqns.
Each graph contains three curves. The dotted curve is the command. The solid curve is the magnitude, rate, and bandwidth limited command. The dashed curve is the actual state or actuator variable. Even though the initial parameter error is large, the transient in the control response is reasonable. Figure 2 includes graphs of the three components of $\bar{x}$ in the left column and the three components of $\bar{x}$ in the right column. Note that as the theory predicted, since there is no saturation, $\bar{x} \to \bar{x} = 0$.

The convergence of $\bar{x}$ to zero is not monotonic. However, the Lyapunov function is non-increasing. The left column of Figure 3 plots the norm of the parameter error, the norm of $\bar{x}$, and the norm defined by the square root of the Lyapunov function. Notice that although the norm of $\bar{x}$ is both increasing and decreasing, the Lyapunov function never increases. The right column of Figure 3 plots each component of $\hat{\Theta}$.

**6.2 Example: Substantial Saturation**

For this set of simulations, $\gamma_r$ is a 25s square wave with peak magnitude of $\pm$10 deg. The commands $\gamma_c$ and $\dot{\gamma}_c$ are the states of a second order, relative degree two, unity gain prefilter with $\zeta = 1$, and $\omega_n = k_{\gamma_r}$.

Figure 4 contains plots of the states and actuator signal for the first and last 25 seconds of a 150 s simulation. Even though the initial parameter error is large, the transient in the control response is reasonable. Note that the large $\gamma$ commands result in rate, magnitude, or bandwidth constraining the $\alpha$, $Q_c$, and $\delta_c$ variables. Figure 5 includes graphs of the three components of $\bar{x}$ in the left column and the three components of $\bar{x}$ in the right column. Note that as the theory predicted, since there is saturation, $\bar{x} \to \bar{x} = 0$, but $\bar{x}$ does not converge to zero. In spite of this fact, the parameter estimates converge toward the correct values. In fact, as shown in the right column of Figure 6, the parameters converge faster than they did in Figure 3. There is a significantly higher level of excitation in the present example, but the parameter estimates will only converge if the training error is properly compensated to remove the effects of the rate, magnitude, and bandwidth limitations on the control signals. The left column of Figure 6 contains plots of the norm of the parameter error, the norm of $\bar{x}$, and the norm defined by the square root of the Lyapunov function. Note that the Lyapunov function is non-increasing even during the periods of saturation.

**7 Conclusions**

This article has presented and analyzed an adaptive backstepping approach to the control of longitudinal aircraft dynamics that directly accommodates magnitude, rate, and bandwidth limits on the aircraft states and actuators. For this preliminary analysis, we have only considered a linearized aircraft point design. Due to the positive analysis of the performance, we are cur-
rently extending this research in four directions. First, we are extending the adaptive state and actuator constrained backstepping control approach to include control of lateral-directional dynamics. Second, we are extending the linearized adaptive approach to a nonlinear on-line function approximation based approach [6]. Third, we are extending the theoretical analysis as a general extension of the backstepping approach[13]. Finally, we have extended the results presented herein to the case where the vehicle has multiple, redundant and independent actuators.
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Table 1: Simulation Parameters: The first row of cells defines the parameters of the model. The second and third rows of cells define controller parameters. The fourth row of cells defines the state constraints and saturation limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$L_o$</th>
<th>$L_{ia}$</th>
<th>$M_o$</th>
<th>$M_Q$</th>
<th>$M_{\delta}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$\Gamma_1$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_2$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_3$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_4$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$k_r$</th>
<th>$k_\alpha$</th>
<th>$k_Q$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$\alpha^c_c$</th>
<th>$\alpha^c_c$</th>
<th>$Q_c$ limits</th>
<th>$\delta_c$ limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>-8.0 deg</td>
<td>15 deg</td>
<td>$\pm 15 , deg$</td>
<td>$\pm 45 , deg$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Plots of the aircraft tracking errors for $\gamma_r \in \pm 5 \, deg$.

(a) Tracking errors $\hat{x}$.

(b) Tracking errors $\dot{\hat{x}}$.

Figure 3: For $\gamma_r \in \pm 5 \, deg$: Left top - Plot of $\sqrt{\Theta(t)^T \Gamma^{-1} \Theta(t)}$ versus $t$. Left middle - Plot of $||\tilde{x}||$ versus $t$. Left bottom - Plot of $\sqrt{V(t)}$ versus $t$. Right - Plots of each component of $\dot{\Theta}$ versus $t$.

(a) Lyapunov quantities.

(b) Parameter estimates.
Figure 4: Plots of the aircraft state and control at the beginning and end of a 150 s simulation for \( \gamma_r \in \pm 10 \) deg: magnitude limited command (dotted), filtered command (solid), actual (dashed).

Figure 5: Plots of the aircraft tracking errors for \( \gamma_r \in \pm 10 \) deg.

Figure 6: For \( \gamma_r \in \pm 5 \) deg: Left top - Plot of \( \sqrt{\dot{\Theta}(t)^2 \Gamma^{-1} \dot{\Theta}(t)} \) versus t. Left middle - Plot of \( \|\dot{x}\| \) versus t. Left bottom - Plot of \( \sqrt{\dot{\gamma}(t)} \) versus t. Right - Plots of each component of \( \dot{\Theta} \) versus t.