Robust fault and icing diagnosis in unmanned aerial vehicles using LPV interval observers
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SUMMARY

This paper proposes a linear parameter varying (LPV) interval observer for the robust diagnosis of actuator faults and ice accretion in unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) described by an uncertain model. The proposed interval observer evaluates the set of values for the state which are compatible with the nominal fault-free and icing-free operation and is designed in such a way that some information about the nature of the unknown inputs affecting the system can be obtained, thus allowing the diagnosis to be performed. The developed theory is supported by simulations which illustrate the strong appeal of the methodology.
1. INTRODUCTION

Feedback control systems are vulnerable to malfunctions in actuators, sensors or other system components, which may have catastrophic consequences, e.g. instability of the closed-loop system. For this reason, fault tolerant control techniques have been investigated widely in the last decades, with the aim of maintaining stability and acceptable performances in the event of faults [1]. As a consequence, the problem of detecting and identifying faults has become a hot topic of research, leading to the development of fault diagnosis techniques [2] with several proposed solutions, involving geometric [3], observer-based [4] and multiple model [5] approaches, just to name a few.

Icing, i.e. the accretion of ice on the aircrafts’ surfaces is one of the most critical faults affecting aviation safety [6]. The aerodynamic consequences of icing (an increase in drag and a decrease in lift) have a strong effect on the aircraft’s performances, inducing a safety risk that can potentially lead to crashing [7]. In the case of small unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), some ice protection systems have been proposed recently in order to mitigate or eliminate the icing, based on heat conducting tapes [8] and electrically conductive carbon nanomaterial based coating for temperature control of UAV airfoil surfaces [9, 10]. However, due to the large power consumption, fault/icing detection schemes [11] with fast and accurate responses are needed for assuring high efficiency. The approaches recently applied to icing detection in aircrafts and UAVs include multiple models [12, 13], statistical methods [14], aerodynamic coefficient estimators [15] and environmental monitoring [16].

Unknown input observers (UIOs) are a special class of observers which allow estimating the state of a system independently of some unknown inputs [17]. UIOs are a very useful tool for achieving a successful fault detection and isolation [18], because they can be made insensitive to certain input space directions if some structural algebraic conditions on the system are fulfilled [19, 20]. This property has been exploited in some recent works in order to perform fault/icing diagnosis. In [21],
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a UIO-based diagnosis scheme able to decouple icing effects from actuators or sensors faults was proposed for the longitudinal steady-state dynamics of a UAV. In [22], this approach was generalized to the linear 6-DOF motion model with coupled longitudinal/lateral dynamics, and integrated with a fault tolerant allocation scheme. A linear parameter varying (LPV) UIO-based icing diagnosis scheme has been presented in [23], with the main advantage of being consistent with the aircraft dynamics for a wide range of operating conditions. Further, this work has been extended in [24], where an LPV proportional integral UIO has been used, with the advantage of being more robust against measurement noise.

The aforementioned approaches all share a common limitation, which is that they have been developed under the assumption of having a perfectly known model available for fault diagnosis purposes. However, it is well known that the presence of uncertainties coming from the mismatch between the model and the real system may impede the convergence of a classical observer to the exact value of the state [25, 26, 27]. In this situation, the use of interval observers is attractive because, under some assumptions, they can provide the set of admissible values for the state at each instant of time [28]. Unlike stochastic approaches, such as the Kalman filter [29], interval observers ignore any probability distribution at the sources of uncertainty, and assume that they are constrained in a known bounded set. Using this information, instead of a single trajectory for each state variable, the interval observer computes the lower and upper bounds, which are compatible with the uncertainty [30]. A successful framework for interval observer design is based on the monotone system theory, proposed at first by [31], and further investigated by [32, 33, 34].

The goal of this paper is to improve the results obtained in [24], by merging the theory of interval observers with the theory of UIOs, developing an LPV interval UIO which can be applied to achieve a robust fault and icing diagnosis in UAVs using an uncertain longitudinal model of their motion. From a theoretical point of view, the developed approach is an extension of the interval UIO described in [35] to the proportional integral case. The inclusion of an integral action is needed in order to avoid the estimation error dynamics to be affected by the sensor noise derivative, which can take big values due to the high-frequency content of the noise signal.
The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the notation and some preliminary background. Section 3 introduces the nonlinear and quasi-LPV model of a UAV, as well as the description of the icing effects. Section 4 describes the proportional integral interval observer which solves the problem of interval state estimation with null unknown input. Section 5 shows how the interval observer can be designed in order to behave as a UIO, such that robust fault and icing diagnosis is achieved. The proposed approach is illustrated using simulation results in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 summarizes the main conclusions.

2. NOTATION AND BACKGROUND

The set of (non-negative) real numbers will be denoted by \( \mathbb{R} \) (\( \mathbb{R}_+ \)). For a generic vector \( x \), the symbol \( n_x \) will denote its dimension. \( \mathcal{L}^m_{\infty} \) will denote the set of all signals \( u \) such that \( \|u\|_{\infty} = \sup \{ |u(t)|, t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \} < \infty \). Given a matrix \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \), \( He\{M\} \) will be used as a shorthand notation for \( M + M^T \). For two vectors \( x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \) or matrices \( M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \), the relations \( x_1 \leq x_2 \) and \( M_1 \leq M_2 \) are meant elementwise. The notation \( M^\dagger \) denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse [36] of the matrix \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \). If \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is symmetric, then \( M \in \mathbb{S}^{n \times n} \). The notation \( M \prec 0 \) (\( M \succ 0 \)) means that the matrix \( M \in \mathbb{S}^{n \times n} \) is negative (positive) definite. If \( M \in \mathbb{S}^{n \times n} \) is diagonal, then \( M \in \mathbb{D}^{n \times n} \). If all the elements of a matrix \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) outside the main diagonal are nonnegative, then \( M \in \mathbb{M}^{n \times n} \) will be called a Metzler matrix.

For a generic vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \), its \( i \)-th element will be denoted by \( x^{(i)} \). For a given matrix \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) and a set of column indices \( \mathcal{N} \), with \( \mathcal{N} \) a subset of \( \{1, \ldots, n_x\} \), the \( i \)-th column of \( M \) will be denoted by \( M^{(i)} \), while \( M^{(\mathcal{N})} \) will denote the matrix obtained from \( M \) by replacing all columns whose indices do not belong to \( \mathcal{N} \) with zeros. Also, the notation \( \Pi(M)x \) will denote the projection of \( x \) onto the subspace generated by the columns of \( M \). Given a set \( \mathcal{J} \), the notation \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{J}) \) will denote the power set of \( \mathcal{J} \), i.e. the set of all subsets of \( \mathcal{J} \), including the empty set and \( \mathcal{J} \) itself. In order to ease the notation, in many cases, the explicit dependence of the variables on time \( t \) is omitted.
Given a vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), let us define \( x^+ = \max \{ 0, x \} \), where \( \max \) denotes the elementwise maximum, \( x^- = x^+ - x \), and let us denote the matrix of absolute values of all elements by \( |x| = x^+ + x^- \). Then, the following lemma holds [26].

**Lemma 1**

Let \( M \leq M' \leq M'' \) for some \( M, M', M'' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) with \( M \leq 0, M' \geq 0 \) and \( x \leq x' \leq x'' \) for \( x, x', x'' \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Then:

\[
Mx^+ - Mx^- \leq Mx' \leq Mx'^+ - Mx'^-
\]

(*Proof of Lemma 1*: See [26]. □)

### 3. MODEL AND SETUP

#### 3.1. Nonlinear model

The longitudinal equations of motion of a UAV, under normal flight conditions (low angle-of-attack) consist of two equations for the airspeed components (\( u \) and \( w \), i.e. the horizontal and the vertical components, respectively), an equation for the pitch rate \( q \) and an equation for the pitch angle \( \theta \) [37]:

\[
\dot{u} = -qw - g \sin \theta + \frac{\rho V_a^2 S}{2m} \left[ -(C_{D_h} + C_{D_a} \alpha) \cos \alpha + (C_{L_a} + C_{L_a} \alpha) \sin \alpha \right. \\
\left. + (C_{D_q} \sin \alpha - C_{D_q} \cos \alpha) \frac{c q}{2 V_a} + (C_{L_q} \sin \alpha - C_{D_q} \cos \alpha) \delta_e \right] + \frac{\rho S_{prop} C_{prop}}{2m} (k_m^2 \delta_e^2 - V_a^2) \tag{2}
\]

\[
\dot{w} = qu + g \cos \theta + \frac{\rho V_a^2 S}{2m} \left[ -(C_{D_h} + C_{D_a} \alpha) \sin \alpha - (C_{L_a} + C_{L_a} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right. \\
\left. - (C_{D_q} \sin \alpha + C_{L_q} \cos \alpha) \frac{c q}{2 V_a} - (C_{D_q} \sin \alpha + C_{L_q} \cos \alpha) \delta_e \right] \tag{3}
\]

\[
\dot{q} = \frac{\rho V_a^2 S c}{2 J_y} \left( C_{m_0} + C_{m_0} \alpha + C_{m_4} \frac{c q}{2 V_a} + C_{m_4} \delta_e \right) \tag{4}
\]

\[
\dot{\theta} = q \tag{5}
\]

where \( \rho \) is the air density, \( S \) is the wing surface area, \( m \) is the airframe mass, \( \alpha \) is the angle-of-attack, \( c \) is the mean aerodynamic chord of the wing, \( S_{prop} \) is the area of the propeller, \( k_m \) is the constant that specifies the efficiency of the motor, \( J_y \) is an element of the inertia matrix and \( V_a \) is the total airspeed with respect to the air mass. The inputs entering the system are the thrust command
\( \delta_t \) and the elevator deflection \( \delta_e \). Finally, the non-dimensional coefficients \( C_i \) are usually referred to as stability and control derivatives. Even without any icing or other faults, it is assumed that the stability and control derivatives are uncertain, i.e. they can be expressed as:

\[
C_i = \bar{C}_i + \Delta C_i
\]

(6)

where \( \bar{C}_i \) is the nominal value, which is assumed to be known, and \( \Delta C_i \) corresponds to the uncertainty, which is unknown but bounded by known bounds. The parameters appearing in the nonlinear longitudinal model (2)-(5) depend on the considered UAV. In this example, values corresponding to a Zagi Flying Wing UAV are used [37], as listed in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m ) 1.56 kg</td>
<td>( \bar{C}_{L_0} ) 0.09167</td>
<td>( \bar{C}_{D_0} ) 0.01631</td>
<td>( \bar{C}_{m_l} ) -1.3990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( J_y ) 0.0576 kg m²</td>
<td>( \bar{C}_{D_0} ) 0.01631</td>
<td>( \bar{C}_{m_l} ) -1.3990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S ) 0.2589 m²</td>
<td>( \bar{C}_{m_0} ) -0.02338</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{L</em>{\delta_e}} ) 0.2724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c ) 0.3302 m</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{L</em>{\alpha}} ) 3.5016</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{D</em>{\delta_e}} ) 0.3045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_{prop} ) 0.0314 m²</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{D</em>{\alpha}} ) 0.2108</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{m</em>{\delta_e}} ) -0.3254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho ) 1.2682 kg/m³</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{m</em>{\alpha}} ) -0.5675</td>
<td>( C_{prop} ) 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_m ) 20</td>
<td>( \bar{C}<em>{L</em>{\bar{q}}} ) 2.8932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wind acceleration acts as an additive disturbance vector \( \mathcal{W} \) given by:

\[
\mathcal{W} = \begin{pmatrix}
-\cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\
-\sin \theta & \cos \theta \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{\omega}_x \\
\dot{\omega}_z
\end{pmatrix} = H_1(\theta)\dot{\omega}_x + H_2(\theta)\dot{\omega}_z \tag{7}
\]

where \( \dot{\omega}_x \) and \( \dot{\omega}_z \) are the wind accelerations in the horizontal and vertical direction in the inertial frame, respectively.

In this paper, we will consider multiplicative actuator faults, described by actuator effectiveness terms ranging between two extreme values, i.e. 0 (total loss) and 1 (healthy behaviour). These faults
can be represented as an unknown input term $F$ given by:

$$
F = \left( \begin{array}{c}
\frac{\rho S_{\text{prop}} C_{L e}}{2m} k_m \delta_l^2 (\phi_l - 1) + \frac{\rho S V_t^2}{2m} (C_L e \sin \alpha - C_D e \cos \alpha) \delta_e (\phi_e - 1) \\
- \frac{\rho S V_t^2}{2m} (C_D e \sin \alpha + C_L e \cos \alpha) \delta_e (\phi_e - 1) \\
\frac{\rho S V_t^2 e_m}{2L} \delta_e (\phi_e - 1) \\
0
\end{array} \right) 
$$

(8)

where $\phi_l$ and $\phi_e$ represent the effectiveness of propulsion and elevator, respectively.

3.2. Quasi-LPV model

Taking into account the relations between $u$, $w$, $V_a$ and $\alpha$:

$$V_a = \sqrt{u^2 + w^2}$$

(9)

$$\alpha = \arctan \left( \frac{w}{u} \right)$$

(10)

the nonlinear model (2)-(5) can be brought to a quasi-LPV form using the nonlinear embedding in the parameters approach [39, 40], as follows:

$$
\dot{x} = [A(u,w,q,\theta) + \Delta A(u,w,q,\theta)]x + [B(u,w) + \Delta B(u,w)]v
+ [B_{\text{un}}(u,w) + \Delta B_{\text{un}}(u,w)]v_{\text{un}} + k(\theta) + d(\theta)
$$

(11)

where $x = (u,w,q,\theta)^T$ is the state vector, $v = (\delta_l^2, \delta_e)^T$ is the known input (control action),

$v_{\text{un}} = ((\phi_l - 1) \delta_l^2, (\phi_e - 1) \delta_e, \omega_x)^T$ is the unknown input, $k(\theta) = (-g \sin \theta, g \cos \theta, 0, 0)^T$ is a known term and $d(\theta) = (-\dot{\omega}_x \cos \theta, -\dot{\omega}_x \sin \theta, 0, 0)^T$ is an unknown disturbance. The matrix functions $A(\cdot), B(\cdot), B_{\text{un}}(\cdot)$ are known, whereas $\Delta A(\cdot), \Delta B(\cdot), \Delta B_{\text{un}}(\cdot)$ are unknown and represent the modelling uncertainties. These matrix functions have the following structure (the expressions of the coefficients appearing in the matrices are reported in Appendix):

$$
A(\cdot) = \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{a}_{11}(\cdot) & \tilde{a}_{12}(\cdot) & \tilde{a}_{13}(\cdot) & 0 \\
\tilde{a}_{21}(\cdot) & \tilde{a}_{22}(\cdot) & \tilde{a}_{23}(\cdot) & 0 \\
\tilde{a}_{31}(\cdot) & \tilde{a}_{32}(\cdot) & \tilde{a}_{33}(\cdot) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \Delta A(\cdot) = \begin{bmatrix}
\Delta a_{11}(\cdot) & \Delta a_{12}(\cdot) & \Delta a_{13}(\cdot) & 0 \\
\Delta a_{21}(\cdot) & \Delta a_{22}(\cdot) & \Delta a_{23}(\cdot) & 0 \\
\Delta a_{31}(\cdot) & \Delta a_{32}(\cdot) & \Delta a_{33}(\cdot) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(12)
\[
B(\cdot) = \\
\begin{pmatrix}
\bar{b}_{11} & \bar{b}_{12}(\cdot) \\
0 & \bar{b}_{22}(\cdot) \\
0 & \bar{b}_{32}(\cdot) \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \\
\Delta B(\cdot) = \\
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \Delta b_{12}(\cdot) \\
0 & \Delta b_{22}(\cdot) \\
0 & \Delta b_{32}(\cdot) \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(13)

\[
B_{un}(\cdot) = \\
\begin{pmatrix}
\bar{b}_{11} & \bar{b}_{12}(\cdot) & -\sin \theta \\
0 & \bar{b}_{22}(\cdot) & \cos \theta \\
0 & \bar{b}_{32}(\cdot) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \\
\Delta B_{un}(\cdot) = \\
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & \Delta b_{12}(\cdot) & 0 \\
0 & \Delta b_{22}(\cdot) & 0 \\
0 & \Delta b_{32}(\cdot) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
(14)

On the other hand, assuming that the UAV is equipped with airspeed measurement device (pitot tube), GPS and inertial sensors, all state variables are supposed to be available and hence the output equation reads:

\[
y = x + v
\]
(15)

where \(y\) is the output vector and \(v\) is the measurement noise. In the following sections, the interval UIO approach will be developed for an output equation given by (15). However, it can be extended to the more general case where the output equation is given by:

\[
y = Cx + v
\]
(16)

with \(C\) full row rank matrix, although at the cost of increasing the mathematical complexity. In order to keep the formulation simple, such case will not be detailed in this paper.

For further reasoning, let us rewrite (11) in a more general form:

\[
\dot{x} = [A(\vartheta) + \Delta A(\vartheta)]x + [B(\vartheta) + \Delta B(\vartheta)]v + [B_{un}(\vartheta) + \Delta B_{un}(\vartheta)]v_{un} + k(\vartheta) + d(\vartheta)
\]
(17)

where \(\vartheta \in \Theta\) is some varying parameter vector, containing exogenous variables, endogenous variables (e.g. states and/or inputs), or a combination of them, and \(\Theta\) is a known closed an bounded set.

**Remark:** It is worth highlighting that although (11) is in a linear form, it is an equivalent representation of the nonlinear equations that describe the longitudinal equations of motion of a UAV (no linearization is performed).
3.3. Icing effects

The accretion of ice on the UAV surfaces modifies the stability and control derivatives according to the following linear model [41]:

\[
C_i^* = (1 + \eta K_i) C_i
\]

(18)

where \( \eta \) is the icing severity factor and the coefficient \( K_i \) depends on aircraft design and atmospheric conditions. The clean condition corresponds to \( \eta = 0 \), while the worst icing condition occurs for \( \eta = 0.2 \).

As a consequence, the overall icing effect can be modeled as an additive time-dependent disturbance term \( \mathcal{E}(u, w, q) \eta \), where \( \eta \) is a scalar unknown quantity and the vector \( \mathcal{E}(u, w, q) \) is given by:

\[
\mathcal{E}(u, w, q) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{E}_1(u, w, q) & \mathcal{E}_2(u, w, q) & \mathcal{E}_3(u, w, q) & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T
\]

(19)

with:

\[
\mathcal{E}_1(u, w, q) = \frac{\rho V_w^2 S}{2m} \left[ (K_{L_0}C_{L_0} + K_{L_a}C_{L_a}\alpha) \sin \alpha - (K_{D_0}C_{D_0} + K_{D_a}C_{D_a} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right. \\
+ \left. (K_{L_q}C_{L_q}\sin \alpha - K_{D_q}C_{D_q} \cos \alpha) \frac{c q}{2 V_a} + \left( K_{L_{\delta_k}}C_{L_{\delta_k}} \sin \alpha - K_{D_{\delta_k}}C_{D_{\delta_k}} \cos \alpha \right) \delta_e \right]
\]

(20)

\[
\mathcal{E}_2(u, w, q) = -\frac{\rho V_w^2 S}{2m} \left[ (K_{D_0}C_{D_0} + K_{D_a}C_{D_a} \alpha) \sin \alpha + (K_{L_0}C_{L_0} + K_{L_a}C_{L_a} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right. \\
+ \left. (K_{D_q}C_{D_q} \sin \alpha + K_{L_q}C_{L_q} \cos \alpha) \frac{c q}{2 V_a} + \left( K_{D_{\delta_k}}C_{D_{\delta_k}} \sin \alpha + K_{L_{\delta_k}}C_{L_{\delta_k}} \cos \alpha \right) \delta_e \right]
\]

(21)

\[
\mathcal{E}_3(u, w, q) = \frac{\rho V_w^2 S e}{2 J_y} \left( K_{m_0}C_{m_0} + K_{m_a}C_{m_a} \alpha + K_{m_q}C_{m_q} \frac{c q}{2 V_a} + K_{m_{\delta_k}}C_{m_{\delta_k}} \delta_e \right)
\]

(22)

4. INTERVAL STATE OBSERVATION WITH NULL UNKNOWN INPUT

As recalled in the introduction, interval observers evaluate the set of admissible values for the state at each instant of time. In this section, the concept of interval observers will be extended to a proportional integral structure. The proportional integral observer will compute lower and upper bounds for the state expressed in a time varying basis, i.e. transformed by a change of basis through a parameter varying matrix function \( R(\varphi) \). This change of basis will be of paramount importance in order to perform a successful icing/fault diagnosis, as explained later in the following. In general,
the interval observer will require the knowledge of \( \dot{\vartheta} \). However, as it will be discussed later, in the case of fault/icing diagnosis, this requirement can be relaxed. Before stating the problem, let us introduce an assumption about the boundedness of disturbances, noise and uncertainties.

**Assumption 1.** The signal \( v \) is such that \(|v| \leq V \) for all \( t \geq 0 \) and some known \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v} \). Moreover, given an invertible and continuous matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x} \), there exist \( d_R(\vartheta), \overline{d}_R(\vartheta) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \), \( \overline{A}_R(\vartheta), \overline{A}_R(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x} \) and \( \overline{B}_R(\vartheta), \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_v} \), with \( \overline{A}_R(\vartheta), \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \leq 0 \) and \( \overline{A}_R(\vartheta), \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \geq 0 \), such that for all \( \vartheta \in \Theta \):

\[
d_R(\vartheta) - R(\vartheta) d(\vartheta) \leq \overline{d}_R(\vartheta) \tag{23}
\]

\[
\overline{A}_R(\vartheta) \leq A_R(\vartheta) = R(\vartheta) A(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} \leq \overline{A}_R(\vartheta) \tag{24}
\]

\[
\overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \leq B_R(\vartheta) \leq \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \tag{25}
\]

**Remark:** The assumption that \( \overline{A}_R(\vartheta), \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \leq 0 \) and \( \overline{A}_R(\vartheta), \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \geq 0 \) is not strictly needed, but allows keeping the mathematical formulation simple.

**Problem 1:** Given an invertible and continuous matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x} \), determine an LPV proportional integral observer which computes \( \underline{x} \) and \( \overline{x} \) such that:

\[
x_R = R(\vartheta) \underline{x} \leq x_R = R(\vartheta) x \leq \overline{x}_R = R(\vartheta) \overline{x} \quad \forall t \geq 0 \tag{26}
\]

with \( \underline{x}_R, \overline{x}_R \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \), provided that:

\[
x_R(0) \leq x_R(0) \leq \overline{x}_R(0) \tag{27}
\]

\[
v_{un} = 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0 \tag{28}
\]

and Assumption 1 holds.

The LPV proportional integral observer proposed in order to solve Problem 1 can be conveniently decomposed into two coupled subsystems, i.e. a lower bound observer, which provides \( \underline{x} \), as follows:

\[
\dot{z} = A(\vartheta) \underline{z} + B(\vartheta) v + k(\vartheta) + A(\vartheta) \Sigma(\vartheta) w - \bar{\Sigma}(\vartheta) w + R(\vartheta)^{-1} (d_R(\vartheta) - |R(\vartheta)\Sigma(\vartheta)K(\vartheta)| V)
\]

\[
+ R(\vartheta)^{-1} \left[ \overline{A}_R(\vartheta) \underline{x}_R^+ - \overline{A}_R(\vartheta) \underline{x}_R^- + \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \nu^+ - \overline{B}_R(\vartheta) \nu^- \right] \tag{29}
\]

\[
\dot{w} = \bar{K}(\vartheta) (v - \underline{x}) \tag{30}
\]

\[
\underline{x} = \bar{z} + \bar{\Sigma}(\vartheta) w \tag{31}
\]
and an upper bound observer, which provides \( \bar{x} \), as follows:

\[
\dot{z} = A(\vartheta)z + B(\vartheta)\nu + k(\vartheta) + A(\vartheta)\mathbf{T}(\vartheta)\bar{w} - \mathbf{T}(\vartheta)\bar{w} + R(\vartheta)^{-1}(\dot{d}_R(\vartheta) + |R(\vartheta)\mathbf{T}(\vartheta)\mathbf{K}(\vartheta)|V) \\
+ R(\vartheta)^{-1}\left[\Delta A_R(\vartheta)\bar{x}_R^+ - \Delta A_R(\vartheta)x_R^- + \Delta B_R(\vartheta)\nu^+ - \Delta B_R(\vartheta)\nu^-\right] \\
\dot{\bar{w}} = \mathbf{K}(\vartheta)(y - \bar{x}) \\
\bar{x} = z + \mathbf{T}(\vartheta)\bar{w}
\]

(32)

where \( \dot{\mathbf{T}}(\vartheta) \) and \( \dot{\mathbf{K}}(\vartheta) \) can be obtained from \( \mathbf{T}(\vartheta) \) and \( \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \), respectively, by differentiating each element with respect to time\(^\dagger\).

**Remark:** The terms post-multiplying \( R(\vartheta)^{-1} \) in (29) and (32) take into account the known bounds of disturbances, noise and uncertainties, in order to provide an interval estimation of the state transformed through the parameter varying matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \).

The following theorem provides the conditions which should be satisfied by the gains \( \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \), \( \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \), \( \mathbf{T}(\vartheta) \) and \( \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \) to ensure an interval estimation of \( x_R \) and the boundedness of \( x_R^+, x_R^- \), as specified in Problem 1.

**Theorem 1**

Let Assumption 1 be satisfied, \( x \in \mathbb{L}_x^n \), \( \nu \in \mathbb{L}_\nu^n \), \( k \in \mathbb{L}_k^n \), the matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \) be invertible, and the proportional integral integral observer be given by (29)-(34). Then, if there exist matrix functions \( \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \), \( \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \), \( \mathbf{T}(\vartheta) \), \( \mathbf{T}(\vartheta) \) such that:

\[
F(\vartheta) = \left[R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta) - R(\vartheta)\mathbf{T}(\vartheta)\mathbf{K}(\vartheta) + \dot{R}(\vartheta)\right]R(\vartheta)^{-1} \in \mathbb{M}_n \times n_x
\]

(35)

\[
\bar{F}(\vartheta) = \left[R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta) - R(\vartheta)\mathbf{T}(\vartheta)\mathbf{K}(\vartheta) + \dot{R}(\vartheta)\right]R(\vartheta)^{-1} \in \mathbb{M}_n \times n_x
\]

(36)

the relation (26) is satisfied provided that (27)-(28) hold.

\(^\dagger\)In general, \( \dot{\mathbf{T}}(\vartheta) \) will depend also on \( \dot{\vartheta} \). However, since an augmented varying parameter vector made up by \( \vartheta \) and \( \dot{\vartheta} \) could be considered for further reasoning, the dependence of a matrix on \( \dot{\vartheta} \) will be left implicit to ease the notation.
In addition, if there exist \( P, Q \in S^{2n_x \times 2n_x} \), \( P, Q \succ 0 \) and constants \( \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \gamma > 0 \) such that the following matrix inequality is verified:

\[
\Phi(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix}
G(\theta)^TP + PG(\theta) + (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)P + Q + \gamma \eta(\theta)^2I_{2n_x} & 0 \\
0 & \varepsilon_1^{-1}P - \gamma I_{2n_x}
\end{pmatrix} \preceq 0
\] (37)

where:

\[
\eta(\theta) = 2 \left( \| \Delta A_R(\theta) \|_2 + \| \Delta \lambda(\theta) \|_2 \right)
\] (38)

\[
G(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix}
F(\theta) & 0 \\
0 & F(\theta) + \Delta A_R(\theta)
\end{pmatrix}
\] (39)

then \( x_R, \overline{x_R} \in L^\infty_{\infty} \).

The theorem statement consists of two parts. Eqs. (35)-(36) guarantee that, at each instant of time, the true state of the LPV system described by (15) and (17) will lie inside the region defined by the lower and upper estimates. On the other hand, the feasibility of the matrix inequality (37) ensures that such estimates will remain bounded, i.e. they will not diverge. Also in this case, \( \dot{R}(\theta) \) can be obtained from \( R(\theta) \) by differentiating each of its elements with respect to time.

**Proof of Theorem 1:** Let us consider the dynamics of the interval estimation errors \( \underline{e} \) and \( \overline{e} \), defined as follows:

\[
\underline{e} = R(\theta)(x - \underline{x}) = x_R - \underline{x}_R
\] (40)

\[
\overline{e} = R(\theta)(\overline{x} - x) = \overline{x}_R - x_R
\] (41)

which, taking into account (15), (17) and (29)-(34), become:

\[
\dot{\underline{e}} = F(\theta)\underline{e} + R(\theta)(B_{un}(\theta) + \Delta B_{un}(\theta))\nu_{un} + \sum_{i=1}^{4} \sigma_i
\] (42)

\[
\dot{\overline{e}} = F(\theta)\overline{e} - R(\theta)(B_{un}(\theta) + \Delta B_{un}(\theta))\nu_{un} + \sum_{i=1}^{4} \overline{\sigma_i}
\] (43)
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where \( \mathcal{E}(\vartheta) \) and \( \mathcal{F}(\vartheta) \) are defined as in (35)-(36), and:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_1 &= |R(\vartheta)T(\vartheta)K(\vartheta)|V - R(\vartheta)T(\vartheta)K(\vartheta)v \\
\sigma_2 &= R(\vartheta)d(\vartheta) - d_R(\vartheta) \\
\sigma_3 &= \Delta A_R(\vartheta)x_R + \Delta A_R(\vartheta)x_R - \Delta A_R(\vartheta)x_R^+ \\
\sigma_4 &= R(\vartheta)\Delta B(\vartheta)v + \Delta B_R(\vartheta)v - \Delta B_R(\vartheta)v^+ \\
\sigma_5 &= |R(\vartheta)T(\vartheta)K(\vartheta)|V + R(\vartheta)T(\vartheta)K(\vartheta)v \\
\sigma_6 &= \overline{d}_R(\vartheta) - R(\vartheta)d(\vartheta) \\
\sigma_7 &= \overline{\Delta A}_R(\vartheta)x_R^+ - \Delta A_R(\vartheta)x_R^+ - \Delta A_R(\vartheta)x_R \\
\sigma_8 &= \overline{\Delta B}_R(\vartheta)v^+ - \Delta B_R(\vartheta)v^+ - R(\vartheta)\Delta B(\vartheta)v
\end{align*}
\]

When (28) holds, since \( \mathcal{E}(\vartheta), \mathcal{F}(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x} \), then any solution of (42)-(43) is elementwise nonnegative for all \( t \geq 0 \), i.e. (26), provided that \( e(0) \geq 0, \bar{e}(0) \geq 0, \sigma_i \geq 0 \) and \( \sigma_j \geq 0 \) \forall t \geq 0, \forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4 [42], \( e(0) \geq 0 \) and \( \bar{e}(0) \geq 0 \) hold due to (27). The terms \( \sigma_i, \sigma_j, i = 1, 2 \), are nonnegative \forall t \geq 0 \) due to Assumption 1 (see (23)). On the other hand, \( \sigma_3, \sigma_5 \) remain nonnegative as long as (26) holds, according to Lemma 1 and Assumption 1 (see (24)). (26) holds for \( t = 0 \), due to \( e(0) \geq 0, \bar{e}(0) \geq 0, \) and (26) is preserved \forall t \geq 0 \) by induction, as long as \( \sigma_4, \sigma_8 \) remain nonnegative too. Indeed, also \( \sigma_4, \sigma_8 \) remain nonnegative because of Lemma 1 and Assumption 1 (see (25)).

Let us show that the variables \( x_R \) and \( \overline{x}_R \) stay bounded \forall t \geq 0. For this purpose, let us write the equations that rule the dynamics of \( x_R \) and \( \overline{x}_R \) as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_R &= \mathcal{E}(\vartheta)x_R + f(x_R, \overline{x}_R) + \bar{\delta} \\
\dot{\overline{x}}_R &= (\mathcal{F}(\vartheta) + \Delta A_R(\vartheta)) \overline{x}_R + \overline{f}(x_R, \overline{x}_R) + \bar{\delta}
\end{align*}
\]
with:

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}) &= \Delta A_R(\vartheta) \mathbf{x}_R^+ - \overline{\Delta A_R}(\vartheta) \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}^- \\
\overline{F}(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}) &= \Delta A_R(\vartheta) \mathbf{x}_R^- - \overline{\Delta A_R}(\vartheta) \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}^+
\end{align*}
\]  

(54)  

(55)

\[\delta = R(\vartheta) \overline{F}(\vartheta) \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \mathbf{v} - |R(\vartheta) \overline{F}(\vartheta) \mathbf{K}(\vartheta)\| V + R(\vartheta) B(\vartheta) \mathbf{v} + R(\vartheta) k(\vartheta) + d_R(\vartheta) + \Delta B_R(\vartheta) \mathbf{v}^+ - \overline{\Delta B_R}(\vartheta) \mathbf{v}^- \]

(56)

\[\bar{\delta} = R(\vartheta) \overline{F}(\vartheta) \mathbf{K}(\vartheta) \mathbf{v} + |R(\vartheta) \overline{F}(\vartheta) \mathbf{K}(\vartheta)\| V + R(\vartheta) B(\vartheta) \mathbf{v} + R(\vartheta) k(\vartheta) + \overline{d_R}(\vartheta) + \Delta B_R(\vartheta) \mathbf{v}^+ - \overline{\Delta B_R}(\vartheta) \mathbf{v}^- \]

(57)

Clearly, for all \(\vartheta \in \Theta\), \(f\) and \(\overline{F}\) satisfy:

\[
\left| f(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}) \right| \leq \left\| \Delta A_R(\vartheta) \right\|_2 \left| \mathbf{x}_R \right| + \left\| \overline{\Delta A_R}(\vartheta) \right\|_2 \left| \mathbf{x}_\bar{R} \right| \]

(58)

\[
\left| \overline{F}(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}) \right| \leq \left\| \Delta A_R(\vartheta) \right\|_2 \left| \mathbf{x}_R \right| + \left\| \overline{\Delta A_R}(\vartheta) \right\|_2 \left| \mathbf{x}_\bar{R} \right|
\]  

(59)

and the inputs \(\delta, \bar{\delta}\) are bounded by Assumption 1 and the fact that \(\mathbf{x} \in L^m_{\infty}, \mathbf{v} \in L^m_{\infty}, k \in L^m_{\infty}\).

To prove the boundedness of the solution of the observer (29)-(34), let us rewrite (52)-(53) as:

\[
\dot{\xi} = G(\vartheta) \xi + \phi(\xi) + \delta
\]

where:

\[
\xi = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_R \\ \mathbf{x}_\bar{R} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}) \\ \overline{F}(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta = \begin{pmatrix} \delta \\ \bar{\delta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad |\phi(\xi)| \leq \eta(\vartheta) |\xi|
\]

Let us consider a Lyapunov function \(V = \xi^T P \xi\), whose derivative takes the form:

\[
V = \xi^T \left[ G(\vartheta)^T P + P G(\vartheta) \right] \xi + 2\phi(\xi)^T P \xi + 2\delta^T P \xi
\]

\[
\leq \begin{pmatrix} \xi & \phi(\xi)^T \end{pmatrix} \Phi(\vartheta) \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \phi(\xi) \end{pmatrix} + e_2^{-1} \delta^T P \delta - \xi^T Q \xi \leq e_2^{-1} \delta^T P \delta - \xi^T Q \xi
\]

(60)

where \(\Phi(\vartheta)\) is given by (37). Then, \(\mathbf{x}_R, \mathbf{x}_\bar{R} \in L^m_{\infty}\). \(\Box\)

Given the matrix functions \(\mathbf{K}(\vartheta), \mathbf{K}(\vartheta), \overline{F}(\vartheta), \mathbf{F}(\vartheta)\) (interval observer gains), the conditions provided by Theorem 1, i.e. (35)-(37), allow analysing whether or not the observer (29)-(34)
will provide a bounded interval estimation of the state. At the expense of introducing some conservativeness, it is possible to derive conditions for performing the design, i.e. for the case where $K(\vartheta)$, $\bar{K}(\vartheta)$, $T(\vartheta)$, $\bar{T}(\vartheta)$ are not given, such that they are obtained as part of the solution of the LMIs. This can be done using the following corollary.

**Corollary 1**

Let Assumption 1 be satisfied, $x \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, $v \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, $k \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, and the matrix function $R(\vartheta)$ be invertible. Also, let us assume that there exist an elementwise nonnegative matrix:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{P} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $P, \bar{P} \in \mathbb{S}_{n_\times n_\times}$, $P, \bar{P} \succ 0$, a matrix function:

$$\begin{pmatrix} W(\vartheta) & 0 \\ 0 & W(\vartheta) \end{pmatrix}$$

with $W(\vartheta), \bar{W}(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}_{n_\times n_\times}$, a matrix $Q \in \mathbb{S}_{2n_\times 2n_\times}$, a sufficiently large matrix function $\Sigma(\vartheta) \in \mathcal{D}_{2n_\times 2n_\times}$ and constants $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \gamma > 0$ such that:

$$P \begin{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta) + \bar{R}(\vartheta) & 0 \\ 0 & [R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta) + \bar{R}(\vartheta)]R(\vartheta)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} & W(\vartheta)Y(\vartheta) + PS(\vartheta) \geq 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta) + \bar{R}(\vartheta) & 0 \\ 0 & [R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta) + \bar{R}(\vartheta)]R(\vartheta)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \leq 0$$

with $\eta(\vartheta)$ defined as in (38) and:

$$\Xi(\vartheta) = \begin{pmatrix} R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta)R(\vartheta)^{-1} + \bar{R}(\vartheta)R(\vartheta)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & R(\vartheta)A(\vartheta)R(\vartheta)^{-1} + \bar{R}(\vartheta)R(\vartheta)^{-1} + \Delta R(\vartheta) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Upsilon(\vartheta) = \begin{pmatrix} CR(\vartheta)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & CR(\vartheta)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$
Then, the proportional integral interval observer (29)-(34) with matrices $K(\vartheta)$, $\overline{K}(\vartheta)$, $\overline{T}(\vartheta)$, $\overline{\tau}(\vartheta)$ satisfying:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\overline{T}(\vartheta)K(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & \overline{T}(\vartheta)\overline{K}(\vartheta)
\end{pmatrix} = 
\begin{pmatrix}
R(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & R(\vartheta)
\end{pmatrix}^{-1}P^{-1}W(\vartheta)
\]

is such that the relation (26) holds provided that (27)-(28) are satisfied, with $\underline{x}_R$, $\overline{x}_R \in L_1^\infty$.

**Proof of Corollary 1:** The matrix inequality (63) can be obtained easily from (37) through the change of variables:

\[
W(\vartheta) = 
\begin{pmatrix}
PR(\vartheta)\overline{T}(\vartheta)K(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & PR(\vartheta)\overline{T}(\vartheta)\overline{K}(\vartheta)
\end{pmatrix}
\]

which explains why $K(\vartheta)$, $\overline{K}(\vartheta)$, $\overline{T}(\vartheta)$, $\overline{\tau}(\vartheta)$ are calculated as (67). On the other hand, (64) corresponds to the verification of the Metzler property (35)-(36). □

**Remark:** It must be pointed out that both Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 rely on the satisfaction of infinite conditions. However, this difficulty can be overcome by gridding $\Theta$ using $N$ points $\vartheta_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Then, once $\varepsilon_1$ and $\varepsilon_2$ have been chosen, the analysis/design problem reduces to finding a feasible solution of a set of LMIs, which can be done efficiently using available solvers, e.g. YALMIP/SeDuMi [43, 44]. By relying on the gridding approach, the theoretical properties would be guaranteed only for $\vartheta = \vartheta_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, i.e. at the gridding points. However, from a practical point of view, it is reasonable to assume that if the gridding of $\Theta$ is dense enough, then they would still hold at operating points different from the gridding ones. A deep theoretical study of this fact is possible using the results developed by [45].

**Remark:** The interval observer (29)-(34) is made up of both a proportional action, given by (29) and (32), and an integral action, given by (30) and (33). As discussed in [23], a limitation of purely proportional UIOs, as the one introduced in [35], is that the resulting estimation error dynamics might be affected by the noise derivative, which can take big values due to the high-frequency content of the noise signal. On the other hand, the introduction of the integral action, allows overcoming this limitation.
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5. INTERVAL UIO FOR ROBUST FAULT AND ICING DIAGNOSIS

The change of basis performed using the parameter varying matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \) is relevant to solve the problem of unknown input observation. In this case, the interval observer will also exhibit some desired properties of decoupling between the effects of the unknown inputs \( \nu_{un} \). In this way, it will be possible to detect the presence of unknown inputs acting on the system, as well as to identify their nature (isolation). Before stating the problem, let us introduce an additional assumption concerning the boundedness of signals and uncertainties related to the unknown inputs.

**Assumption 2.** The signal \( \nu_{un} \) is such that:

\[
\nu_{un} \leq \nu_{in} \leq \nu_{un}
\]  

(69)

with \( \nu_{un} \leq 0 \) and \( \nu_{un} \geq 0 \), \( \nu_{in}, \nu_{un} \in \mathbb{L}^{n_{nu}} \). Moreover, given an invertible and continuous matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{x} \times n_{x}} \), there exist \( \Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta) \), \( \Delta B_{in,R}(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{x} \times n_{nu}} \), with \( \Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta) \leq 0 \), \( \Delta B_{in,R}(\vartheta) \geq 0 \), such that for all \( \vartheta \in \Theta \):

\[
\Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta) \leq R(\vartheta) \Delta B_{in}(\vartheta) \leq \Delta B_{in,R}(\vartheta)
\]  

(70)

**Problem 2.** Given \( S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{x} \times n_{un}} \) full column rank, such that there exists an invertible matrix function \( R(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{x} \times n_{x}} \) for which the following holds:

\[
R(\vartheta)B_{un}(\vartheta) = S \quad \forall \vartheta \in \Theta
\]  

(71)

and provided that (27) and Assumptions 1-2 hold, determine an LPV proportional integral interval unknown input observer which, in addition to solve Problem 1, satisfies:

\[
\nu_{un}^{(j)} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Pi(S^{(j)})\xi \geq 0 \land \Pi(S^{(j)})\bar{\xi} \geq 0
\]  

(72)

\[
\Pi(S^{(j)})\xi < 0 \lor \Pi(S^{(j)})\bar{\xi} < 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \nu_{un}^{(j)} \neq 0
\]  

(73)

where \( \xi \) and \( \bar{\xi} \) are evaluable signals that can be used as unknown input isolation signals, and are given by:

\[
\xi = R(\vartheta)(y - \bar{\chi}) - |R(\vartheta)|V
\]  

(74)

\[
\bar{\xi} = R(\vartheta)(\bar{\chi} - y) - |R(\vartheta)|V
\]  

(75)
In other words, Problem 2 concerns the isolation of faults, which can be represented by the unknown input $ν_{un}$ in (17). The idea consists in assigning different directions of residuals for each element of the vector $ν_{un}$, and choosing the interval observer in order to guarantee that, if the component of at least one between $ε$ and $−ε$ along the direction specified by the $j$-th column of the matrix $S$ becomes negative, then the $j$-th element of the vector $ν_{un}$ must be necessarily different from zero, which allows detecting and isolating the fault.

Looking at (42)-(43), and recalling (71), it is evident that when $ΔB_{un}(θ) = 0$, in order to achieve this property, the columns of $S$ should correspond to eigenvectors of the matrices $F(θ)$, $F(θ)$, and the terms $ϖ_i$, $ϖ_i$ should maintain nonnegativity despite a possible change in the sign of $ε$ and/or $−ε$. This last property, which is not necessary for fault detection, but is fundamental to achieve fault isolation, requires a slight modification of the interval observer structure provided in (29)-(34). On the other hand, a further modification of (29)-(34) is performed to embed the term $R(θ)ΔB_{un}(θ)ν_{un}$ into nonnegative terms that will be referred to as $ϖ_5$ and $ϖ_5$.

The following LPV proportional integral interval unknown input observer is proposed to solve Problem 2:

$$\dot{ξ} = \dot{z} + A(θ)(ξ - z) + R(θ)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_x} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\text{sign}(ε^{(i)β})}{2} \Delta A_R^{(i)}(θ) \left( x_R^{(i)β} - \tilde{x}_R^{(i)β} \right) \right\} + R(θ)^{-1}\left[ ΔB_{un,R}(θ)ν_{un}^{ω} - ΔB_{un,R}(θ)ν_{un}^{-ω} \right]$$

$$\bar{ξ} = ξ + L(θ)w$$

$$\tilde{ξ} = \tilde{z} + A(θ)(\tilde{ξ} - \tilde{z}) + R(θ)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_x} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\text{sign}(ε^{(i)β})}{2} \Delta A_R^{(i)}(θ) \left( \tilde{x}_R^{(i)β} - \tilde{x}_R^{(i)β} \right) \right\} + R(θ)^{-1}\left[ ΔB_{un,R}(θ)ν_{un}^{ω} - ΔB_{un,R}(θ)ν_{un}^{-ω} \right]$$

$$\bar{ξ} = \tilde{ξ} + T(θ)\tilde{w}$$

where $\dot{ξ}$, $w$, $\tilde{ξ}$, $\tilde{w}$, $ξ$ and $\tilde{ξ}$ are given by (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (74)-(75), and:

$$x_R = R(θ)y - |R(θ)|V$$

$$\tilde{x}_R = R(θ)y + |R(θ)|V$$
The following lemma provides the conditions which should be satisfied by the gains $K(\vartheta), \bar{K}(\vartheta), \underline{T}(\vartheta)$ and $\bar{T}(\vartheta)$ in order to ensure an interval estimation of $x_R$ and the boundedness of $\underline{x}_R, \overline{x}_R$, as specified in Problem 1.

**Lemma 2**

Let Assumptions 1-2 be satisfied, $x \in L_{\infty}^n, v \in L_{\infty}^n, k \in L_{\infty}^n$, the matrix $R(\vartheta)$ be invertible, and the proportional integral interval unknown input observer be given by (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79). Then, if there exist matrix functions $K(\vartheta), \bar{K}(\vartheta), \underline{T}(\vartheta), \overline{T}(\vartheta)$ such that $F(\vartheta), \bar{F}(\vartheta)$, defined as in (35)-(36) are Metzler, the relation (26) is satisfied provided that (27)-(28) hold.

In addition, if there exist $P, Q \in S_{2n \times 2n}, P, Q \succ 0$ and constants $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \gamma > 0$ such that the following matrix inequality is verified $\forall S_1, S_2 \in P(\{1, \ldots, n_x\})$:

$$
\Phi(\vartheta, S_1, S_2) = 
\begin{pmatrix}
G(\vartheta, S_2)^T P + PG(\vartheta, S_2) + (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)P + Q + \gamma \eta(\vartheta, S_1, S_2)^2 & 0 \\
0 & \varepsilon_1^{-1}P - \gamma I_{2n_x}
\end{pmatrix} \preceq 0
$$

where:

$$
\eta(\vartheta, S_1, S_2) = \left\| \Delta A_{S_1}^{-1}(\vartheta) \right\|_2 + \left\| \Delta A_{S_2}^{-1}(\vartheta) \right\|_2 + \left\| \Delta A_{S_1}^{-1}(\vartheta) \right\|_2 + \left\| \Delta A_{S_2}^{-1}(\vartheta) \right\|_2
$$

$$
G(\vartheta, S_2) = 
\begin{pmatrix}
F(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & F(\vartheta) + \Delta A_{S_2}(\vartheta)
\end{pmatrix}
$$

then $x_R, \overline{x}_R \in L_{\infty}^n$.

Similarly to Theorem 1, the matrix inequality (82) is needed to ensure that the lower and upper estimates provided by the interval observer will remain bounded despite the modifications in the structure of the observer due to changes in the signs of $\varepsilon^{(i)}, \overline{\varepsilon}^{(i)}, i = 1, \ldots, n_x$. This fact will be further detailed in the proof of Lemma 2.

**Proof of Lemma 2:** By using the interval unknown input observer (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79), the dynamics of the interval estimation errors $\varepsilon, \overline{\varepsilon}$ follow:

$$
\dot{\varepsilon} = F(\vartheta) \varepsilon + R(\vartheta) B_{un}(\vartheta) v_{un} + \sum_{i=1}^{5} \overline{\alpha}_i
$$

$$
\dot{\overline{\varepsilon}} = \overline{F}(\vartheta) \overline{\varepsilon} - R(\vartheta) B_{un}(\vartheta) v_{un} + \sum_{i=1}^{5} \overline{\alpha}_i
$$
where $\varpi_i, \varpi_i^T, i = 1, 2, 4$, are given by (44)-(45), (47)-(49) and (51), and:

$$\varpi_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)x_R^{(i)} + \Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)x_R^{(i)^+} - \Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)x_R^{(i)^-} + \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(\varrho^{(i)})\Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)(x_R^{(i)^+} - x_R^{(i)^-})}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(\varrho^{(i)})\Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)(x_R^{(i)^+} - x_R^{(i)^-})$$

(87)

$$\varpi_2 = R(\vartheta)\Delta B_{un}(\vartheta)v_{un} + \Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta)v_{un}^+ - \Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta)v_{un}^-$$

(88)

$$\varpi_3 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)x_R^{(i)^+} - \Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)x_R^{(i)^-} - \Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)x_R^{(i)^+} + \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(\varrho^{(i)})\Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)(x_R^{(i)^+} - x_R^{(i)^-})}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(\varrho^{(i)})\Delta A_i^{(i)}(\vartheta)(x_R^{(i)^+} - x_R^{(i)^-})$$

(89)

$$\varpi_4 = \Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta)v_{un}^+ - \Delta B_{un,R}(\vartheta)v_{un}^- - R(\vartheta)\Delta B_{un}(\vartheta)v_{un}^-$$

(90)

As it has already been discussed, the terms $\varpi_i, \varpi_i^T, i = 1, 2, 4$ are nonnegative due to Assumption 1 and (27). Let us show that $\varpi_1 \geq 0$ and $\varpi_2 \geq 0$. To do so, let us notice that if $\varrho^{(i)} \geq 0$ and $\varphi^{(i)} \geq 0$, it is straightforward to see that the $i$-th terms in (87)-(89) equal the $i$-th terms in (46) and (50), such that non-negativity is assured as long as $x_R^{(i)} \leq x_R^{(i)} \leq x_R^{(i)}$. This is necessarily true, since from (15), it follows that:

$$y - \chi = x - x + v = R(\vartheta)^{-1}(x_R - x_R) + v$$

(91)

$$\chi - y = \bar{x} - x - v = R(\vartheta)^{-1}(x_R - x_R) - v$$

(92)

which means that:

$$x_R - x_R = R(\vartheta)(y - \chi)$$

(93)

$$x_R - x_R = R(\vartheta)(\bar{x} - y)$$

(94)

From Lemma 1 and $|v| \leq V$ (see Assumption 1), it follows that:

$$R(\vartheta)v \in [-|R(\vartheta)|V, |R(\vartheta)|V]$$

(95)

such that:

$$x_R - x_R \in [\varrho, R(\vartheta)(y - \chi) + |R(\vartheta)|V]$$

(96)

$$\bar{x}_R - x_R \in [\varphi, R(\vartheta)(\bar{x} - y) + |R(\vartheta)|V]$$

(97)
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Hence, \( x_R^{(i)} - \bar{x}_R^{(i)} \geq \epsilon^{(i)} \geq 0 \) and \( \bar{x}_R^{(i)} - x_R^{(i)} \geq \bar{\epsilon}^{(i)} \geq 0 \), which assures non-negativity of the \( i \)-th terms in (87) and (89) for \( \bar{\epsilon}^{(i)} \geq 0 \) and \( \bar{\epsilon}^{(i)} \geq 0 \).

Let us consider the case when \( \epsilon^{(i)} < 0 \) (the case when \( \bar{\epsilon}^{(i)} < 0 \) follows a similar reasoning, thus it is omitted). When \( \epsilon^{(i)} < 0 \), the \( i \)-th terms in (87) and (89) become the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta A_R^{(i)}(\theta) x_R^{(i)} + \Delta A_R^{(i)}(\theta) \bar{x}_R^{(i)} - \Delta A_R^{(i)}(\bar{\theta}) \bar{x}_R^{(i)} + \\
\Delta A_R^{(i)}(\bar{\theta}) \bar{x}_R^{(i)} - \Delta A_R^{(i)}(\theta) x_R^{(i)} - \Delta A_R^{(i)}(\theta) \bar{x}_R^{(i)}.
\end{align*}
\]

From Lemma 1, in order to prove positiveness of (98)-(99), \( \bar{x}_R^{(i)} \leq x_R^{(i)} \leq x_R^{(i)} \) should hold. It is straightforward that \( x_R^{(i)} \leq x_R^{(i)} \) due to \( \epsilon^{(i)} \geq 0 \). On the other hand, from (15), it follows that:

\[
y = x + v = R(\bar{\theta})^{-1}x + v
\]

for which, following the reasoning already provided for (91)-(92), the solution:

\[
x_R = R(\bar{\theta})(y - v)
\]

can be considered. Taking into account (95), (101) leads to:

\[
x_R \in [\bar{x}_R, \bar{x}_R]
\]

which proves that \( x_R^{(i)} \geq x_R^{(i)} \), so that \( \underline{\sigma}_3 \) and \( \overline{\sigma}_3 \) are nonnegative. Also, the nonnegativity of \( \underline{\sigma}_3 \) follows directly from Assumption 2, taking into account Lemma 1. Then, since \( F(\theta), F(\bar{\theta}) \in \mathbb{M}^{n_1 \times n_2} \), any solution of (42)-(43) with \( v_{un} = 0 \) is elementwise nonnegative for all \( t \geq 0 \).

Let us show that the variables \( x_R \) and \( \bar{x}_R \) stay bounded \( \forall t \geq 0 \). Without loss of generality, let us consider the case where:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_1 & \cap \mathcal{I}_1 = \emptyset, \mathcal{I}_2 \cap \mathcal{J}_2 = \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{J}_2 \cup \mathcal{J}_2 = \{1, \ldots, n_1 \}. \text{ In this case, the equations that rule the dynamics of } x_R \text{ and } \bar{x}_R \text{ can be written as:}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
x_R &= F(\bar{\theta})x_R + \bar{g}(x_R, \bar{x}_R) + \bar{\delta} \\
\bar{x}_R &= \left( F(\theta) + \Delta A_R^{(i)}(\bar{\theta}) \right) \bar{x}_R + \bar{g}(x_R, \bar{x}_R) + \bar{\delta}
\end{align*}
\]
where:

\[
\begin{align*}
g(x_R, \overline{x_R}) &= \Delta A_R \xi_R^T \xi_R^+ - \Delta A_R \xi_R^- \\
\overline{g}(x_R, \overline{x_R}) &= \Delta A_R \xi_R^T \xi_R^+ - \Delta A_R \xi_R^-
\end{align*}
\]

(106)

\[
\delta = R(\dot{\theta}) \Gamma(\dot{\theta}) \dot{y} - |R(\dot{\theta}) \Gamma(\dot{\theta}) K(\dot{\theta})| V + R(\dot{\theta}) B(\dot{\theta}) v + R(\dot{\theta}) k(\theta) + d_R(\dot{\theta}) \]

(108)

\[
\overline{\delta} = R(\dot{\theta}) \overline{T}(\dot{\theta}) \overline{K}(\dot{\theta}) \dot{y} + |R(\dot{\theta}) \overline{T}(\dot{\theta}) \overline{K}(\dot{\theta})| V + R(\dot{\theta}) B(\dot{\theta}) v + R(\dot{\theta}) k(\theta) + \overline{d_R}(\dot{\theta})
\]

(109)

Also in this case, similarly to the proof of Theorem 1, \(g(x_R, \overline{x_R})\) and \(\overline{g}(x_R, \overline{x_R})\) are such that:

\[
\begin{align*}
|g(x_R, \overline{x_R})| &\leq \left\| \Delta A_R \xi_R^T (\theta) \right\|_2 |\xi_R| + \left\| \Delta A_R \xi_R^- (\theta) \right\|_2 |\overline{x_R}|
\end{align*}
\]

(110)

\[
\begin{align*}
|\overline{g}(x_R, \overline{x_R})| &\leq \left\| \Delta A_R \xi_R^T (\theta) \right\|_2 |\xi_R| + \left\| \Delta A_R \xi_R^- (\theta) \right\|_2 |\overline{x_R}|
\end{align*}
\]

(111)

and the inputs \(\delta\) and \(\overline{\delta}\) are bounded because of Assumptions 1-2, and the fact that \(x \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}, v \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}, k \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}\) and \(|v| \leq V\). Hence, it can be shown through a Lyapunov function \(V = \xi^T P \xi\) that if (82) holds, then \(x_R, \overline{x_R} \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}\) (this part of the proof follows the last part of the proof of Theorem 1, thus it is omitted). Since the indices contained in the sets \(\mathcal{I}_1\) and \(\mathcal{I}_2\) are not known a priori, it follows that (82) should hold \(\forall \mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2 \in \mathcal{P}\{1, \ldots, n_x\}\) in order to guarantee the boundedness of \(x_R\) and \(\overline{x_R}\), thus completing the proof. \(\square\)

At this point, using Lemma 2, the following theorem provides the conditions which should be satisfied by the gains \(K(\theta), \overline{K}(\theta), \Gamma(\theta)\) and \(\overline{\Gamma}(\theta)\) in order to solve Problem 2.

**Theorem 2**

Given the matrix \(S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{un}}\), let Assumptions 1-2 be satisfied, \(x \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}, v \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}, k \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}\), the matrix function \(R(\theta)\) be such that (71) holds, and the proportional integral interval unknown input observer be given by (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79). Then, if there exist matrix functions \(\Gamma(\theta), \overline{\Gamma}(\theta) \in \mathcal{D}_{\infty}^{n_{un} \times n_{un}}\) and matrix functions \(\overline{S}(\theta), \overline{S}'(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}\) such that \(F(\theta), \overline{F}(\theta)\), defined
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as in (35)-(36), with:
\[
\mathcal{T}(\dot{\vartheta}) \mathcal{K}(\vartheta) = \left[ A(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S + R(\vartheta)^{-1} R(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S - R(\vartheta)^{-1} S \Gamma(\vartheta) \right] B_{un}(\vartheta) \tag{112}
\]
\[
+ \mathcal{S}^\vartheta(\vartheta) \left[ I - B_{un}(\vartheta) B_{un}(\vartheta)^\top \right]
\]
\[
\mathcal{T}(\dot{\vartheta}) \mathcal{K}(\vartheta) = \left[ A(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S + R(\vartheta)^{-1} R(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S - R(\vartheta)^{-1} S \Gamma(\vartheta) \right] B_{un}(\vartheta) \tag{113}
\]
\[
+ \mathcal{S}^\vartheta(\vartheta) \left[ I - B_{un}(\vartheta) B_{un}(\vartheta)^\top \right]
\]
are Mertzler, then the relations (72)-(73) are satisfied provided that (27) holds. Moreover, if (28)
holds, then also (26) is satisfied.

In addition, if there exist \( P \in \mathbb{S}^{2 n_x \times 2 n_x} \), \( P \succ 0 \), \( Q \in \mathbb{S}^{2 n_x \times 2 n_x} \), \( Q \succ 0 \) and constants \( \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \gamma > 0 \)
such that (82), with \( \eta(\vartheta, \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2) \) and \( G(\vartheta, \mathcal{J}_2) \) defined as in (83)-(84), is verified \( \forall \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2 \in \mathcal{D}(1, \ldots, n_x) \), then \( \underline{x}_R, \bar{x}_R \in \mathcal{L}^{n_x} \).

**Proof of Theorem 2:** As shown previously, by using the unknown input interval observer (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79), the dynamics of the interval estimation errors \( \varepsilon, \bar{v} \) follow (85)-(86), where \( \underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, \) are given by (44)-(45), (47)-(49), (51) and (87)-(90). Looking at (71), it is straightforward that for guaranteeing (26) and (72)-(73), in addition to the conditions of Lemma 2, the columns of \( S \) need to correspond to eigenvectors of the matrices \( \mathcal{E}(\dot{\vartheta}) \) and \( \mathcal{F}(\dot{\vartheta}) \), i.e.:
\[
\mathcal{E}(\dot{\vartheta}) S = S \Gamma(\vartheta) \tag{114}
\]
\[
\mathcal{F}(\dot{\vartheta}) S = S \Gamma(\vartheta) \tag{115}
\]
where \( \Gamma(\vartheta), \Gamma(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{un} \times n_{un}} \) contain some of the eigenvalues of \( \mathcal{E}(\dot{\vartheta}), \mathcal{F}(\dot{\vartheta}) \) (the ones that correspond to the eigenvectors that are columns of \( S \)).

Taking into account (71) and (35)-(36), it is easy to see that (114)-(115) are equivalent to:
\[
\mathcal{T}(\dot{\vartheta}) \mathcal{K}(\vartheta) B_{un}(\vartheta) = A(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S + R(\vartheta)^{-1} R(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S - R(\vartheta)^{-1} S \Gamma(\vartheta) \tag{116}
\]
\[
\mathcal{T}(\dot{\vartheta}) \mathcal{K}(\vartheta) B_{un}(\vartheta) = A(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S + R(\vartheta)^{-1} R(\vartheta) R(\vartheta)^{-1} S - R(\vartheta)^{-1} S \Gamma(\vartheta) \tag{117}
\]
whose solutions can be expressed as (112)-(113), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

Also in this case, it is possible to derive conditions for performing the design, as specified by the following corollary.
Corollary 2

Given the matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times n_w}$, let Assumptions 1-2 be satisfied, $x \in \mathcal{L}^\infty_{n_s}$, $v \in \mathcal{L}^\infty_{n_v}$, $k \in \mathcal{L}^\infty_{n_k}$ and the matrix function $R(\theta)$ be such that (71) holds. Also, let us assume that there exist an elementwise nonnegative block-diagonal matrix $P$ as in (61), with $P, \overline{P} \in \mathbb{S}^{n_s \times n_s}$, $P, \overline{P} \succ 0$, a matrix function:

$$W_S(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} W_S(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{W}_S(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$$ (118)

with $W_S(\theta), \overline{W}_S(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times n_s}$, a matrix $Q \in \mathbb{S}^{2n_s \times 2n_s}$, a sufficiently large matrix function $\Sigma \in \mathbb{D}_{+}^{2n_s \times 2n_s}$ and constants $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \gamma > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{pmatrix} He \{ P\overline{E}(\theta, \mathcal{F}) + W_S(\theta) \hat{\Gamma}(\theta) \} + (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)P + Q + \gamma \eta(\theta, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)^2 I_{2n_t} & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon_1^{-1} P - \gamma I_{2n_t} \end{pmatrix} \preceq 0$$ (119)

$$P \begin{pmatrix} \overline{E}(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{E}(\theta, \mathcal{F}_2) - \Delta A_R^2(\theta) \end{pmatrix} - W_S(\theta) \hat{\Gamma}(\theta) + P\Sigma(\theta) \succeq 0$$ (120)

with $\eta(\theta, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ defined as in (83) and:

$$\overline{E}(\theta, \mathcal{F}_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{E}(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{E}(\theta, \mathcal{F}_2) \end{pmatrix}$$ (121)

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} (I - B_{un}(\theta))B_{un}(\theta)^\dagger R(\theta)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (I - B_{un}(\theta))B_{un}(\theta)^\dagger R(\theta)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$ (122)

$$\overline{E}(\theta, \mathcal{F}_2) = R(\theta)A(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1}(I - SB_{un}(\theta)^\dagger R(\theta)^{-1}) + \tilde{R}(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1}$$ (123)

$$+ (ST(\theta) - \tilde{R}(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1} S) B_{un}(\theta)^\dagger R(\theta)^{-1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{E}(\theta, \mathcal{F}_2) &= R(\theta)A(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1}(I - SB_{un}(\theta)^\dagger R(\theta)^{-1}) + \tilde{R}(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1} \\
&+ (ST(\theta) - \tilde{R}(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1} S) B_{un}(\theta)^\dagger R(\theta)^{-1} + \Delta A_R^2(\theta)
\end{aligned}$$ (124)

Then, the proportional integral interval unknown input observer (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79) with matrices satisfying (112)-(113), with:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^*(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\Sigma}^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{PR}(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{PR}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} W_S(\theta)$$ (125)
is such that the relations (72)-(73) are satisfied provided that (27) holds. Moreover, if (28) holds, then also (26) is satisfied, with $x_R, \overline{x_R} \in L^\infty$.

**Proof of Corollary 2:** (119) can be obtained from (82) through the change of variables:

$$W_\tilde{S}(\vartheta) = \begin{pmatrix} PR(\vartheta)S^*(\vartheta) & 0 \\ 0 & PR(\vartheta)\tilde{S}^*(\vartheta) \end{pmatrix}$$  

which explains why $S^*(\vartheta)$ and $\tilde{S}^*(\vartheta)$ are calculated as in (125). On the other hand, (120) corresponds to the verification of the Metzler property. □

Also in this case, the infinite number of conditions given by Theorem 2 and Corollary 2 can be brought to a finite number by gridding the varying parameter space $\Theta$ using $N$ points $\vartheta_i, i = 1, \ldots, N$. The details are skipped for the sake of brevity.

### 5.1. Fault/icing diagnosis

Let us notice that, as long as $\cos \theta \neq 0$, the following condition holds:

$$\mathcal{E}(u, w, q) = \mathcal{E}(t) \in \text{span} \left[ B_1 B_2(u, w) H_2(\theta) \right] \forall t \geq 0$$  

Since the actuator effectiveness ranges between 0 and 1, it is straightforward that (69) is satisfied with $\overline{v_{un}} = (-\overline{\delta}_t^2, \min(0, -\overline{\delta}_t), -\overline{\omega}_z^{\text{max}})T$ and $\underline{v_{un}} = (0, \max(0, -\overline{\delta}_t), \overline{\omega}_z^{\text{max}})T$, where $\overline{\omega}_z^{\text{max}}$ is the maximum value for $|\omega_z|$. Due to the actuator actions and the wind acceleration being limited in magnitude, it follows that $\overline{v_{un}}, \underline{v_{un}} \in L^\infty, d \in L^\infty$, and it is reasonable that there exists a known bound $V$ on the noise. Hence, Assumptions 1-2 are satisfied and the robust fault/icing diagnosis can be achieved using the LPV proportional integral interval unknown observer given by (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79).
Then, by recalling the definition of Problem 2, it is possible to choose the matrix $S$ as:

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}$$ (128)

which, under single fault assumption, leads to the following fault/icing diagnosis algorithm, based on conditions (72)-(73):

**Diagnosis Algorithm.**

```
if \[ \begin{align*}
\epsilon^{(1)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(1)} \geq 0 \\
\epsilon^{(2)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(2)} \geq 0 \\
\epsilon^{(3)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(3)} \geq 0 
\end{align*} \]
then ''no faults/no icing''

if \[ \begin{align*}
\epsilon^{(1)} &< 0 \lor \bar{\epsilon}^{(1)} < 0 \\
\epsilon^{(2)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(2)} \geq 0 \\
\epsilon^{(3)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(3)} \geq 0 
\end{align*} \]
then ''fault in thrust''

if \[ \begin{align*}
\epsilon^{(1)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(1)} \geq 0 \\
\epsilon^{(2)} &< 0 \lor \bar{\epsilon}^{(2)} < 0 \\
\epsilon^{(3)} &\geq 0 \land \bar{\epsilon}^{(3)} \geq 0 
\end{align*} \]
then ''fault in elevator''

else '‘possible icing’'
```

By imposing condition (71), and taking into account the structure of $B_{\mu n} (\vartheta)$ in (14), it is possible to calculate the matrix $R(\vartheta)$, as follows:

$$R(\vartheta) = \begin{pmatrix}
1/b_{11} & \tan \theta / b_{11} & r_{13}(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1/\bar{b}_{32}(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & 1/\cos \theta & r_{33}(\vartheta) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & r_{44}(\vartheta)
\end{pmatrix}$$ (129)

\[ \text{Infinite choices of } S \text{ are possible, but they would lead to more complicated diagnosis algorithms.} \]
with:

\[ r_{13}(\vartheta) = -\frac{1}{b_{32}(\vartheta)} \left[ \frac{\dot{b}_{12}(\vartheta)}{b_{11}} + \frac{\sin \theta \, \dot{b}_{22}(\vartheta)}{\cos \theta \, b_{11}} \right] \]  
\[ r_{33}(\vartheta) = -\frac{\dot{b}_{22}(\vartheta)}{b_{32}(\vartheta) \cos \theta} \]  

(130) (131)

**Remark:** It is worth stating that the matrix \( R(\vartheta) \) given by (129) depends on the state variables \( u \) and \( w \) through the angle-of-attack \( \alpha \). Consequently, the matrix function \( \hat{R} \) will depend on \( u \) and \( \dot{w} \), which are not measured, in contrast with the assumption that \( \dot{\vartheta} \) is known made in Section 4. However, since it has been noticed that the elements depending on \( u \) and \( \dot{w} \) are small in size, \( \hat{R} \) can be approximated successfully by a matrix \( \tilde{R} \), obtained from \( R(\vartheta) \) assuming a constant \( \alpha \), which depends only on measured variables, such that the proposed technique can still be applied despite not measuring \( \dot{\vartheta} \).

6. SIMULATION RESULTS

The simulation results shown in this section have been obtained assuming that each parameter \( C_i \) is affected by a symmetric uncertainty \( \Delta C_i \) with bounds corresponding to 0.4% of the nominal value \( \bar{C}_i \). Dryden-like wind disturbances [38], with \( \omega_x, \omega_x \in [-0.1, 0.1] \) have been used to simulate the components of the wind gusts. It is assumed that the noise affecting the sensor measurements is uniformly distributed within the intervals defined by \( V = [0.1, 0.1, 0.0001, 0.0005]^T \).

In order to calculate the matrices appearing in (29)-(30), (32)-(33) and (76)-(79), let us notice that an optimal choice of the diagonal matrix functions \( \Lambda(\vartheta) \), \( \Gamma(\vartheta) \) can be performed by maximizing the icing to wind/noise ratios (IWNRs) [24] for each residual, which enhances the residuals’ ability to reject the wind acceleration disturbance and the noise, and increases their sensitivity to the icing.

Also, due to the structure of the matrix \( S \) in (128), the matrix functions \( \overline{S}^*(\vartheta), \bar{S}^*(\vartheta) \) should be such that \( F(\vartheta), \overline{F}(\vartheta) \) are upper triangular, with the upper left diagonal block corresponding to \( \Lambda(\vartheta) \) and \( \Gamma(\vartheta) \), respectively. For the sake of simplicity, \( S^*(\vartheta) \) and \( \bar{S}^*(\vartheta) \) can be chosen in such a way that diagonal matrix functions \( \overline{F}(\vartheta) \) and \( \overline{F}(\vartheta) \) are obtained. In this case, it is easy to ensure that the matrix functions \( F(\vartheta) \) and \( \overline{F}(\vartheta) \) are Metzler.
The set of conditions given by (82) has been verified using 256 gridding points, which correspond to the partition of each interval of variation of the state variables \( u \in [16, 21], \ w \in [0.5, 2.5], \ q \in [-0.002, 0.002], \ \theta \in [-0.1, 0.1] \) in 4 sub-intervals.

For simulation purposes, the aircraft is controlled by an autopilot, responsible of maintaining the horizontal velocity \( u \) around the desired value \( u_{ref} = 20 m/s \) with the following reference pitch angle:

\[
\theta_{ref} = \begin{cases} 
0 & t \leq 100s \\
\frac{(t-100)}{1500} & 100s \leq t \leq 250s \\
\frac{(450-t)}{200} & 250s \leq t \leq 450s \\
0 & t > 450s
\end{cases}
\] (132)

Five different scenarios have been considered, as follows:

**Scenario 1**

In this scenario, no faults/icing occur. Figs. 1-3 show the residuals obtained in this scenario. Since they are all positive, no fault/no icing indication is provided by the decision algorithm.

![Figure 1. Residuals $\tilde{e}_{(1)}^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{e}_{(1)}^i$ in scenario 1 (no fault/icing).](image)

**Scenario 2**

The propulsion is subject to a linearly incipient loss of efficiency which starts at time \( t = 200s \) and equals \( \phi_t(t) = 0.5 \) starting from time \( t = 210s \). Figs. 4-6 show the residuals obtained in this scenario.
At time $t = 200.06\, s$, $\varepsilon^{(1)}$ becomes negative, and since all the other residuals remain positive, a correct indication of fault in thrust is provided by the decision algorithm.

**Scenario 3**

The elevator is subject to a linearly incipient loss of efficiency which starts at time $t = 200\, s$ and equals $\varphi_e(t) = 0.9$ starting from time $t = 210\, s$. Figs. 7-9 show that in this scenario a correct indication of fault in elevator is provided by the decision algorithm at time $t = 200.01\, s$, due to $\varepsilon^{(2)}$ becoming negative.

**Scenario 4**
The aircraft is subject to icing, i.e. the stability and control derivatives are modified according to (18), taking into account the coefficients $K_i$ listed in Table II\(^5\). The icing starts at time $t = 200\, s$ and slowly increases $\eta$ from 0 to 0.2, such that $\eta = 0.2$ starting from time $t = 400\, s$. Figs. 10-12 show that in this scenario, i.e. under icing occurrence, an abnormal situation is detected at time $t = 293.51\, s$ ($\epsilon^{(2)}$ becomes negative) and the icing occurrence is correctly isolated at time

\(^5\)The coefficients $K_i$ used in this work have been computed mimicking the proportional variation of the stability and control derivatives for a Twin Otter aircraft subject to all iced condition [41], and they could differ in the case of a real Zagi Flying Wing UAV. However, since the proposed LPV interval unknown input observer does not depend on the values of these coefficients, it can be expected that similar results would be obtained with different values of the coefficients $K_i$. 
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\( t = 314.29 \text{s} \) (\( \varepsilon^{(1)} \) becomes negative). It is worth noticing that, although a decreasing of \( \varepsilon^{(3)} \) is experienced, it is not strong enough to cause a change in its sign. However, under single fault assumption, the negativity of \( \varepsilon^{(1)} \) and \( \varepsilon^{(2)} \) is sufficient for a successful icing isolation.

**Scenario 5**

Scenario 5 combines scenarios 2 and 3, which means both the thrust command and the elevator deflection are subject to a linearly incipient loss of efficiency, which starts at time \( t = 200 \text{s} \) and equals \( \varphi_{t}(t) = 0.5 \) and \( \varphi_{e}(t) = 0.9 \), respectively, starting from time \( t = 210 \text{s} \). Luckily, Figs. 13-15 show that in the double fault situation, the evolution of \( \varepsilon^{(3)} \) and \( \varepsilon^{(3)} \) is qualitatively different.
Figure 8. Residuals $\epsilon^{(2)}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}^{(2)}$ in scenario 3 (fault in elevator).

Figure 9. Residuals $\epsilon^{(3)}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}^{(3)}$ in scenario 3 (fault in elevator).

Table II. Coefficients $K_i$ for an all iced configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_{L_0}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$K_{\alpha}$</td>
<td>$-0.5000$</td>
<td>$K_{L_q}$</td>
<td>$-0.0675$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\delta_e}$</td>
<td>$-0.4770$</td>
<td>$K_{D_0}$</td>
<td>$2.5610$</td>
<td>$K_{\delta\alpha}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{D_q}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$K_{\delta_e}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$K_{m_0}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{m\alpha}$</td>
<td>$-0.4960$</td>
<td>$K_{m_q}$</td>
<td>$-0.1755$</td>
<td>$K_{m_{\delta_e}}$</td>
<td>$-0.5000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from the one obtained in scenario 4. From a practical perspective, this fact would potentially allow distinguishing between an icing occurrence and a double fault situation.
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7. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has proposed an LPV proportional integral interval UIO for the robust fault/icing detection in UAVs described by an uncertain model. The proposed technique has several advantages. First, it can take into account operating point variations in an elegant way using the LPV paradigm. Second, the presence of the integral term avoids the appearance of the noise derivative term in the estimation error equation, thus increasing the noise rejection properties. Third, due to the property of interval estimation guaranteed by the observer, the absence of false alarms and wrong diagnosis will be guaranteed.
The conditions for the analysis and design of these observers are based on LMIs, which can be solved efficiently using available solvers. In particular, two properties are required by the analysis/design: i) interval estimation of the state, i.e., as long as some assumptions about uncertainties, disturbances and noise are verified, the state will always be contained within the bounds calculated by the interval observer; and ii) boundedness of the estimation, which is akin to the asymptotic stability of classical state observers, and is verified by finding an appropriate Lyapunov function.
Simulation results, obtained with the uncertain model of a Zagi Flying Wing UAV have shown the effectiveness of the decision algorithm, which identifies correctly unexpected changes in the system dynamics due to actuator faults or icing. Five scenarios have given more insight into the proposed method and have confirmed the results provided by the theory.

Future research will be aimed at decreasing the conservativeness introduced by the use of a constant Lyapunov matrix, using other alternatives, e.g. parameter-varying Lyapunov matrices. Also, the experimental validation of the proposed methodology will be pursued.
APPENDIX

\[ \ddot{a}_{11}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho u S}{2m} \left[ (\ddot{C}_{L_0} + \ddot{C}_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha - (\ddot{C}_{D_0} + \ddot{C}_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha - \frac{S_{propC_{prop}}}{S} \right] \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{12}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho w S}{2m} \left[ (\ddot{C}_{L_0} + \ddot{C}_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha - (\ddot{C}_{D_0} + \ddot{C}_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha - \frac{S_{propC_{prop}}}{S} \right] \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{13}(\cdot) = -w + \frac{\rho S_{C_{v_\alpha}}}{4m} (\ddot{C}_{L_q} \sin \alpha - \ddot{C}_{D_q} \cos \alpha) \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{21}(\cdot) = -\frac{\rho u S}{2m} \left[ (\ddot{C}_{D_0} + \ddot{C}_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha + (\ddot{C}_{L_0} + \ddot{C}_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right] \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{22}(\cdot) = -\frac{\rho w S}{2m} \left[ (\ddot{C}_{D_0} + \ddot{C}_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha + (\ddot{C}_{L_0} + \ddot{C}_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right] \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{23}(\cdot) = u - \frac{\rho S_{C_{v_\alpha}}}{4m} (\ddot{C}_{D_q} \sin \alpha + \ddot{C}_{L_q} \cos \alpha) \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{31}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho S_{C_{w}}}{2J_y} (\ddot{C}_{m_0} + \ddot{C}_{m_\alpha} \alpha) \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{32}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho S_{V_0 \alpha}}{2J_y} (\ddot{C}_{m_0} + \ddot{C}_{m_\alpha} \alpha) \]

\[ \ddot{a}_{33}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho V_0 S_{C_{v_\alpha}}}{4J_y} \ddot{C}_{m_q} \]

\[ b_{11} = \frac{\rho S_{propC_{prop}}}{2m} k_m^2 \]

\[ \ddot{b}_{12}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho S_{V_0 \alpha}}{2m} (\ddot{C}_{L_k} \sin \alpha - \ddot{C}_{D_k} \cos \alpha) \]

\[ \ddot{b}_{22}(\cdot) = -\frac{\rho \dot{V}_0 S_{V_0 \alpha}}{2m} \left( \ddot{C}_{D_k} \sin \alpha + \ddot{C}_{L_k} \cos \alpha \right) \]

\[ \ddot{b}_{32}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho \dot{V}_0^2 S_{C_{v_\alpha}}}{2J_y} \ddot{C}_{m_k} \]

\[ \Delta a_{11}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho u S}{2m} \left[ (\Delta C_{L_0} + \Delta C_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha - (\Delta C_{D_0} + \Delta C_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right] \]

\[ \Delta a_{12}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho w S}{2m} \left[ (\Delta C_{L_0} + \Delta C_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha - (\Delta C_{D_0} + \Delta C_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right] \]

\[ \Delta a_{13}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho S_{V_0 \alpha}}{4m} (\Delta C_{L_q} \sin \alpha - \Delta C_{D_q} \cos \alpha) \]

\[ \Delta a_{21}(\cdot) = -\frac{\rho u S}{2m} \left[ (\Delta C_{D_0} + \Delta C_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha + (\Delta C_{L_0} + \Delta C_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right] \]

\[ \Delta a_{22}(\cdot) = -\frac{\rho w S}{2m} \left[ (\Delta C_{D_0} + \Delta C_{D_\alpha} \alpha) \sin \alpha + (\Delta C_{L_0} + \Delta C_{L_\alpha} \alpha) \cos \alpha \right] \]

\[ \Delta a_{23}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho S_{V_0 \alpha}}{4m} (\Delta C_{D_q} \sin \alpha + \Delta C_{L_q} \cos \alpha) \]

\[ \Delta a_{31}(\cdot) = \frac{\rho S_{C_{w}}}{2J_y} (\Delta C_{m_0} + \Delta C_{m_\alpha} \alpha) \]

*Int. J. Robust. Nonlinear Control (2016)*

DOI: 10.1002/rnc
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta a_{32}(\cdot) &= \frac{\rho S c w}{2J_y} (\Delta C_{m0} + \Delta C_{m4} \alpha) \\
\Delta a_{33}(\cdot) &= \frac{\rho V_a S c^2}{4J_y} \Delta C_{m4} \\
\Delta b_{12}(\cdot) &= \frac{\rho S V_a^2}{2m} \left( \Delta C_{L_e} \sin \alpha - \Delta C_{D_e} \cos \alpha \right) \\
\Delta b_{22}(\cdot) &= -\frac{\rho V_a^2 S}{2m} \left( \Delta C_{D_e} \sin \alpha + \Delta C_{L_e} \cos \alpha \right) \\
\Delta b_{32}(\cdot) &= \frac{\rho V_a^2 S c}{2J_y} \Delta C_{m8_e} 
\end{align*}
\]
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