Feasibility analysis of a class of high-order sliding-mode differentiators for redox flow batteries parameter estimation
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Abstract—This work presents the preliminary findings of a feasibility study for a class of sliding mode differentiators to be used in an on-line parameter estimation methodology for vanadium redox flow batteries (VRFB). Specifically, three high-order continuous differentiators are considered: a Standard Differentiator; a Filtering Differentiator, which excels the former by incorporating rejection to large noises small in average; and a Tracking Filtering Differentiator, which produces smooth consistent derivatives while inheriting the noise rejection capabilities from the previous one.

To model the vanadium redox flow batteries an equivalent circuit model is employed, whose time-varying parameters are estimated by a recursive least squares algorithm with forgetting factor, that requires the VRFB measured voltage and current, together with their derivatives. To assess the performance of the different differentiation algorithms in obtaining reliable values of the VRFB parameters, the storage system is excited with standardised current demand profiles. Finally, representative simulation results are presented and discussed.

Index Terms—Vanadium redox flow battery, Sliding mode differentiators, Parameter estimation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The gradual depletion of fossil fuels deposits, together with the impact that their massive utilisation has provoked on the environment has prompted a deployment of carbon-free sustainable energy sources. However, due to the inherent intermittent nature of most major renewable energy sources, such as wind or solar, they still comprise only a minority of the primary power sources. To achieve a greater degree of renewables penetration, they need to be coupled with efficient energy storage systems (ESS) that collect a part of the harvested energy, and deliver it when required [1].

Among the different ESS developed up to now, vanadium redox flow batteries (VRFB) are probably one the most promising for large scale stationary applications. They gather unique features such as high efficiency, module scalability, independence between capacity and power output, safe and environmentally friendly operation, and long life-time in comparison with other battery technologies [2]. Additionally, the fact that the energy is stored in tanks of electrolyte decoupled from the electrochemical device make it possible for them to be refuelled as quickly as gasoline. As a result, there are ongoing efforts to develop RFB with high energy densities so that they can be competitive also in mobile applications. In this framework, the interest they have raised is so high that there already are some proposals for their implementation in vehicles that do not require long autonomy such as urban electric buses [3].

To fulfil the necessities of a variety of applications, an adequate modelling and a subsequent VRFB characterisation are required. This would permit to rapidly detect failures as well as to improve the control design aiming to optimise their efficiency and satisfy specific power demands. Regarding the VRFB modelling, in this work an equivalent electric circuit model (ECM) is employed [4]. These models have gained a lot of interest and popularity amongst battery management system designers due to their simplicity in the implementation and relatively low computational cost, particularly when compared to the more complex electrochemical, neural, or distributed parameter models. Specifically, in this work a second order ECM is employed (See Figure 1). With respect to the estimation method utilised to determine the values of the electric elements of the ECM, in this paper an structure based on the combination of sliding mode differentiators (SMD) and a recursive least squares (RLS) with forgetting factor is proposed [5] [6]. This approach requires precise robust information of the voltages and currents of the VRFB and their derivatives. The computation of the latter is not a simple task and, furthermore, the differentiation accuracy normally diminishes together with the order of the required derivatives.

Considering the mentioned aspects, in this work a feasibility analysis of sliding mode based differentiators applied to the estimation method [5] is made. Specifically, among a variety of SMD (e.g. [7]– [12]), three different continuous time differentiators are considered: firstly the so called standard-SMD (SSMD), then the filtering-SMD (FSMD), and finally the tracking-FSMD (TSMD) [13].

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE REDOX FLOW BATTERY MODEL AND PARAMETER ESTIMATION METHODOLOGY

In this section, the VRFB time-varying equivalent circuit model is introduced, along with a brief description of its parameters and associated dynamic equations. Subsequently, the employed estimation method, based on RLS with forgetting factor, is presented.

A. Vanadium redox flow battery equivalent circuit model

In this subsection the ECM of the VRFB is presented (Fig. 1). All parameters are assumed to be slowly time-varying but, for conciseness, the temporal argument t will be omitted in the mathematical formulations.

The open circuit voltage of the battery, \( v_{oc} \), is modelled with the series of a constant source, that corresponds to its minimum value \( V_0 \) and a capacitor \( C_{bat} \), whose electrical charge accounts for the available charge stored in the VRFB. The capacitor varies with the State of Charge (SoC) such that \( C_{bat} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial v_{oc}} = \frac{v_{oc}}{v_{oc} - V_0} (1 - SoC)SoC \), in accordance with the VRFB Nernst equation (for details, see [2]). A series resistance \( (R_{ohm}) \) is included to represent the ohmic effects of the membrane, the electrolyte, the porous electrodes and the collector plates. The circuit is completed with a RC module \( (R_{par}, C_{pol}) \) to represent the concentration and activation polarisation of the VRFB [4].

- Dynamic equations of the vanadium redox flow battery

The dynamic equations of the VRFB are straightforwardly obtained from the ECM of Figure 1 employing \( v_{oc} = V_0 + v_{bat} \), and \( v_{pol} \) as...
the system states. Defining $I$ and $v_{out}$ as the terminal current and voltage of the battery, then:

$$
\dot{v} = A v + B I = \begin{bmatrix} v_{pol} \\ v_{out} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/(R_{pol} C_{pol}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_{oc} \\ v_{pol} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{C_{pol}} \\ v_{pol} \end{bmatrix} I \tag{1a}
$$

$$
v_{out} = C v + D I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_{oc} \\ v_{pol} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ R_{ohm} \end{bmatrix} I \tag{1b}
$$

To perform the parameter estimation, the system is described in the Generalised Flies Model as presented below. In this representation, the new states are defined as the successive derivatives of the system output: $z_1 = v_{out}$, $z_2 = \dot{z}_1 = v_{out}$. The resulting diffeomorphism $\Phi$ is:

$$
z = \Phi(v, I, \dot{I}) = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ A & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_{oc} \\ v_{pol} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ D \end{bmatrix} \dot{I} \tag{2}
$$

and the transformed dynamic system:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{z}_1 &= z_2 \\
\dot{z}_2 &= m_1 \dot{I} + m_2 \dot{I} + m_3 I + m_4 z_2 \\
v_{out} &= z_1
\end{aligned} \tag{3a-b-c}
$$

It can be appreciated that Equation (3b) is linear in the parameters $m_1$ to $m_4$. Then, assuming that these are slow time-varying for almost all $t$, the terms related to their time derivatives can be neglected. Subsequently, the following relations between the electrical and the new parameters are obtained:

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_1 &= \frac{R_{ohm}}{C_{bat}} \\
m_2 &= \frac{1}{C_{bat}} + \frac{1}{C_{pol}} + \frac{R_{ohm}}{C_{pol} R_{pol}} \\
m_3 &= \frac{1}{C_{bat} C_{pol} R_{pol}} \\
m_4 &= -\frac{1}{C_{pol} R_{pol}}
\end{aligned} \tag{4a-b-c-d}
$$

**B. Estimation methodology and real-time results validation**

This subsection presents the parameter estimation methodology previously developed in [5] and [6]. This methodology permits to estimate, with a prescribed convergence time and known error bound, the electric parameters of the ECM. To meet this goal, a Recursive Least Square (RLS) with forgetting factor estimation is implemented. This algorithm is utilised to perform a linear regression on (3b), thereby obtaining an estimation of the parameters $m_1$ to $m_4$. Subsequently, the electric parameters and the system states can be straightforwardly obtained by computing the inverse of (4) and (2), respectively. Firstly, before presenting the employed RLS algorithm, for conciseness sake, the auxiliary equation (3b) is rewritten as follows:

$$
\eta(t) = \dot{z}_2 = \dot{v}_{out} = \theta(t)^T \varphi(t) = [m_1 \ m_2 \ m_3 \ m_4] [I \ \dot{I} \ I \ \dot{z}_2]^T \tag{5}
$$

where $\varphi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is the linear regressor and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^4$ contains the desired parameters. Thereafter, defining $\hat{\theta}(t)$ as the vector that contains the estimates, the recursive expression that provides the estimation is given by [14]:

$$
\dot{\hat{\theta}}(t) = -G \begin{bmatrix} R(t) \hat{\theta}(t) + r(t) \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}
$$

$$
\hat{R}(t) = -qR(t) + \varphi(t) \hat{\varphi}(t) \tag{7}
$$

$$
\hat{r}(t) = -q \rho(t) - \varphi(t) \hat{\rho}(t) \tag{8}
$$

where $r(t)$ and $R(t)$ are auxiliary variables initialised in zero: $r(t_0) = 0_{4x1}$, and $R(t_0) = 0_{4x4}$. The elements of $\varphi(t)$ and $\eta(t)$ are obtained from the differentiators. The design parameters are the gain matrix $G$ and the forgetting factor $q$, which are defined as follows:

- The forgetting factor $q$, exponentially weights the measured data, giving more relevance to the recent measures with a time constant $\tau = 1/q$.
- $G$ is a gain matrix that determines the convergence rate of the estimations. It must be symmetric and positive-definite, and has to be designed so that the dynamic of the estimation process is faster than the variation of the system parameters.

It can be proved that, by appropriately selecting the parameters $q$ and $G$, an upper bound for the convergence time is [14]:

$$
T_e = \frac{\eta_r}{2 \cdot \lambda_{min}(G) \cdot \lambda_{min}(R(t))} \leq \frac{\eta_r}{2 \cdot \lambda_{min}(G) \cdot \lambda_p} \tag{9}
$$

valid only if the so called *Estimation Condition* holds:

$$\lambda_{min}(R(t)) \geq \lambda_p \tag{10}\]
determined by studying the behaviour and limitations of the electrical variables of the VRFB.

In the proposed estimation methodology, these differentiators have a fundamental role, since they permit to obtain derivatives of the measured current and voltage, which are required to perform the regression from equation (5). The main reason for choosing sliding mode based differentiators lies in their finite time convergence. This is a powerful feature, given that allows to considerably improve the RLS regression from equation (5). The main reason for choosing sliding measured current and voltage, which are required to perform the fundamental role, since they permit to obtain derivatives of the variables of the VRFB.

A. Standard Sliding Mode Differentiators

The structure of a SSMD, utilised to estimate up to second-order derivatives, in its non recursive form is the following [13], [15]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\mu}_1 &= -\lambda_2 L^{1/3} |\mu_1 - f(t)|^{2/3} \text{sign}(\mu_1 - f(t)) + \mu_2 \\
\dot{\mu}_2 &= -\lambda_3 L^{2/3} |\mu_1 - f(t)|^{1/3} \text{sign}(\mu_1 - f(t)) + \mu_3 \\
\dot{\mu}_3 &= -\lambda_0 L \text{sign}(\mu_1 - (f(t)))
\end{align*}
\]

being \(f(t)\) the signal of interest to be differentiated; and \(\lambda_0 = 1.1\), \(\lambda_1 = 2.12\) and \(\lambda_2 = 2\) fixed gains predefined to guarantee the algorithm convergence as explained in [17]. The outputs are the variables \(\mu_1 \rightarrow f(t), \mu_2 \rightarrow f(t)\) and \(\mu_3 \rightarrow \hat{f}(t)\). It can be highlighted the capability of the SSMD to provide robust exact derivatives of \(f(t)\) in the absence of noise, and asymptotically optimal estimates in the presence of bounded noise, i.e. with a known error bound determined by the noise magnitude [15].

B. Filtering Sliding Mode Differentiators

In spite of the robustness of SSMDS with respect to small bounded noises, their accuracy can be affected by high-value spurious signals that can distort the current and voltage measurements. This is a problem of particular interest in power electronics and in applications such as the presented in this work. To deal with this problem, without compromising its precision, the FSMD includes a sliding mode filter. It is capable to reject large noises small in average, particularly unbounded noises of filtering order not exceeding the differentiator filtering order [17]. The structure of such FSMD in its non-recursive form is the following [17]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{w}_1 &= -\lambda_4 L^{1/5} |w_1|^{4/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + w_2 \\
\dot{w}_2 &= -\lambda_5 L^{2/5} |w_1|^{3/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + (\mu_1 - f(t)) \\
\dot{\mu}_1 &= -\lambda_6 L^{3/5} |w_1|^{2/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + \mu_2 \\
\dot{\mu}_2 &= -\lambda_7 L^{4/5} |w_1|^{1/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + \mu_3 \\
\dot{\mu}_3 &= -\lambda_0 L \text{sign}(w_1)
\end{align*}
\]

Note that (16) to (18) are somewhat equivalent to those of the SSMD. On the other hand, (14) and (15) constitute a sliding mode filter which in this particular case is of second order. The filter is applied to the difference between the signal to be differentiated and its estimate: \((\mu_1 - f(t))\). After a finite-time transient, the signal \(w_1\) is a filtered version of that difference. The outputs of the differentiator are \(\mu_1 \rightarrow f(t), \mu_2 \rightarrow \hat{f}(t)\) and \(\mu_3 \rightarrow \hat{f}(t)\). In this case, the gains \(\lambda_i\) are adjusted as in [17]: \(\lambda_0 = 1.1, \lambda_1 = 4.57, \lambda_2 = 9.30, \lambda_3 = 10.03\) y \(\lambda_4 = 5\).

It is worth noting that in both SSMD and FSMD the derivatives estimates contain high frequency oscillations inherent to the differentiation structure, generated by the fractional power terms in the right hand side of (11) to (13) in the SSMD and (16) to (18) in the FSMD case. This phenomenon, normally referred to as chattering, is subsequently introduced in the RLS as a high frequency component but does not contain relevant information to the parameter estimation. The effects of the chattering are discussed in section IV.

C. Tracking Sliding Mode Differentiators

The third and last type of sliding mode differentiator analysed in this work is the tracking SMD. It possess the same virtues of the FSMD with regard to its capacity to reject large noises small in average. However, TSMD include in their structure a higher order \((n + 1)\) sliding mode control algorithm with the purpose of keeping the sliding mode variable \(\sigma = f(t) - \zeta_1\) and its derivatives up to the order \(n\) equal to zero. \(\zeta_1\) is the estimate of the signal to be differentiated \(f(t)\), extracted from a chain of integrators. As in this work \(n = 2\), the resulting control objective is: \(\sigma = \dot{\sigma} = \ddot{\sigma} = 0\). The structure of a second order TSMD, in its non recursive form is [17]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{w}_1 &= -\lambda_1 5 L^{1/5} |w_1|^{4/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + w_2 \\
\dot{w}_2 &= -\lambda_2 5 L^{2/5} |w_1|^{3/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + (\mu_1 - \sigma) \\
\dot{\mu}_1 &= -\lambda_3 5 L^{3/5} |w_1|^{2/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + \mu_2 \rightarrow \dot{\mu}_1 = \mu_1 \\
\dot{\mu}_2 &= -\lambda_4 5 L^{4/5} |w_1|^{1/5} \text{sign}(w_1) + \mu_3 \rightarrow \dot{\mu}_2 = \mu_2 \\
\dot{\zeta}_1 &= \zeta_2 \\
\dot{\zeta}_2 &= \zeta_3 \\
\dot{\zeta}_3 &= \nu = \frac{-|\mu_2|^{2/3} \text{sign}(\mu_2) + \mu_1}{|\mu_3|^3 + |\mu_4|^{5/2} + |\mu_1|^5}
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that the structure of (19) to (23) is equivalent to that of the FSMD. Indeed, these equations comprise a second order differentiator to compute derivatives of the sliding surface \(\sigma\). Besides, \(\zeta_3\) is defined utilising the estimates of the sliding variable derivatives \(\mu_1, \mu_2\) and \(\mu_3\), in order to develop a control action \(\nu\) that guarantees \(\sigma = \dot{\sigma} = \ddot{\sigma} = 0\). The outputs of this scheme are the parameters \(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3\), obtained from the chain of integrators (24)-(26). As a result, the derivative estimates are smooth and consistent, i.e. each estimated derivative is the integral of the following: \(\zeta_1 = \zeta_2\) and \(\zeta_2 = \zeta_3\).

As presented in [17], the TSMD estimation accuracy of \(|\zeta_i - f^{(i)}(t)|\) are of the order \(|f(t)^{(i+1)}|\) independently of noises and sampling periods. However, their consistency turns out to be of vital importance in estimation algorithms, and the feasibility of these differentiators in our particular application is therefore thoroughly evaluated. Indeed, as will be discussed in the results section, the performance of the estimation algorithm heavily relies on the quality of the input variables conforming the regressor vector.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and analyses representative results of the simulations obtained in the Matlab Simulink® environment. In this sense, the performance of the previously presented differentiation algorithms is compared and contrasted, in particular with regard to their application to the estimation of the parameters \(m_i\) of equation (3b).

To perform a valid comparison between these algorithms, sampling step of \(2.5e^{-5}\) s is utilised. The estimation results are calculated by conforming the regressor \((5)\) and \(\eta\) with the estimated derivatives obtained from the SSMD, FSMD and TSMD, respectively. To this end, the Lipschitz constants are set \(L_{\nu} = 250\) and \(L_{\eta} = 700\) for the differentiators to compute the voltage and the current derivatives. As for the estimation parameters setup please refer to [18].
A comprehensive analysis involving a large number of tests with different levels of noise was made. For the sake of space, only two representative sets of these results are presented and discussed in this work. The first set was performed in an ideal noise-free scenario. The second one included additive noise to study the robustness of the proposed methodology when the differentiators are subjected to more exigent conditions. Note that, in those cases where the accuracy of the estimation is very high, some of the resulting curves corresponding to the different differentiators may be overlapped.

To simulate an on-line estimation environment, it is assumed that the VRFB operates under a variable current demand profile, generated using a standardised urban driving profile. The main reasons to employ this profile are twofold. On the one hand, it is a current demand profile with enough PE, therefore simplifies the results comprehension. On the other hand, as previously mentioned, even though it still requires further studies and improvements, the utilisation of VRFB in vehicular applications is an attractive alternative to standard batteries. The current profile, together with the resulting output voltage obtained with the ECM are shown in Figure 2.

A. Results comparison employing SSMD and FSMD

In this subsection, the results of the parameter estimation obtained by employing SSMD and FSMD are compared and analysed. When the signals to be differentiated are free of noise, the estimation performance is very similar for both differentiators (see Fig. 3). This is because the accuracy asymptotics of both SSMD and FSMD is preserved. To better visualise the obtained results, the relative error is computed and shown in Fig. 5. It can be appreciated that, in both cases, after an initial convergence lapse, the relative error stays below 5% for all the parameters.

Subsequently, to assess the advantages of including a sliding mode filter in the differentiation algorithm, a second simulation is performed (see Fig. 4). In this case, white noise was introduced in the measured signals \( I \) and \( v_{\text{out}} \). Additionally, a high frequency component \( \epsilon = 0.01 \sin(10000t) \) was also included, aiming to put the algorithms under even more challenging conditions. In this scenario, the estimates obtained with the SSMD are seriously affected, with an error that surpasses 20% in the estimation of \( m_3 \) (See Fig. 6). Conversely, the FSMD performs considerably better, with its relative error being less than half the SSMD’s error.

B. Results comparison employing FSMD and TSMD

To perform a comparative analysis between the FSMD and the TSMD, it is firstly highlighted that both algorithms inherently possess the same capabilities to reject undesired noises contained in the base signal.

To understand the incidence of each differentiator on the parameter estimation process, it is initially of interest to analyse the current error \( (I - \hat{I}) \) and the first derivative error \( (\dot{I} - \dot{\hat{I}}) \) without noise (See Fig. 7). In the first place, observe that the error in the estimates is exiguous in both differentiators. However, note that the amplitude of the TSMD error is considerably higher than the one of the FSMD. On the other hand, the derivatives of the TSMD are smoother and consistent, since they are obtained from a chain of integrators.

Then, even though both the FSMD and the TSMD possess the same noise rejection capabilities, the smoothness and consistency of the
TSMD derivatives is a determinant factor to improve the estimation. This can be appreciated in Figs. 5 and 8 where, with or without noise, the relative error in the RLS estimation is maintained below a \( \%5 \) error bound. For its part, under exacting noise conditions, the use of the FSMD still provides an acceptable estimation error, although accuracy is worsen in comparison to the TSMD.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The work presented in this paper was undertaken as part of a project aiming to develop an estimation methodology to deal with energy storage systems utilised in sustainable hybrid energy systems. In this stage, three differentiators were evaluated to be applied in on-line estimation of VRFB parameters: a Standard, a Filtering and a Tracking SMD.

Without (or with very low) noise, all of them demonstrated excellent behaviours, allowing finite-time convergence for the regression equation variables which, in the VRFB under study, are the voltage, the current and their respective time derivatives. Above a certain level of noise the performance of the Standard SMD visibly deteriorates. Conversely, the Filtering and the Tracking SMDs, keep on delivering very good results. Subsequently, putting them to test under exacting noise conditions, the TSMD proved capability to better deal with it. The results reveal that, even though the error amplitude in the FSMD’s derivatives are lower than the ones of the TSMD, the
consistency in the estimated derivatives of the latter positively impact in the parameter estimations.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the Filtering and the Tracking SMDs are both applicable alternatives to implement the RLS with forgetting factor methodology for flow batteries on-line estimation. The latter is recommended, however if a lower computational burden is required, the former is also a highly suitable option.

As future work, other differentiation strategies, as well as different methods for the differentiators discretisation, will be investigated.
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