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Adaptive Observer-based parameter estimation with application to Road Gradient and Vehicle Mass Estimation

Muhammad Nasiruddin Mahyuddin, Member, IEEE, Jing Na, Guido Herrmann, Senior Member, IEEE, Xuemei Ren and Phil Barber

Abstract—A novel observer-based parameter estimation scheme with sliding mode term has been developed to estimate the road gradient and the vehicle weight using only the vehicle’s velocity and the driving torque. The estimation algorithm exploits all known terms in the system dynamics and a low pass filtered representation of the dynamics to derive an explicit expression of the parameter estimation error without measuring the acceleration. The proposed parameter estimation scheme which features a sliding-mode term to ensure the fast and robust convergence of the estimation in the presence of persistent excitation is augmented to an adaptive observer and analyzed using Lyapunov Theory. The analytical results show that the algorithm is stable and ensures finite-time error convergence to a bounded error even in the presence of disturbances. In the absence of disturbances, convergence to the true values in finite time is guaranteed.

A simple practical method for validating persistent excitation is provided using the new theoretical approach to estimation. This is validated by the practical implementation of the algorithm on a small-scaled vehicle, emulating a car system. The slope gradient as well as the vehicle’s mass/weight are estimated online. The algorithm shows a significant improvement over previous results.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, improving safety of the drivers and protecting the environment from excessive carbon emission and fuel consumption have become the main agenda of automotive companies. Several results in the literature evidently show the motivation of harnessing the knowledge of road gradient and vehicle’s mass [1]-[7], for the purpose of delivering safety features and fuel efficiency in vehicular technology. Active safety technologies such as vehicle stability control [8],[9] and antilock braking systems [10],[11] promise better control of the vehicle in the midst of aggressive maneuvers, minimising the likelihoods of rollover and skidding. UK research indicates the effectiveness of reducing serious crashes involving loss of control situations such as skidding, and rollover as much as 33% and 59% respectively [12]. These active safety technologies require information on the vehicle’s inertial parameter such as mass in order to perform prior system calibration. To add further challenge, trucks and SUVs are vehicles with highly variable loads. Nominal loads may provide high load safety but at the expense of the need of load calibration in case of load changes [13], [2]. Adapting active safety systems to variations in loading is the solution to the calibration problem, in particular, the online estimation of mass of the vehicle across all varying loads.

It has been shown that mass estimation without the knowledge of road grade proves to be ineffective as the method would contain an unacceptable level of error [1]. Knowledge of the road grade can be used in engine and gearbox control systems to assist the instantaneous power demand whilst regulating fuel consumption and thus, keeping environmental impact as low as possible [14]. Acceleration performance of a vehicle on a steep downhill can be improved in terms of hill holding, traction control and transmission shift scheduling, simultaneously giving the vehicle the merits of safety and fuel efficiency [6]. The reasons above prompt us to obtain the road gradient and vehicle’s mass simultaneously in a reliable and economic way.

Sensor-based methods to obtain road gradient information are prevalent [14], [15], [16]. Extraneous hardware and wiring complexity as consequence of additional sensors may not be desirable for automotive manufacturers [5]. One may argue that the cost of an accelerometer-based sensor, such as an inclinometer may be acceptable. However, due to the nature of the inclinometer’s construction, it is so susceptible to give out errors [17] as it is only suited to measure static inclination. Exploiting remote sensing methods such as GPS, e.g. in [14], may aid in road gradient estimation but at some cost. In [2], a GPS or barometer sensor is utilized in addition to torque and velocity sensors to obtain absolute road height information, while Barrho, et al. [18] require accurate information of the vehicle mass which is not always possible.

There is some work adopting a sensorless or model-based approach in road gradient and vehicle’s mass estimation [13],[1],[7],[19],[5],[4]. Mangan et al. [5] adopt a sensorless longitudinal road gradient estimation method which proves...
to be effective, although reliance on acceleration information, through differentiated velocity, may expose estimation to be over-sensitive to noise. Bae et al. [1] suggest a recursive least-squares (RLS) approach which requires acceleration information and then assumes the existence of sufficient data points to solve for the missing parameters, i.e. vehicle mass and gradient, by inverting a regressor matrix in a batch process. Similarly, the work in [20] and [6] estimate the road grade only using the position, velocity and driving torque or force signal. In [7], an RLS-based observer is designed to estimate the road gradient only, with the knowledge of the vehicle’s mass.

In this paper, we revisit the online road gradient and mass estimation of vehicular systems using only the vehicle’s velocity and the driving torque. This is achieved based on a novel adaptive nonlinear observer design. A novel estimation algorithm guarantees finite-time convergence of the estimated parameters to the true values. Moreover, auxiliary filtered variables implicitly generate a parameter estimation error which drives the adaptation algorithm with finite-time convergence. Compared to previous results (e.g. [21]) concerning the parameter estimation, some appropriate information of the parameter error is derived, and then incorporated into the parameter adaptation for the observer design. The proposed method is verified experimentally in a reduced-scale vehicular system, which provides a significant improvement over a previous algorithm. Moreover, the adaptation scheme does not rely on acceleration information due to some auxiliary filters. In addition, the parameter estimation scheme uses a filtered regressor matrix. Measurable system states, a regressor vector and the known dynamics are collected and filtered to form auxiliary variables. Owing to the special feature of a sliding mode term, the adaptation algorithm guarantees robust finite-time convergence to a compact set, provided that there is a Persistent Excitation (PE) condition fulfilled so that a filtered regressor matrix remains positive definite. The parameter error information can be explicitly formulated by virtue of the filtered auxiliary variables. The possible instability and infinite growth found in [22] and [23] due to the existence of an unstable integrator are prevented in this paper. We also show robustness of our adaptive scheme and we can verify the PE condition through computation of the respective filtered regressor matrix’s condition number. In contrast, the classical RLS algorithm fundamentally lacks in fast convergence, specifically exponential convergence, let alone finite-time convergence [21],[24].

Based on the discussions above, the contributions made in the paper can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed estimation approach does not require the knowledge of vehicle’s acceleration, i.e. only velocity and torque is needed.
- The adaptive observer-based parameter estimation algorithm proposed here incorporates a novel adaptive law that captures the parameter estimation error.
- Finite-time convergence of parameter estimate to true values is guaranteed in the presence of PE or sufficient richness (SR), in the absence of unknown disturbances. This is simultaneously achievable with being robust.

- The adaptive law incorporated in the proposed algorithm scheme contains significant robustness against disturbances. The sliding-mode term allows the switching signal to effectively reject disturbances and uncertainties.
- Extensive comparative experimental analysis provide evidence of the advantages of our approach in comparison to the RLS-algorithm.

This paper is organised as follows: In Section II, a system formulation is presented in a generic form along with the required assumption. Section III presents the adaptive observer design together with the novel adaptive law design in Section IV. A stability analysis is discussed in Section V followed by Section VI which presents the main contribution of the paper; the parameter estimation algorithm in application to road gradient and vehicle’s weight estimation. Section VII describes the experimental process and the main results of the contribution. Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM FORMULATIONS

Consider a nonlinear system of the following structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax + B_1 u_1 + B_2 f(x, u_2) + \zeta \\
y &= C x
\end{align*}
\]

where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is the known system matrix, \( B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_1} \) and \( B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_2} \) are known input matrices, \( u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \) and \( u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \) are known inputs, whilst \( C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n} \) is the corresponding output matrix and \( \zeta \in \mathbb{L}_\infty \) is a bounded disturbance. The function \( f(x, u_2) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \) is partially unknown for which the detail will be outlined below and the pair \((A, B_1)\) is controllable. It is assumed that \( p \geq m_2 \).

The following assumptions are made:

Assumption 1 \((C, A, B_2)\) is minimum phase and \((CB_2)\) is full rank.

Assumption 2 The function \( f(x, u_2) \) can be represented in a linear parameterized form: \( f(x, u_2) = \varphi(x, u_2)\Theta \), where \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times l} \) is a known Lipschitz continuous function, while \( \Theta = \text{const.} \), \( \Theta \in \mathbb{R}^l \) is an unknown parameter vector which is to be estimated.

Assumption 3 The signals \( x, u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) are measurable and bounded.

Assumption 3 is a common assumption for observer design and can be easily achieved by suitable choice of the control signal \( u_1 \) (e.g. [22],[26]).

Under these conditions, the system can take the following structure:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{x}_1 \\
\dot{x}_2
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
A_{11} & A_{12} \\
A_{21} & A_{22}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
B_{11} & B_{12}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
u_1 \\
u_2
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\bar{B}_2
\end{bmatrix}\varphi\Theta + \begin{bmatrix}
\zeta_1 \\
\zeta_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
y = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & I
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \bar{B}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m_2} \), \( I \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \) and \( x_2 = C x \). Note that this reformulation is always possible from Assumptions 1 and 3 using Proposition 6.3 in [26]. Moreover, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 4 \( A_{21} = 0 \), i.e. the second state equation in (2)
is decoupled. Assumption 4 is possibly a strong assumption but it will fit the generic practical system structures (e.g. vehicular) investigated in this paper.

III. ADAPTIVE OBSERVER DESIGN

We will design an adaptive observer to estimate the state vectors which will be suitably combined with a novel parameter estimation algorithm. The adaptive observer takes the following form:

\[
\dot{x} = A\dot{x} + B_1 u_1 + B_2 \varphi \hat{\Theta} + L(y - C\dot{x}) \tag{3}
\]

where, \(\dot{x}\) is the estimated state vector, \(\hat{\Theta}\) is the estimated parameter vector. \(L\) is the observer gain matrix such that \(A_c = A - LC\) is a stable matrix and there exist, according to Proposition 6.3 in [26], positive definite matrices, \(P\) and \(Q\) so that,

\[
A_c^T P + PA_c = -Q \tag{4}
\]

where,

\[
P = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & 0 \\ 0 & P_2 \end{bmatrix} > 0, \tag{5}
\]

\[
Q = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}^T & Q_2 \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad PB_2 = C^T F^T \tag{6}
\]

and \(F \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p}\) is a positive definite matrix. From (4), it follows,

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
A_{c11} P_1 + P_1 A_{c11} & P_1 A_{c12} \\
A_{c12} P_1 & P_2 A_{c22} + A_{c22}^T P_2
\end{bmatrix} = -Q
\tag{7}
\]

and \(A_{c21} = 0\). Let \(\hat{x} = x - \dot{x}\) and \(\hat{\Theta} = \Theta - \hat{\Theta}\). We can then use (1) and (3) to define the error dynamics \(\hat{x} = x - \dot{x}\) as

\[
\dot{\hat{x}} = (A - LC)\hat{x} + B_2 \varphi \hat{\Theta} + \zeta
\tag{8}
\]

where \(\hat{\Theta} = \Theta - \hat{\Theta}\) is the estimated parameter error vector.

In the next section, the adaptive laws that update the estimated parameter vector \(\hat{\Theta}\) are developed.

IV. ADAPTIVE LAW FORMULATION

In this section, we shall define the adaptive law for our parameter estimator.

A. Filter design

From (2), the second state equation can be expressed as,

\[
\dot{x}_2 = (A_{22} x_2 + B_{12} u_1) + B_2 \varphi \Theta + \zeta_2 \tag{9}
\]

Let

\[
\psi = A_{22} x_2 + B_{12} u_1 \tag{10a}
\]

\[
\phi = B_2 \varphi \tag{10b}
\]

then, the following filtered variables can be defined as,

\[
\begin{align*}
k \dot{x}_2 f + x_2 f &= x_2, \\
k \psi f &= \psi, \\
k \phi f &= \phi
\end{align*} \tag{11}
\]

where \(k > 0\). In addition, we may introduce an auxiliary filter for the bounded disturbance (which is only used for analysis),

\[
k \zeta_2 f + \zeta_2 f = \zeta_2, \quad \zeta_2 f(0) = 0 \tag{12}
\]

i.e. \(\zeta_2 f \in L_\infty\). Consequently, we can obtain from (9) and (11) that,

\[
\dot{x}_2 f = \frac{x_2 - x_{2f}}{k}, \quad \frac{x_2 - x_{2f}}{k} - \psi_f = \phi_f \Theta + \zeta_2 f \tag{13}
\]

B. Auxiliary integrated regressor matrix and vector

The filtered variables introduced above will be used in the definition of a filtered regressor matrix, \(M(t)\), and a vector, \(N(t)\) as,

\[
M(t) = -k_{FF} M(t) + k_{FF} \phi_f^T(t) \phi_f(t), \quad M(0) = 0 \tag{14}
\]

\[
N(t) = -k_{FF} N(t) + k_{FF} \phi_f^T(t) \left(\frac{x_2 - x_{2f}}{k} - \psi_f\right) \tag{15}
\]

where, \(k_{FF} \in \mathbb{R}^+\), can be implemented as a forgetting factor and the initial condition of \(N(t)\) is \(N(0) = 0\). Note that (15) is equivalent to:

\[
\dot{N}(t) = -k_{FF} N(t) + k_{FF} \phi_f^T(t) (\phi_f(t) \Theta + \zeta_2 f), \tag{16}
\]

Consequently, we can find the solution to (14) and (15),

\[
M(t) = \int_0^t e^{-k_{FF}(t-r)} k_{FF} \phi_f^T(r) \phi_f(r) dr
\]

\[
N(t) = \int_0^t e^{-k_{FF}(t-r)} k_{FF} \phi_f^T(r) \left(\frac{x_2 - x_{2f}}{k} - \psi_f\right) dr
\tag{17}
\]

where

\[
M(t) = M(t) \Theta + \int_0^t e^{-k_{FF}(t-r)} k_{FF} \phi_f^T(r) \zeta_2 f dr
\tag{18}
\]

and \(\zeta_2 N = \int_0^t e^{-k_{FF}(t-r)} k_{FF} \phi_f^T(r) \zeta_2 f dr\). Note that \(\phi_f\) is bounded since it is Lipschitz continuous and \(x, u_2\) are bounded (Assumption 1). Thus, \(\psi_f\) is bounded. Since \(\zeta_2 f \in L_\infty\), it follows that \(N(t), M(t)\) and \(\zeta_2 N\) are bounded.

Lemma 1: The auxiliary regressor matrix \(M(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}\) is positive definite, \(M(t) > 0\), if and only if \(\int_0^T \phi_f^T(t) \phi_f(t) dt > 0\).

Proof: It can be easily shown that

\[
\int_0^T \phi_f^T(t) \phi_f(t) dt \geq \int_0^T e^{-k_{FF}(t-r)} \phi_f^T(r) \phi_f(r) dt
\tag{19}
\]

when \(T < t\). For \(T = 0\), the claim follows.

Thus, if \(\phi_f\) is persistently excited, \(M(t) > \lambda_m I\) is positive definite for some \(\lambda_m > 0\). Clearly, if \(\phi_f\) is persistently excited for any time and a sufficiently large time interval (as derived from the linear system (11) and definition (10b)), then \(\psi_f\) is also persistently excited [36], [34]. Thus, if \(\phi_f\) is persistently excited then \(M(t) > \lambda_m I\) for some \(\lambda_m > 0\) and \(\int_0^T \phi_f^T \phi_f dt > \lambda_m I\). In this paper, it is important to achieve \(M(t) > \lambda_m I\) for our adaptation algorithm to work. This can be achieved through persistent excitation of \(\phi_f\).

Remark 1: The Persistent Excitation (PE) condition for the regressor \(\phi\) can be achieved in the experiment through an appropriate control signal, \(u_1\). For instance, the control signal
can be augmented by a noise signal or the controller can introduce ‘sufficient richness’ (SR) of x and guarantees M(t) > λmI, λm > 0 as in [30]. Note also that some practical systems may be subject to sufficient disturbances causing PE, e.g. [29].

C. Parameter Estimation

We shall write our adaptive law as,

$$\hat{\Theta}(t) = \Gamma[x^T F(y - C\hat{x}) - R(t)]$$

(20)

The term R(t) contains a sliding mode type term to ensure fast parameter convergence,

$$R(t) = M(t)\omega_1\Omega M(t)\hat{\Theta} - N(t)$$

(21)

$$+ M(t)\omega_2\Omega(M(t)\hat{\Theta} - N(t))$$

where $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ are positive definite scalars. $\Gamma$ and $\Omega$ are positive definite and diagonal design matrices:

$$\Gamma = \text{diag}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_l), \quad \Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_l)$$

(22)

It will be proven that the parameter error matrix, $\hat{\Theta}$, converges to zero in finite time for systems without disturbance.

Remark 2: Compared to previous results (i.e. the parameter adaptation is only driven by the observer error in (20)), the extra term R(t), taking parameter error information, M(t)\(\hat{\Theta} - N(t)\), is employed; this could enhance the parameter convergence performance [35]. In particular, we incorporate the sliding mode technique in (21) such that the finite-time convergence is guaranteed as stated in the next section.

V. STABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

The following theorem is the key technical result which is to be applied to the mass and gradient estimation.

Theorem 1: Given a system (1), which satisfies Assumption 1-4, an adaptive observer (3) with adaptation law (20) and (14) - (15) can be designed so that the unknown parameter vector $\Theta$ can be estimated via $\hat{\Theta}$. The following holds for persistently excited $\hat{\phi}$ (10b):

a) Ultimate bounded stability can be satisfied for all states (observer error and parameter estimation error).

b) For $\zeta = 0$, the adaptive observer and parameter estimation is exponentially stable for both states (observer error and parameter estimation error).

c) For $\zeta = 0$, finite-time convergence of the estimated parameters can be guaranteed.

Proof: a.) Note that we assume that $\phi$ is persistently excited, i.e. $M(t)$ is invertible. We shall prove the ultimate boundedness at first for observer error $\tilde{x}$ and parameter estimation error, $\hat{\Theta}$. The following Lyapunov candidate shall be employed,

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{2}x^T P\tilde{x} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} M^{-1}\tilde{N}$$

(23)

Note that $\tilde{N} = N - M\hat{\Theta}$, i.e. $\tilde{N} = M\Theta + \zeta_2N - M\hat{\Theta}$ and $\hat{\Theta} = M^{-1}[\tilde{N} - \zeta_2N]$. We shall then decompose (23) into,

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{2}[\tilde{x}_1^T P_1 \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{x}_2 + \tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} M^{-1}\tilde{N}]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T P_1 \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{x}_2 + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} M^{-1}\tilde{N}$$

$$= V_1 + V_2 + V_3$$

(24)

We now analyse the functions of $V_1 = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T P_1 \tilde{x}_1$ and $V_2 = V_2$ separately for convenience. Taking the derivative of $V_2$,

$$\dot{V}_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{x}_1^T P_2 \tilde{x}_2 + \tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{x}_2) - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T Q_2 \tilde{x}_1 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T Q_2 \tilde{x}_2 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} M^{-1}\tilde{N}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T Q_2 \tilde{x}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} (\tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\tilde{N}) + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2$$

(25)

The matrix $M(14)$ and the vector $\zeta_2N(18)$ are bounded for bounded $x_2$ which implies boundedness for $\zeta_{BD}$,

$$\zeta_{BD} = M^{-1}\tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\tilde{N}$$

(26)

Then,

$$\dot{V}_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T Q_2 \tilde{x}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} (\tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\tilde{N}) + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2$$

(27)

Adopting our adaptive law (20), it follows:

$$\dot{V}_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T Q_2 \tilde{x}_2 + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{x}_2$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2 - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_1^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1} (\tilde{N}^T M^{-1}\tilde{N}) + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{x}_2^T P_2 \tilde{P}_2 \tilde{x}_2$$

(28)

Let $\Omega_1 = \omega_1\Omega$ and $\Omega_2 = \omega_2\Omega$.

$$\dot{V}_2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{g}(Q_2)\|\tilde{x}_2\|^2 - \|\tilde{N}\|\Omega_1 \|\Omega_2\|$$

(29)

$$\leq -\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{g}(Q_2)\|\|\tilde{P}_2\|^2\|\|\tilde{N}\|\|\Omega_1 \|\|\Omega_2\|$$

(30)
where $\rho = 2||z|| + \lambda_m^{-1}||z||\|z\|$ and $g(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot)$ denote the minimum and maximum singular values for a matrix. Note that $z_{BD} \in L_{\infty}$ and $\rho \in L_{\infty}$. Thus, the result of (30) implies that the pair $(\hat{x}_2, \hat{N})$ will converge to a set of ultimate boundedness. Considering the special system structure of equation (2), Assumption 2 and the boundedness of $z_{2N}$, it is easily seen that also the pair $(\hat{x}, \hat{\Theta})$ will enter a set of ultimate boundedness.

b.) Now, we can prove exponential stability of both states. In this case, it follows for $\zeta = 0$ and (30);

$$V(t) \leq \frac{1}{2} \hat{x}_2Q_2\hat{x}_2 - g(\hat{O}_1)||\hat{N}||$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

$$\leq -\frac{1}{2}z(Q_2)z(P_2^{-1})V_2$$

$$\leq \lambda_m^{-1}2\sqrt{z(\hat{O}_1)}z(\Gamma^{1/2})\sqrt{V_3}$$

$$\leq 2\lambda_m^{-1}z(\hat{O}_2)z(\Gamma^{1/2})V_3$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

Thus, the pair $(\hat{x}_2, \hat{N})$ will decay exponentially to 0. Note that, now $\hat{N} = M\hat{\Theta}$ and $M > \lambda_m I$. Thus, under the condition $\zeta = 0$, it follows that the pair $(\hat{x}_2, \hat{\Theta})$ converges exponentially to 0 and subsequently also the pair $(\hat{x}, \hat{\Theta})$ due to Assumption 4.

c.) To prove finite-time convergence of $\hat{\Theta}$ for $\zeta = 0$, we can analyse $V_3 = \frac{1}{2}\hat{N}^T M^{-1}\Gamma^{-1/2}M^{-1}\hat{N}$ as follows for $M(t) > \lambda_m I$.

$$V_3 = \hat{N}^T M^{-1} \Gamma^{-1/2}[-(\varphi FC \hat{x} - R)\]$$

$$= \hat{N}^T M^{-1} [-(\varphi FC \hat{x} - R)]$$

$$= -\hat{\Theta}^T \varphi B_2^T P_2^T \hat{x} + \hat{\Theta}^T M\hat{\Theta} - N$$

$$\leq -\frac{1}{2}z(\hat{O}_1)\lambda_m - g(P_2)||\varphi||||\hat{x}||||\hat{\Theta}||$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}z(\hat{O}_2)\lambda_m ||\hat{\Theta}||^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

Exploiting again the fact that, $M(t) > \lambda_m I$, it follows

$$V_3 \leq -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma(\Gamma^{1/2})}z(\hat{O}_1)\lambda_m$$

$$-\frac{g(P_2)||\varphi||||\hat{x}||\sqrt{V_3}}{2}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}z(\hat{O}_2)\lambda_m ||\hat{\Theta}||^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

Since $\hat{x} \to 0$ and the scalar $||\varphi||$ is bounded, there is a time $T_1$ where, for $t > T_1$

$$g(\hat{O}_1)\lambda_m > g(P_2)||\varphi||||\hat{x}||$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

Thus, there is a time $T_2$ so that for $t > T_2$ and $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\hat{V}_3 \leq -\epsilon \sqrt{V_3}$$. Hence, using results from [25] finite-time convergence of the parameter error $\hat{\Theta}$ to zero can be achieved.

Remark 3: The result in Theorem 1 in fact is quite generic. It also allows for analysis of measurement errors of $x_2$ and $\varphi$. For this reason, we may have in the observer some measurement errors affecting both $x_2$ and also $\varphi(x, u_2)$ measurement and in reality $\hat{x}_2$ and $\varphi(x, u_2)$ are provided in the practical system. Thus, the observer equation is

$$\hat{x} = A\hat{x} + B_1u_1 + B_2\hat{\varphi}\hat{\Theta} + L(\hat{x}_2 - C\hat{x})$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)
where \( m \) is the mass of the vehicle, \( \theta \) is the road gradient on which the vehicle traverses, \( \dot{x} \) is the vehicle’s velocity, \( C_v \) is the viscous damping/friction coefficient and \( C_r \) is the rolling friction coefficient. Adhering to the structure presented in (1), we may represent the system in the following state space representation,

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{x} \\
\dot{\hat{x}}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
\dot{x}
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{m} \\
0
\end{bmatrix} F_{\text{engine}} - \begin{bmatrix}
\sin \theta + C_r \cos \theta \\
0 \end{bmatrix} g - \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
\frac{1}{m} C_r
\end{bmatrix} \dot{x}
\]

\[\begin{align}
y &= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
\dot{x}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align}\]

which will be used to develop our extended adaptive parameter estimator.

**B. Observer Design**

Following the general structure presented in (3), the adaptive observer with finite-time parameter estimation can be written as,

\[
\dot{x} = Ax + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
1
\end{bmatrix} \left[-g F_{\text{engine}} - \dot{x}\right] \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{s} \\
\dot{b}
\end{bmatrix} + L (y - \hat{y})
\]

\[y = Cx\]

where \( \hat{x} = [\hat{x} \ \dot{\hat{x}}] \) is the observed state vector. The observer’s system matrix, \( A \) and its output matrix, \( C \) are defined as

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[\begin{align}
\dot{s}, \dot{b}, \dot{f} \text{ are the estimated parameters of } \sin \theta + C_r \cos \theta, \frac{1}{m} \text{ and } \frac{C_r}{m} \text{ respectively whereas } L \text{ is the observer gain chosen to deliver the positive definite Lyapunov matrix } P \text{ such that it satisfies (4). The engine driving force } F_{\text{engine}} \text{ is assumed to be bounded (as it implements a velocity controller) to ensure that the system states } x \text{ remain bounded. Thus, using this structure, it follows,}
\end{align}\]

\[
B_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Theta} = \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{s} \\
\dot{b} \\
\dot{f}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \varphi = \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{g} \\
\dot{F}_{\text{engine}} \\
\dot{\dot{x}}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[\Gamma = \text{diag}(\gamma_s, \gamma_b, \gamma_f), \quad \Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_s, \omega_b, \omega_f)
\]

**VII. PRACTICAL APPLICATION RESULTS**

This section presents the practical implementation of our proposed novel estimation algorithm. The hardware realisation is briefly described at first followed by the estimation performance characterisation methodology. This section elucidates the method to assess the performance of the algorithm. The Mean Integral Absolute Error (mean IAE), which will be explained is used in the characterisation as a performance index computed across different sets of test condition (various slope profiles) and settings (noise level and velocity variations). Results on road gradient estimation performance are discussed which are then followed by mass estimation results.

**A. Hardware implementation**

A previously built small-scale model car [27] was used in the experiment to evaluate the estimation algorithm. There were two parameters to be estimated: the vehicle’s mass (nominally weighs \( \sim 10kg \) and the road gradients on which it traverses. An inclinometer, SCA61T, was installed for gradient measurements solely for reference purpose and not to be used in the algorithm. Figure 3 shows the implemented controller system network and architecture which emulates the system network of a road vehicle.

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope profile</th>
<th>( \theta_1 )</th>
<th>( \theta_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( 10^\circ )</td>
<td>( 15^\circ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( 18^\circ )</td>
<td>( 0^\circ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( 15^\circ )</td>
<td>( 20^\circ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( 22.3^\circ )</td>
<td>( 11.8^\circ )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental set for variation in noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 3.** Functional Structure of the System Onboard

Together with Matlab \(^{TM}\), the dSPACE MicroAutoBox, used in the experiment, is a dedicated Rapid Prototyping embedded...
system suited to test the proposed estimation algorithm. The drive train comprises of an EPOS 24/5 motor driver and the brushless DC motor (EC-i 40 Maxon) representing the vehicle’s engine. The motor is current-controlled via the MicroAutoBox which subsequently provides the driving force, \(F_{\text{engine}}\), proportional to the current signal, being controlled. Two Agilent HEDL5540 encoders are installed, one is attached to the driving motor and the other one is attached to the front wheel which is passive and not coupled to the drive train. The reasons for such attachment are two-fold. The first reason is to provide the true speed measurement of the vehicle. Secondly, they were used to help us in monitoring any sign of slippage on the rear driving wheel which may be caused by the excessive jerkiness or acceleration by the motor due to over excitation of the control signal. In our experiment, we would avoid the occurrence of significant slippage as this would invalidate our estimation effort. The tyre pressure of the test rig is kept at a constant 0.7 bar.

The test slope rig, constructed from two stiff wooden planks of 2 m in length each, were tilted and bolted together to give various slope profiles (Figure 2). There were four slope profiles (Table I) chosen to characterise the performance of our novel estimation algorithm. The starting slope would be always zero, i.e. flat ground start-up. Two load masses (of 1.85kg each) were used in the experiment to evaluate the mass estimation performance of the proposed algorithm on a flat surface.

### C. Parameter tuning

In our experiment, there were important parameters (see Table III) of the adaptive observer algorithm needed to be tuned to achieve satisfactory results. It is to be noted that universal adaptation gains and tuning knobs were obtained via the Lyapunov design, achieved in the preceding Section V. For practical implementation, the algorithm of (20) was slightly modified and a projection method [21] was introduced to limit the parameter values via realistic lower and upper bounds (Table IV). Assuming the algorithm is stable, it will remain within the bounds and avoid hitting them most of the time. This will be discussed later in the practical tests. In particular, we will be interested in a performance index \(\hat{n}\%\) which represents the ability of the algorithm to stay away from the practically imposed bounds. It can be calculated by

\[
\hat{n}\% = \frac{t_b}{t_d} \times 100
\]

where \(t_b\) is the sum of the periods of the estimated mass touching the bounds, divided by the overall estimation period, \(t_d\). The forgetting factor, \(k_{FF}\) which corresponds to the auxiliary regressors (formulated in Section IV-B equation (14) and (15)) was chosen to prevent the regressor matrix from growing unboundedly, compromising the need for conserving the immediate past horizon data (for better learning) and at the same time, ensuring faster parameter convergence. The corresponding values of the parameters displayed in the table are used in the experiment. Figures 4(a) and 4(b) show the effects of estimation performance (measured by mean IAE) of varying the adaptation gains \(\gamma_s, \gamma_0\) (see Equation (50)). As shown in Figure 4(a), increasing \(\gamma_s\) enhances the gradient estimation performance as this adaptive weight is associated with the gradient term, \((\sin \theta)\). On the other hand,
compromise in selecting \( \omega \) comprised of gains associated with the leakage term, \( \gamma \). The adaptation of the engine force needs to be selected at a right magnitude so as to observe the term \( \omega \) sharp spike during the track gradient transition. It is apparent to noise and system changes at high magnitude of \( \omega \) drive the estimated parameters to the true values in finite-time. \( \omega \) adhering to the requirement of a sufficiently large b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter Poles</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>0.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Filtering factor, \( k_p \) is defined as the gain that provides the desired balance between the adaptation rate and robustness to noise. A smaller \( k_p \) would result in a slower adaptation, while a larger \( k_p \) could lead to over-excitation and instability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer Adaptive weights, ( \Gamma )</th>
<th>( \gamma_1 )</th>
<th>700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma_2 )</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma_3 )</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sliding-Mode Adaptive weights, ( \Omega )</th>
<th>( \omega_f )</th>
<th>( 3.2 \times 10^{-15} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \omega_2 )</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \omega_1 )</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptation Gain within the leakage term, ( R )</th>
<th>( \omega_1 )</th>
<th>13.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forgetting Factor</td>
<td>( k_{PF} )</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \omega_1 \) associated with the mass estimation and correlated with the engine force, needs to be selected at a right magnitude so as to have the algorithm sufficiently sensitive to changes in gradient but not to over-excite the adaptation. The adaptation gains associated with the leakage term, \( R \) (see Equation (21)) comprised of \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) which are constant scalars chosen to be sufficiently large by virtue of Lyapunov Design as analysed in Section V. It is also evident in Figure 4(c) that there is a compromise in selecting \( \omega_1 \) to be significantly larger than \( \omega_2 \) to drive the estimated parameters to the true values in finite-time. Having \( \omega_1 \) too large may subject the algorithm to be over-sensitive to noise. For instance, the over-sensitised algorithm to noise and system changes at high magnitude of \( \omega_1 \) shows a sharp spike during the track gradient transition. It is apparent to observe the term \( \omega_1 \) works in concert with \( \omega_2 \), whereby, adhering to the requirement of a sufficiently large \( \omega_1 \), a lower \( \omega_2 \) improves the convergence rate.

### TABLE IV: SATURATION LIMITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Parameters</th>
<th>Estimation</th>
<th>Lower Limit</th>
<th>Upper Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass(m,kg)</td>
<td>( \bar{b} = 1/\dot{\bar{m}} )</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradient(( \theta ))</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradient(( \theta ))</td>
<td>( \sin(\theta) )</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction Coefficient</td>
<td>( C_{VF} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction Coefficient</td>
<td>( f = C_{VF}/\bar{m} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III: ADAPTATION MECHANISM PARAMETERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Description</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer Adaptive weights, ( \Gamma )</td>
<td>( \gamma_1 )</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Adaptive weights, ( \Gamma )</td>
<td>( \gamma_2 )</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Adaptive weights, ( \Gamma )</td>
<td>( \gamma_3 )</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding-Mode Adaptive weights, ( \Omega )</td>
<td>( \omega_f )</td>
<td>( 3.2 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding-Mode Adaptive weights, ( \Omega )</td>
<td>( \omega_2 )</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding-Mode Adaptive weights, ( \Omega )</td>
<td>( \omega_1 )</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation Gain within the leakage term, ( R )</td>
<td>( \omega_1 )</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgetting Factor</td>
<td>( k_{PF} )</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another component of the vehicle’s dynamic model required to be known is the rolling friction coefficient, \( C_{\mu} \). This was determined by allowing the vehicle to traverse in a constant velocity on a flat surface, i.e. \( \theta = 0 \), whereby the algorithm would estimate \( C_{\mu} \) with a notion that \( \sin\theta = 0 \) and \( \cos\theta = 1 \) were kept constant. The surface material on which the vehicle was tested was of cement floor type. The value of \( C_{\mu} \) was found to be in the range of \( 0.1 \sim 0.15 \). The value \( C_{\mu} = 0.12 \) was employed as a known constant in the dynamic model. Hence, the algorithm would be then used to estimate the road gradient.

### E. Road Gradient Estimation

Road gradient estimation performance will be evaluated under two sets of settings: i) different levels of noise content in the control signal and ii) different velocity profiles.

1) Influence of noise content in the control signal on the estimation performance: Figure 5 shows the distribution of computed mean IAE across four types of slope profiles for various levels of magnitude of white noise injected into the control signal. From the figure, it clearly shows that a white noise multiplied by 8 times of the nominal level enhanced the estimation.

2) Influence of the velocity profile in the control signal on the estimation performance: Using the characterisation result from Section VII-E1, the optimal noise level (8 times of nominal) is used in this section. Figure 6 shows the distribution of computed mean IAE for different velocity level and demand type across four types of slope profile. The figure also shows that 0.14 m/s would be the optimal velocity for the algorithm to best perform. Having this knowledge at our expense, the proposed algorithm was compared with the conventional least-square (LS) based algorithm [1], [24], [13], [20], [19] across all four types of slope profiles. Estimation performance results for two slopes are shown in Figure 7 and 9. Figure 10 also shows that our proposed algorithm supersedes the LS
algorithm in terms of the performance index, $\hat{n}_{\text{m}} \%$ (52). Figure 8 shows that all the three estimated components, i.e., $\hat{s}$, $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{f}$ remained within the realistic practical bounds. Interestingly, $\hat{f}$, associated with the coefficient of viscous friction, $C_{vf}$, remained constant in between $0.015 \sim 0.02$. Assuming the nominal mass of the vehicle was 10 kg, this translates to having $\hat{C}_{vf} \approx 0.12$ which is of an acceptable value.

### F. Mass Estimation Performance

A test was also carried out to evaluate the performance of the proposed estimation algorithm in estimating the step changes of mass on the vehicle. This is, in reality, equivalent to the unloading of cargo boxes or passengers from a truck or a SUV (sports utility vehicle) vehicle (See section VII-D for test procedure to determine $C_{m}$). Figure 11 shows the estimated mass of the vehicle together with the preloaded masses. The original signal of the estimated mass (shown by the lighter (vigorous) shades of the plot) was filtered by a Butterworth low pass filter with a 3 rad/s cut-off frequency. The test rig was preloaded with two extra load masses, weighing each 1.85 kg giving a total mass of 13.70 kg (since the net mass of the vehicle is 10 kg). Then, two load masses of 1.85 kg were removed consecutively at two intervals. The load masses

---

**Fig. 6.** Mean IAE distribution for all slope profiles with various velocity demand

**Fig. 7.** Comparative gradient estimation for slope profile 1 with the optimal velocity at 0.14 m/s

**Fig. 8.** The estimated parameter components, (a) $\hat{s}$, (b) $\hat{b}$ and (c) $\hat{f}$ during the gradient estimation of a slope with slope profile 1

**Fig. 9.** Comparative Gradient estimation for slope profile 2 with the optimal velocity at 0.14 m/s

**Fig. 10.** Percentage of hitting the mass estimation limit during the traverse for Slope profile 1 with (a) velocity variations and (b) noise level variations

**Fig. 11.** Mass Estimation, $\hat{m}(\text{kg})$ was preloaded with two extra load masses, weighing each 1.85 kg giving a total mass of 13.70 kg (since the net mass of the vehicle is 10 kg). Then, two load masses of 1.85 kg were removed consecutively at two intervals. The load masses
were placed (at the initial position) at almost center position to allow equal distribution of mass addition on the test rig. The vehicle was controlled to travel on a flat ground with constant velocity of 0.14 m/s assuming a constant rolling friction was present. White noise was also injected to the control signal supplied to the motor for regulated PE condition. The choice of the noise multiplier level and suitable traversal velocity were based on the test conducted in the previous road gradient performance characterisation test. Figure 11 shows that the novel estimation algorithm is sufficiently sensitive to the changes in the vehicle’s mass, awarding a very good mass estimation performance in its trait. Owing to the sliding-mode term in the adaptive law of the proposed estimation algorithm, the performance concurs with the initial theory and analysis in terms of its guaranteed finite-time convergence feature. Again, the finite-time convergence can be only ensured if (14) and (15) satisfy the PE condition. The result shows relatively good performance in terms of its responsiveness and accuracy. To strain the estimation effort further, the integrator of the algorithm’s filtered regressor were reset at the time of load masses removal with a purpose to see the convergence effect on it. Figures 12-13 show the effects of resetting the integrators and remarkably that the estimation was responsive to settle at the true value within a short time as proven in the theory by virtue of Lyapunov analysis. Hence, the results of Figure 11 are not influenced by the resetting or lack of resetting of the filtered regressor matrix (14) and vector (15) during experimentation.

G. Effects of Viscous Friction, $C_{vf}$, and Persistent Excitation

Prudent observation of the behavior of the estimated parameters in the experiment revealed that the viscous friction component, $C_{vf}$, imposed an insignificant influence on the overall dynamic of the system. Hence, the estimation performance would not be adversely affected by the component. Figure 8 (c) shows the key component associated with $C_{vf}$, i.e. $f_v$. It displays a constant value without much erratic behaviour. To investigate the rationale behind the phenomena, Table V illustrates the numerical disparity of $C_{vf}$ in terms of its dynamic effect in comparison to the rest of the components, in particular, $F_{engine}$. Observing the dynamic contribution of $C_{vf}$ in both extremities, the magnitude of $f \cdot \dot{x}$ is very small in comparison to the rest of the key dynamic components such as $(\sin \theta + C_{mu}) \cdot g$ and $\frac{m}{m} \cdot F_{engine}$. Referring back to Section VII-E2, $C_{vf}$ is estimated to be approximately 0.2, and the velocity was set at 0.14 m/s. The computed condition number of the filtered regressor matrix in (14) with all the three regressors involved ($F_{engine}$, $g$, $\dot{x}$) is about $1 \times 10^7$ which is very high. A very high condition number indicates that the regressor, $\dot{x}$, in particular, has either a strong correlation with any of the two regressors, possibly regressor $g$, i.e. gravity or the magnitude of the regressor value is insignificant. In this case, the huge difference in magnitude of $\dot{x}$ and $F_{engine}$ explains this ill-conditioning of the filtered regressor matrix as the filtered regressor matrix involves the squaring of these disparate regressors.
Therefore, in retrospect, the PE condition of (14) should be investigated by computing the condition number of the filtered regressor, \( \mathbf{r} \), involving only two key regressors, \( g \) and \( F_{\text{engine}} \).

Velocity, \( v \), which relates to the viscous friction, was omitted from the filtered regressor matrix in (14). This creates a well-conditioned filtered regressor matrix with a condition number of about 3000. This verifies that the PE condition has been fulfilled in this case. Figure 14 shows the respective condition number computed for experiments involving all slope profiles. Hence, the PE condition is fulfilled for all the experiments. The results without the inclusion of \( C_{\text{vf}} \) into the model and estimation are in fact fully consistent with the results where the \( C_{\text{vf}} \) estimation was included (see prior sections).
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### IX. CONCLUSION

An adaptive observer with novel sliding-mode based parameter estimation algorithm to estimate the road gradient and vehicle’s mass is presented. The proposed parameter estimator with the sliding-mode term has been proven analytically to be finite time convergent to an error of well defined bound. The algorithm shows significant levels of robustness to disturbances and a particular class of measurement errors. The analytical results are further supported and validated by the practical implementation in a form of experiments conducted on a small-scale vehicle traversing a designated test slope profile with certain parameters tuned. Performance characterisation has been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed road gradient estimation algorithm given a certain level of noise introduced in the control signal and under a certain traversal velocity. The practical results show a significant improvement over the LS-based algorithm in terms of realistic values within the physical bounds and convergence.
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