On Parameter Selection of Nonsingular Predefined-time Terminal Sliding Mode With the Fixed-time Convergence Guarantee

Wen Yan^a,

^aCollege of Electrical Engineering, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China

This paper study the parameter selection of predefined-time sliding mode and try to design a general nonsingular predefined-time terminal sliding mode. 1). On parameter selection: Some existing predefined-time sliding modes are designed to focus on the reaching time and ignore the characterization of the equilibrium point i.e. $x_e = 0$. In actual engineer, the system can only converge to a small neighborhood near the equilibrium point because of the existence of uncertainty i.e. $x_e \to 0$. The actual equilibrium point should be deduced by taking the limit but not directly solve the equilibrium point. Hence, the actual selection of exponential term is suggested to be not 1 to make system convergence to the equilibrium point within predefined time. 2). On singularity-avoidance: Based on the exponential feature of predefined-time stability systems, a mathematic concept of switching sliding mode [1] is applied in the design of nonsingular predefined-time terminal sliding mode. However, this class of sliding mode switching method will cause a singular problem, which can be described as control input $u \to \infty$ if the system state $x \to 0$ and any-order time derivative of x is not 0. Hence, a non-singular selection condition for each recursive sliding mode surface is explored in this paper to realize the global finiteness of control input. In addition, an unnecessary chattering of control input will also be caused by the sliding mode switching frequency, and a novel switching condition will be applied in the controller to reduce this chattering. Simulations will be carried out to validate the effect of the novel nonsingular predefined-time sliding mode switching condition will be applied in the control of the system.

Key words: exponential term; predefined-time stability; nonsingular terminal sliding mode; parameter selection.

1 Introduction

Sliding mode control is widely studied by researchers for its robustness, time convergence and high-precision [2,3,4]. An important research direction of sliding mode control is finite time control [5]. With the development of finite time sliding mode control, the characteristic of a terminal attractor is explored gradually to obtain faster convergence rate of system [6]. It is not satisfied that the convergence time depends on the initial state, a fixed-time attractivity is presented in [7] to obtain a fixed-time stability system. However, the upper bound of the settling time of traditional fixed-time is usually determined by two or more parameters, hence, a simplifying fixed-time stability system is presented in [8] to make the upper bound of settling time explicit in the system function. In addition, the improved fixed-time stability system can also obtain an upper bound of settling time without enlarging and reducing mathematically [9,10], but most of traditional fixed-time stability systems enlarged the upper bound of settling time. Especially, a note on predefined-time stability in [11] pointed that the predefined-time stability of system can be guaranteed without the exponential term. This result allows a construction of the predefined-time stabilizing controller with only polynominal term (instead of the exponential one) and its Lyapunov characterization analysis is perfect, but this class of predefined-time stability function [11,12,13,14] may not consider if system can reach and stay in the neighborhood of equilibrium point within predefined time. The related researchers study a reconstruction

 $^{^{\}star}$ Corresponding author Wen Yan. Tel. 18683977138.

Email address: essay.yan@qq.com (Wen Yan).

method of controller in Definition 3.1 of [8] to make system convergence to the equilibrium point theoretically, but it seems that the actual characterization of the equilibrium point will be different from the description in [8] by considering the analysis and simulation in this paper.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that almost all fixed-time or predefined-time sliding mode controllers have a singular problem. This singularity can be defined as a case where the control input may be infinite if the system state $x \to 0$ and any-order time derivative of x is not 0 or ∞ . For a second-order system, related researchers have presented many non-singulary control methods, and these methods can be divided into two categories: one is to transfer the singularity caused by the state x = 0 to the time derivative of the state $\dot{x} = 0$ [15,12,16], another one is to deal with singular term of controller directly [17,18,19]. The first category seems to deal well with the singularity proposed in this paper, but the control input may be infinite if $\dot{x} = 0$. The value of this time derivative is possible in practice. Another one (except the method in [19]) can only guarantee finite-time stability of system, because its essence is to limit the max value of control input while ignoring the infinite control input required by the controller to ensure the fixed time convergence of the system when system is in singularity, then the actual convergence time may be longer than the predefined maximum convergence time. Fortunately, based on the exponential feature of predefined-time stability systems, a traditional sliding mode switching strategy [1] can be applied to design a nonsingular predefinedtime terminal sliding mode controller in [19]. This controller can guarantee not only the strict fixed time stability of system but also the finiteness of the control input, however, it is difficult to find an appropriate switching sliding mode. For a higher-order system, there seems to be little research on non-singular fixed-time recursive sliding mode control. The above-mentioned methods may be too complex if apply them directly to higher-order system, hence, it is necessary to study a simplifying sidling mode switching scheme to overcome the singularity of fixed-time terminal sidling mode control method for second-order or high-order system.

The contribution of this paper lies on: 1). The relationship between the non-time parameter value of predefinedtime stability system and the characterization of equilibrium point is studied to explore the better value range of parameters. 2). A simplifying sidling mode switching scheme is studied to overcome the singularity of fixed-time terminal sliding mode control. 3). A nonsingular predefined-time sliding mode controller for higher-order system is studied to explore the max range of non-time parameter value.

2 Preliminaries

Definition 1: (see [8]). Consider a system:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(t) = -\frac{1}{T_c} f(\boldsymbol{x}(t); m), \ \boldsymbol{x}(0) = \boldsymbol{x}_0.$$
(1)

where $\boldsymbol{x} = [x_1, x_2 \cdots x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of system state, $f(\boldsymbol{x}) : D \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuous function and $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$. The system (1) is predefined-time stable if system is globally fixed-time stable and the minimum upper bound of settling time $T(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$ can be deduced without enlarging and reducing in math.

Lemma 1: (see [11]). Consider the following system:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right]^T.$$
(2)

where $T_c > 0$, and W(x) satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} (i)0 < W(\boldsymbol{x}) < 1 \ for \ all \ \boldsymbol{x} \in R^n \\ (ii)W(\boldsymbol{x}) &= 0 \ \text{if and only if } \boldsymbol{x} = 0 \\ (iii)W(\boldsymbol{x}) \to 1 \ \text{as } \|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty \\ (iv)W(\boldsymbol{x}) \ is \ C^1 \ \text{in } R^n \setminus \{0\} \\ (v) \left\| \frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right\| \neq 0 \ \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in R^n \end{aligned}$$
(3)

Then, the system can be said predefined-time stable, and the minimum upper bound of settling time is T_c .

Lemma 2: Consider the following system:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right]^T.$$
(4)

where $W(||\boldsymbol{x}||^m)$ satisfies the conditions in (3). The exponential term should be emphasized in here and 0 < m < 1 $(m \neq 1)$. The (3)-(v) should be modified as $\frac{\partial W(||\boldsymbol{x}||^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} > 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In addition, a supplementary condition should be: $\frac{\partial W(||\boldsymbol{x}||^m)}{\partial ||\boldsymbol{x}||^m} \neq 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof: The system (4) can be written as:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right]^T \\ = -\frac{1}{T_c} \frac{\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right]^T \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}}}{\left\| \frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x}^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right\|^2 \frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x}^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}}} \\ = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right]^{-1}$$
(5)

1) By considering m = 1, the $W(||\boldsymbol{x}||^m)$ still satisfies the condition in (3). However, a limit will be exampled in the following to emphasize $m \neq 1$:

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{x}\to0} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{x}\|} \frac{\boldsymbol{x}^T}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|} \right]^{-1}$$

$$\stackrel{y=\|\boldsymbol{x}\|}{=} -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{x}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|}$$

$$= \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}} \right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{E}_{n1} , \boldsymbol{x} \to 0^+ \\ \frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}} \right]^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} sign(x_1) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & sign(x_n) \end{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{E}_{n1}, others$$

$$\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{y})}{\partial \boldsymbol{y}} \right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{E}_{n1} , \boldsymbol{x} \to 0^-$$
(6)

where $E_{n1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It is clear that \dot{x} will be not zero when $x \to 0$ by the theorem of equivalent infinitesimal. Hence, the system (5) may be not stable at 0 as $t \to \infty$.

Example 1: Consider a simple on-order system: $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} - \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_d = \boldsymbol{u}$ in which $\boldsymbol{u} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \right]^T$ and $W(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1 - exp(\|\boldsymbol{x}^m\|)$. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the simulation is carried out to show the different convergence performance of predefined-time stable system under different parameters m. It is clear that the system can converge to the equilibrium point more smoothly in $0 < m \le 0.5$ than $0.5 < m \le 1$ after $T_c = 0.1$. In addition, there is a very interesting performance of system: by consider a traditional idea (m=1 may be an appropriate value in Lemma 1), the chattering degree of controller should decrease as m decreases. However, according to the curves of simulation, the chattering degree of controller in m = 1 is smaller than that in $0.8 \le m \le 0.9$. Not only that, but this curve is a regular triangular curve, not as irregular as other curves. The mathematical principles of this phenomenon may be explained by (6).

Remark 1: Even by considering the following discontinuous predefined-time stabile system which is given as the case 2 of Definition 3.1 in [8]:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{e}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} exp(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|) \operatorname{sign}(\boldsymbol{e}), \tag{7}$$



Fig. 1. The curve of $(x|\dot{x}=-\frac{1}{T_c}exp(|x|^m)\frac{x}{|x|^m})$: $T_c=0.1,\ m=1,0.9,\cdots 0.1$



Fig. 2. The curve of $(\dot{x}|\dot{x} = -\frac{1}{T_c}exp(|x|^m)\frac{x}{|x|^m})$: $T_c = 0.1, m = 1, 0.9, \cdots 0.1$

However, the system is still difficult to converge to the equilibrium point within a predetermined time, because:

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{\boldsymbol{e} \to \mathbf{0}^+} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \exp(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|) sign(\boldsymbol{e}) = -\frac{1}{T_c} \exp(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|) \\ \lim_{\boldsymbol{e} \to \mathbf{0}^-} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \exp(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|) sign(\boldsymbol{e}) = \frac{1}{T_c} \exp(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|) \end{cases}$$
(8)

2) By considering 0 < m < 1, $W(||\boldsymbol{x}||^m)$ still satisfies the condition in Lemma1, and a limit will be exemplified in the following to emphasize $m \in (0, 1)$ and $m \neq 1$:

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{x}\to 0} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m} \frac{m \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m-1} x^T}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|} \right]^{-1}$$

$$\stackrel{y=\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m}{=} -\frac{1}{mT_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{x}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m} \quad . \tag{9}$$

$$= \mathbf{0}$$

It is clear that \dot{x} will be zero when $x \to 0$ according to the theorem of higher-order infinitesimal. Hence, the system (5) can be stable at 0 as $t \to T_c$.

Consider a candidate Lyapunov function as the following:

$$V_1 = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|. \tag{10}$$

The time derivative of Lyapunov function (10) can be deduced as:

$$\dot{V}_{1} = \frac{\boldsymbol{x}^{T} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|} \\
= -\frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\boldsymbol{x}^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m}} \frac{m \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m-1} \boldsymbol{x}^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|} \right]^{-1} \\
\overset{y=\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m}}{=} -\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{1-m}$$
(11)

According to (3), the system (11) may not be stable. The (3)-(v) may only be a necessary but not sufficient condition, for example:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{mT_c} exp(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m) \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{1-m},$$
(12)

Although all the conditions is satisfied, but (12) is not stable in $\boldsymbol{x} < 0$, hence, (3)-(v) should be modified as a necessary and sufficient condition: $\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} > 0$, then, (11) can be deduced as:

$$\dot{V}_{1} = -\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{1}^{m})}{\partial V_{1}^{m}} \right]^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{1-m}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{1}^{m})}{\partial V_{1}^{m}} \right]^{-1} V_{1}^{1-m}$$

$$< 0$$
(13)

Then, the settling time can be deduced as:

$$T(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}) = \int_{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{x}_{0})}^{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})} \frac{1}{-\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{1}^{m})}{\partial V_{1}^{m}}\right]^{-1} V_{1}^{1-m}} dV_{1}$$

$$= T_{c} \int_{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})^{m}}^{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{x}_{0})^{m}} \frac{\partial W(V_{1}^{m})}{\partial V_{1}^{m}} dV_{1}^{m}$$

$$= T_{c} \left[W(V_{1}(\boldsymbol{x}_{0})^{m}) - W(V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})^{m})\right]$$
(14)

Hence, the max settling time can be direct defined as T_c without any math method of enlarging and reducing. In addition, in my opinion, it is also the essential difference between predefined time stability and fixed time one.

The proof is complete.

Definition 2: Until now, the definition of singularity for terminal sliding mode has been complex and confusing. Hence, we suggest that the singularity for fixed-time terminal sliding mode control can be defined: control input will not be infinite whenever system state is not to infinite. This may be the more proper description of singularity.

3 Main Results

3.1 A Second-order System

Consider a second-order MIMO system as the following:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_1 = \boldsymbol{x}_2 \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_2 = f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + b(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\boldsymbol{u} \\ \boldsymbol{y}_o = \boldsymbol{x}_1 \end{cases}$$
(15)

where $\boldsymbol{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,1} \ x_{1,2} \ \cdots \ x_{1,n} \end{bmatrix}^T$, $\boldsymbol{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{x}_1^T \ \boldsymbol{x}_2^T \end{bmatrix}^T$. $f(\boldsymbol{x},t) : D \to R^n$ is a continuous function. $b(\boldsymbol{x},t) : D \to R^{n \times n}$ is a continuous function. $\boldsymbol{u} \in R^n$ is the control input, $\boldsymbol{y}_o \in R^n$ is system output.

Assumption 1 (for finite control input): $\frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y} > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial^2 \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y^2} > 0.$

Corollary 1: According to Lemma 2, a predefined-time sliding mode can be designed as:

$$\boldsymbol{s} = \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} + \frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right]^T.$$
(16)

where $e = y_o - y_d$ in which y_d is the desired system output. Then, a simple sliding mode switching method can be designed to make sliding mode control input nonsingular as:

$$m = \begin{cases} 1 + (m-1)sign(sat(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|}{\varepsilon})), & \|\boldsymbol{s}\| \neq 0\\ m & , & \|\boldsymbol{s}\| = 0 \end{cases}.$$
 (17)

with

$$sat(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|}{\varepsilon}) = \begin{cases} 1 , & \|\boldsymbol{e}\| > \varepsilon \\ 0 , & \|\boldsymbol{e}\| \le \varepsilon \end{cases}.$$
(18)

where $0 < m \leq 0.5$ and ε is a small parameter representing the risk of singularity. As a direct consequence, the singularity of sliding mode can be overcome by (17) and (18) if Assumption 1 is satisfied for $y = \|e\|^m$.

Proof: This subsection mainly discusses the finiteness of control input, hence b(x, t) can set to a n-order unit matrix, f(x, t) can be set to **0**.

The dynamic of sliding mode surface s can be expressed as:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{s}} = \boldsymbol{u} + \frac{1}{T_c} \frac{\partial \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right]^{-1} \right)}{\partial t}.$$
(19)

1) By considering an arbitrary reaching law $\dot{s} = f(s)$ which satisfies Lemma 2 , then, the control input u can be deduced as:

$$\boldsymbol{u}^{y=\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{mT_{c}} \frac{\partial \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{e}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} \right)}{\partial t} \\ = f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left(\frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \frac{m\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m-1}\boldsymbol{e}^{T}\dot{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|} \frac{\boldsymbol{e}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} \\ + \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \frac{(1-m)\dot{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} \right) \\ = f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} - \frac{(1-m)}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}}$$
(20)

Then, the singularity will come (generally, $\dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \to \infty$ will not be considered):

$$\lim_{e \to 0, \dot{e} \neq 0} \boldsymbol{u}^{y = ||\boldsymbol{e}||^{m}} f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} - \frac{\left(1 - m\right)}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1} \frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{e}}}{||\boldsymbol{0}||^{m}} = f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} - \infty \operatorname{sign}(\dot{\boldsymbol{e}}) = f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \infty \operatorname{sign}(\dot{\boldsymbol{e}})$$

$$(21)$$

Let me break off the proof for a moment, an interesting phenomenon can be discussed to express my alternative understanding of singularity.

a). By considering f(s) is finite, then,

$$\lim_{e \to 0, \dot{e} \neq 0} u = -\infty \operatorname{sign}(\dot{e}).$$
⁽²²⁾

b). By considering ||f(s)|| is the inequivalent infinity of $\left\|\frac{1}{T_c}\frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y}\dot{e} + \infty \operatorname{sign}(\dot{e})\right\|$ in (21) and $\Psi_i = \operatorname{sign}(f(s_i)) - \operatorname{sign}(\dot{e}_i)$, then,

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{e}\to 0, \boldsymbol{\dot{e}}\neq 0} \boldsymbol{u} = \pm\infty \tag{23}$$

c). By considering ||f(s)|| is the equivalent infinity of $\left\|\frac{1}{T_c}\frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y}\dot{e} + \infty \operatorname{sign}(\dot{e})\right\|$ in (21) and $\Psi_i = \operatorname{sign}(f(s_i)) - \operatorname{sign}(\dot{e}_i)$, then,

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{e}\to 0, \boldsymbol{\dot{e}}\neq 0} \boldsymbol{u} = \infty \left[\operatorname{sign}(f(\boldsymbol{s})) - \operatorname{sign}(\boldsymbol{\dot{e}}) \right] \\ = \left[\infty \Psi_1 \ \infty \Psi_2 \ \cdots \ \infty \Psi_n \right]^T$$
(24)

In case of (c), it is clear that the control input \boldsymbol{u} may be zero if each $f(s_i)\dot{e}_i > 0$.

Remark 2: In the perspective of control engineering, the infinite initial condition may not be controlled, however, according to (21) and (24), the control input may be finite in a very strict condition as the equivalent infinity in (c). In addition, according to $\dot{s} = f(s)$ in (20), if each $\dot{s}_i \dot{x}_i > 0$ and there is no unknown disturbance, the strict condition may be relaxed as: $\lim_{e \to \frac{1}{c}, \dot{e} = c} \|u\|_{f(s_i)\dot{e}_i > 0}^{y = \|\underline{e}\|^m} \|f(s)\| - \left(\left\|\frac{1}{T_c} \frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y}\dot{\underline{e}}\right\| + \left\|\frac{(1-m)}{mT_c}\left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}\frac{\dot{e}}{\|0\|^m}\right\|\right) \leq a \ finite \ constant$ in which $\|c\|$ is a big number. i.e. $\|c\| = 3.0 \times 10^8$. Hence, a special class of infinite initial condition may be controlled to be stable by a global finite control input if controller can make $\dot{s}_i \dot{e}_i > 0$ all the time.

The Remark 2 is only a conjecture, but it also reveals some properties of singularity.

Go on the proof. Then, according to (21), (22), (23) and (24), we know that the possible reason of infinite control inputs. By considering actual engineer, f(s) and \dot{e} is finite, hence, we set m = 1 when $e \to 0$ and $s \neq 0$:

$$\lim_{e \to 0, \dot{e} \neq 0} \|\boldsymbol{u}\| \stackrel{y = \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m}{=} f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{T_c} \frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y}\right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \dot{\boldsymbol{e}}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{a} \text{ finite constant}$$
(25)

Then, by considering a predefined-time reaching law $f(s) = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}\|^m)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}\|^m} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}} \right]^T$, the candidate Lyapunov function is $V_s = \|\boldsymbol{s}\|$ and the sliding mode existence condition can be expressed:

$$\dot{V}_{s} = \frac{\boldsymbol{s}^{T} \boldsymbol{\dot{s}}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}\|} \\
= -\frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}\|} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}\|^{m})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}\|^{m}} \frac{m \|\boldsymbol{s}\|^{m-1} \boldsymbol{s}^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}\|} \right]^{-1} \\
= -\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{s}^{m})}{\partial V_{s}^{m}} \right]^{-1} V_{s}^{1-m} \\
< 0$$
(26)



Fig. 3. The curve of \boldsymbol{y} in which $W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m) = 1 - exp(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m)$: $T_c = 1, \ m = 1, 0.9, \cdots 0.1$

The reaching time can be deduced by:

$$T = \int_{V_{s}(\mathbf{e}_{s}=0)}^{V_{s}(\mathbf{e}_{s}=0)} \frac{1}{-\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{s}^{m})}{\partial V_{s}^{m}}\right]^{-1} V_{s}^{1-m}} dV_{s}$$

$$= T_{c} \int_{V_{s}(\mathbf{e}_{s}=0)^{m}}^{V_{s}(\mathbf{e}_{0})^{m}} \frac{\partial W(V^{m})}{\partial V^{m}} dV_{s}^{m}$$

$$= T_{c} \left[W(V_{s}(\mathbf{e}_{0})^{m}) - W(V_{s}(\mathbf{e}_{s}=0)^{m})\right]$$

(27)

Hence, the minimum upper bound of reaching time is T_c .

Result 1: the parameter m satisfied the condition of (17) will not affect the minimum upper bound of reaching time.

2) When sliding mode surface reaches 0, then, (16) can be written as:

$$\boldsymbol{s} = \boldsymbol{0} = \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} + \frac{1}{mT_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right]^T.$$
(28)

Then control input could be expressed by (20) and (28) as the following:

$$\boldsymbol{u}^{y=\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left(\frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \boldsymbol{m} \boldsymbol{\dot{e}} + \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \frac{(m-1)\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m})}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right]^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} \right)$$

$$= f(\boldsymbol{s}) - \frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\partial \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1}}{\partial y} \boldsymbol{\dot{e}} - \frac{(m-1)}{m^{2}T^{2}_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-2} \frac{\boldsymbol{e}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{2m}}$$
(29)

According to higher-order infinitesimal theorem, it is clear that control input \boldsymbol{u} in (29) will not be infinite in any actual conditions when $0 < m \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Then a candidate Lyapunov function can be shown as:

$$V_2 = \|\boldsymbol{e}\|. \tag{30}$$

The time derivative of Lyapunov function (30) can be deduced as:

$$\dot{V}_{2} = \frac{\boldsymbol{e}^{T} \dot{\boldsymbol{e}}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|} \\ = -\frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{\boldsymbol{e}^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}} \frac{m\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m-1}\boldsymbol{e}^{T}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|} \right]^{-1} \\ y = \frac{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m}}{=} -\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(y)}{\partial y} \right]^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{1-m}$$

$$(31)$$

When m = 1:

$$\dot{V}_2 = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_2)}{\partial V_2} \right]^{-1} .$$

$$< 0$$
(32)

The settling time function of (32) can be deduced:

$$T = \int_{V_{2}(\mathbf{e}_{0})}^{V_{2}(\mathbf{0})} \frac{1}{-\frac{1}{T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{2})}{\partial V_{2}}\right]^{-1}} dV_{2}$$

= $T_{c} \int_{V_{2}(\mathbf{0})}^{V_{2}(\mathbf{e}_{0})} \frac{\partial W(V_{2})}{\partial V_{2}} dV_{2}$
= $T_{c} \left[W(V_{2}(\mathbf{e}_{0})) - W(V_{2}(\mathbf{0}))\right]$ (33)

Note that $m \neq 1$ when s = 0, because $\dot{V} \neq 0$ if V = 0. In addition, by considering $f(\boldsymbol{x},t) = -\boldsymbol{x}_2$ and $b(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \boldsymbol{E}_{3\times 3}$. The output of system with the controller designed by (20) can be showed in Fig. 3. According to Fig. 3, it is clear that the system errors will not converge to zero within $2T_c$ only if m = 1, and it converge wavily to zero at about 2.5s.

When $0 < m \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

$$\dot{V}_{2} = -\frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{2}^{m})}{\partial V_{2}^{m}} \right]^{-1} V_{2}^{1-m}$$

$$< 0$$
(34)

The settling time function of (34) can be deduced:

$$T = \int_{V_2(\mathbf{e}_0)}^{V_2(\mathbf{e}_0)} \frac{1}{-\frac{1}{mT_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_2^m)}{\partial V_2^m}\right]^{-1} V_2^{1-m}} dV_2$$

= $T_c \int_{V_2(\mathbf{e}_0)^m}^{V_2(\mathbf{e}_0)^m} \frac{\partial W(V_2^m)}{\partial V_2^m} dV_2^m$
= $T_c \left[W(V_2(\mathbf{e}_0)^m) - W(V_2(\mathbf{0})^m)\right]$ (35)

The upper bounds of reaching time in the case of (32) and (34) are same. However, these equilibrium states may be different: (32) is $(V_2, \dot{V}_2)_{V_2=0} = (V_2, -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_2)}{\partial V_2} \right]^{-1})_{V_2=0} = (0, -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_2 \to 0^+)}{\partial (V_2 \to 0^+)} \right]^{-1})$, (34) is $(V_2, \dot{V}_2)_{V_2=0} = (V_2, -\frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_2)}{\partial V_2} \right]^{-1} V_2^{1-m})_{V_2=0} = (0, 0)$. In addition, none of the *y* derivative of the known predefined-time stability functions is 0 if $V_2 \to 0$. Hence, the parameter should be $0 < m \le \frac{1}{2}$ when $\|\boldsymbol{s}\| = 0$.

In order to make control system nonsingular and predefined-time stable, the parameter m should be changed as (17).

The proof is complete.

Remark 3: By considering a design method of semi-global predefined-time system in [9,10,20]. A class of candidate Lyapunov function can be set as:

$$V = \left\| \boldsymbol{e} \right\|^m. \tag{36}$$

Then, the predefined-time system could be designed as:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{e}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} exp(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{mp}) \frac{\boldsymbol{e}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{mp}}.$$
(37)

In this case, the parameters m and p will be considered combined into a single parameter m = mp.

Remark 4: In actual control engineering using the SMC control, s will not be zero in the presence of perturbations. Hence, the sliding mode switching strategy in (17) will work frequently, and then, an unavoidable chattering of control input will occur when sliding mode switches. We suggest that sliding mode switching strategy in (17) will work only if control input u is real large:

$$\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \varepsilon , & \|\boldsymbol{u}\| > u_{\max} \\ 0 , & others \end{cases}$$
(38)

where u_{max} is the maximum allowable value of control input.

3.2 A N-order System

Consider a n-order MIMO system as the following:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i} = \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} ; & i = 1, 2 \cdots, n-1 \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_{n} = f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + b(\boldsymbol{x}, t)(\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}_{r}) + \boldsymbol{d}(t) \\ \boldsymbol{y}_{o} = \boldsymbol{x}_{1} \end{cases}$$
(39)

where $\boldsymbol{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{x}_1^T \ \boldsymbol{x}_2^T \ \cdots \ \boldsymbol{x}_n^T \end{bmatrix}^T$, $\boldsymbol{u}_r \in R^n$ is a robust controller, and an accurate estimation $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}(t)$ of $\boldsymbol{d}(t)$ will be considered to design $\boldsymbol{u}_r \in R^n = b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \| \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}(t) \| sign(\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}).$

Consider a tracking problem $y \to y_d$, and the error vector can be defined as:

$$\mathfrak{S} = \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_d = \left[\boldsymbol{e}^T \ \dot{\boldsymbol{e}}^T \ \cdots \ \boldsymbol{e}^{(n-1)^T} \right]^T.$$
(40)

Corollary 2: The singularity of n-order system can be described as: control input u will be infinite if $e \to 0$ and $||\Im| \neq 0$. A nonsingular recursive predefined-time sliding mode can be designed by Lemma 2 as:

in which $s_0 = e$ and the parameters satisfy the following condition:

$$m_{k} = \begin{cases} 1 + (m_{k} - 1)sign(sat(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|}{\varepsilon})), & \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k+1}\| \neq 0\\ m_{k}, & \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k+1}\| = 0 \end{cases}.$$
(42)

with

$$sat(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|}{\varepsilon}) = \begin{cases} 1 , & \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\| > \varepsilon \\ 0 , & \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\| \le \varepsilon \end{cases}$$
(43)

where $k = 0, \dots, n-2$. $0 < m_k \leq \frac{1}{n-k}$ and $0 < m_{n-1} < 1$. ε is a small parameter representing the risk of singularity which satisfy the Remark 4.

Assumption 2: $\frac{\partial^{(n)} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^m)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^m} \right]^{-1}}{\partial (\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^m)^{(n)}} \text{ should be bounded in finite area for } 0 < m \leq 1, n \in R \text{ and } \boldsymbol{s}_{n-1} \in R^n \setminus (\infty). \text{ i.e. } W(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m) = 1 - e^{-\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m}.$

Corollary 2 is valid only if Assumption 2 is satisfied.

Then, according to Corollary 2, a sliding mode reaching law can be chose as:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}_{n-1} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}} \right]^T.$$
(44)

The nonsingular predefined-time sliding mode control input u for n-order MIMO system (39) with global finite control input can be designed by (29), (41) and (44) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{u} &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \left[f(\boldsymbol{x},t) + y_d^{(n)} \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_k} \right\| \right|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_k} \right]^T \right)^{(n-k-1)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}} \right]^T \right] \\ &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \left[f(\boldsymbol{x},t) \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{1}{m_k T_c} \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_k}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right)^{(n-k-1)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{m_{n-1} T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1}} \end{aligned}$$
(45)

where $(\cdot)^{(n-k-1)} = \frac{\partial^{(n-k-1)}(\cdot)}{\partial t^{(n-k-1)}}$.

Proof of predefined-time stable control system:

Consider a candidate Lyapunov function as:

$$V_1 = \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\| \tag{46}$$

The time derivative of Lyapunov function (46) can be deduced as:

T

$$\dot{V}_{1} = \frac{s_{n-1}}{\|s_{n-1}\|} \left\{ f(\boldsymbol{x},t) + b(\boldsymbol{x},t)(\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}_{r}) + \boldsymbol{d}(t) \\
+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{1}{m_{k}T_{c}} \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m_{k}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m_{k}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{s_{k}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m_{k}}} \right)^{(n-k-1)} \right\} \\
= \frac{s_{n-1}}{m_{k}T_{c}} \left\{ f(\boldsymbol{x},t) - b(\boldsymbol{x},t)b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \left[f(\boldsymbol{x},t) \\
+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{1}{m_{k}T_{c}} \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{s_{k}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m_{k}}} \right)^{(n-k-1)} \\
+ \frac{1}{m_{n-1}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{s_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \\
+ \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{d}}(t) \right\| \operatorname{sign}(\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}) \right\} + \boldsymbol{d}(t) \\
+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{1}{m_{k}T_{c}} \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{s_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \\
= -\frac{1}{m_{n-1}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{1-m_{n-1}} \\
= -\frac{1}{m_{n-1}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{1-m_{n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Then, the reaching time of s_{n-1} can be deduced as:

$$T_{n-1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}(\boldsymbol{0})) = \int_{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})}^{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})} \frac{1}{-\frac{1}{m_{n-1}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{1}^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial V_{1}^{m_{n-1}}}\right]^{-1} V_{1}^{1-m_{n-1}}} dV_{1}$$

$$= T_{c} \int_{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})^{m_{n-1}}}^{V_{1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}(\boldsymbol{0}))^{m_{n-1}}} \frac{\partial W(V_{1}^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial V_{1}^{m_{n-1}}} dV_{1}^{m_{n-1}}$$

$$= T_{c} (W(V_{1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}(\boldsymbol{0}))^{m_{n-1}}) - W(V_{1}(\boldsymbol{0})^{m_{n-1}}))$$
(48)

It is clear that $\mathbf{s}_{n-1} = 0$ after $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} T_{n-k}(\mathbf{s}_{n-k}(\mathbf{0}))$. In a similar way of (47) and (48), each reaching time of s_{n-k} can be deduced as $T_c(W(V_1(\mathbf{x}_{s_{n-k}=0})^{m_{n-1}}) - W(V_1(\mathbf{x}_{s_{n-k-1}=0})^{m_{n-1}}))$, and $k = 1, 2 \cdots n - 1$. Then, the minimum upper bound of reaching time is $(n-1)T_c$.

After $(n-1)T_c$, the sliding mode surface $s_1 = 0$ has been reached, and (41) can be expressed as:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{e}} = -\frac{1}{m_0 T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right]^T$$
(49)

The time derivative of a candidate Lyapunov function: $V_2 = \|\boldsymbol{e}\|$ can be deduced as:

$$\dot{V}_{2} = \frac{e^{T} \dot{e}}{\|e\|}
= -\frac{1}{T_{c}} \frac{e^{T}}{\|e\|} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|e\|^{m_{0}})}{\partial e} \frac{m_{0}\|e\|^{m_{0}-1}e^{T}}{\|e\|} \right]^{-1}
= -\frac{1}{m_{0}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|e\|^{m_{0}})}{\partial \|e\|^{m_{0}}} \right]^{-1} \|e\|^{1-m_{0}}
= -\frac{1}{m_{0}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{2}^{m_{0}})}{\partial V_{2}^{m_{0}}} \right]^{-1} V_{2}^{1-m_{0}}$$
(50)

Then the reaching time of e = 0 can be deduced as:

$$T(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}) = \int_{V_{2}(\boldsymbol{x}_{0})}^{V_{2}(\boldsymbol{0})} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{m_{0}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(V_{2}^{m_{0}})}{\partial V_{2}^{m_{0}}}\right]^{-1} V_{2}^{1-m_{0}}} dV_{2}$$

$$= T_{c} \int_{V_{2}(\boldsymbol{0})}^{V_{2}(\boldsymbol{x}_{0})} \frac{\partial W(V_{2}^{m_{0}})}{\partial V_{2}^{m_{0}}} dV_{2}^{m_{0}}$$

$$= T_{c} (W(V_{2}(\boldsymbol{x}_{0})^{m_{0}}) - W(V_{2}(\boldsymbol{0})^{m_{0}}))$$
(51)

Then the minimum upper bound of settling time of system can be predefined as nT_c .

TT (-)

The system will be said to be predefined-time stable if n is finite.

The proof is complete.

According to general Leibniz rule, (45) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{u} &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \left[f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \frac{1}{m_k T_c} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{j} \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right]^{-1} \right)^{(n-k-1-j)} \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{s}_k}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right)^{(j)} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{m_{n-1} T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right] \\ &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \left\{ f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \frac{1}{m_k T_c} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{j} \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right]^{-1} \right)^{(n-k-1-j)} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} \left(\boldsymbol{s}_k \right)^{(j-l)} (\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{-m_k})^{(l)} \right) \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{m_{n-1} T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Result 2: According to Result 1, the **singularity**, which occurs at the reaching time of sliding mode s_k : $t \in ((n-k-1)T_c, (n-k)T_c)$, can also be **avoided** if $m_k = 1$ for any k and Assumption 2 is satisfied.

Proof of Result 2 (for nonsingular parameter selection): In this proof, we will study how to make control input finite when $e \to 0$ and $||\Im|| \neq 0$

Consider $m_k = 1$ for all k, then a term in the first equation of (52) can be expressed:

$$\lim_{s_k \to 0} \frac{s_k}{\|s_k\|} = \frac{0}{\|\mathbf{0}\|} = E_{n1}.$$
(53)

If $s_k \to 0$, the control input u can be written as:

$$\boldsymbol{u} = -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \left[f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \frac{1}{m_k T_c} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{j} \right] \\ \cdot \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|} \right]^{-1} \right)^{(n-k-1-j)} (\boldsymbol{E}_{n1})^{(j)} \\ + \frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|} \right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{E}_{n1} \right]$$
(54)

It is clear that $E_{n1}^{(j)}$ will not be infinite forever. Then, by considering a Faa di Bruno's formula in [21], the singularity problem in controller (52) will be focused on the following:

$$\left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|}\right]^{-1}\right)^{(n-k-1-j)} = \sum \frac{(n-k-1-j)!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{n-k-1-j}!} \frac{\partial^{h_{p}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|}\right]^{-1}}{\partial(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{h_{p}}} \\
\cdot \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{(1)}}{1!}\right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{(2)}}{2!}\right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{(n-k-1-j)}}{(n-k-1-j)!}\right)^{b_{n-k-1-j}}$$
(55)

where $b_1 + 2b_2 + \cdots + (n - k - 1 - j)b_{n-k-1-j} = n - k - 1 - j$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_{n-k-1-j} = h_p$ in which *b* is non-negative integer.

Remark 5:; There is a new definition in Faa di Bruno's formula $\frac{\partial^{\gamma} \varphi(\phi(x))}{\partial x^{\gamma}} = \sum \frac{\gamma!}{b_1! \cdots b_{\gamma}} \frac{\partial^{h_{\gamma}} \varphi(\phi(x))}{\partial \phi(x)^{h_{\gamma}}} (\frac{\dot{\phi}(x)}{1!})^{b_1} \cdots (\frac{\phi^{(\gamma)}(x)}{\gamma!})^{b_{\gamma}}$ for this paper: $\frac{\partial^{\gamma} \varphi(\phi(x))}{\partial x^{\gamma}}$ will be equal to $\varphi(\phi(x))$ if $\gamma=0$.

Let $\|\boldsymbol{s}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\|^2 = \boldsymbol{s}_k^T \boldsymbol{s}_k$, then, $\|\boldsymbol{s}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\|^2$ in (55) can be expressed:

$$(\boldsymbol{s}_{\boldsymbol{k}}^{T} \boldsymbol{s}_{\boldsymbol{k}})^{(l_{v})} = \sum_{v=1}^{n} (s_{k,v}^{2})^{(l_{v})}$$

$$= \sum_{v=1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{l_{v}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v}}!} \left[\frac{\partial^{h_{v}} s_{k,v}^{2}}{\partial(s_{k,v})^{h_{v}}} \right]$$

$$\cdot \left(\frac{\dot{s}_{k,v}}{1!} \right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{\ddot{s}_{k,v}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(s_{k,v})^{(l_{v})}}{v!} \right)^{b_{l_{v}}} \right\}$$

$$(56)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_k = \begin{bmatrix} s_{k,1} & s_{k,2} & \cdots & s_{k,n} \end{bmatrix}^T$; $\mathbf{e} = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 & \cdots & e_n \end{bmatrix}^T$; $l_v = 1, 2 \cdots, l_1$; $b_1 + 2b_2 + \cdots + l_v b_{l_v} = l_v$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_{l_v} = h_v$.

One of the possible singularity term in (56) can be focused on the following:

$$\left[\frac{\partial^{h_v} s_{k,v}^2}{\partial (s_{k,v})^{h_v}}\right] = \begin{cases} \sum_{\substack{v=1\\v=1\\v=1\\v=1\\0\\0\\0\\k_v \ge 3 \end{cases}}^n |2s_{k,v}|, h_v = 1 \\ \sum_{\substack{v=1\\v=1\\0\\0\\k_v \ge 3} \end{cases}$$
(57)

and it is clear that the term (57) will not be infinite if $s_{k,v}$ is not infinite.

Assumption 3: There will be no infinite value in (57) if $s_{k,v}$ is bounded.

Then, other possible singularity terms: $s_k^{(i_k)}$ for $i_k = 1, 2 \cdots, n - k - 1 - j$ in (56) will be discussed in the following steps:

Step 0: The singularity definition of this subsection is that control input will be infinite if $e \to 0$ and $\|\mathfrak{S}\| \neq 0$. $s_{1,2,\dots,n-1}^{(i_1)}$ will be assumed to be bounded first for $i_1 = 1, 2, \dots, n-j$. Then, by substituting $s_0 = e$ in (55) and (56), it is clear that the singularity of controller about s_0 will not occur if $m_k = 1$ for any k.

Step 1: $s_{2,3,\dots,n-1}^{(i_1)}$ will be assumed to be bounded first for $i_1 = 1, 2, \dots, n-1-j$. If $m_0 = 1$ and $s_0 = e$, the

singularity of controller about s_1 can be expressed as:

$$s_{1}^{(i_{1})} = e^{(i_{1})} + \frac{1}{T_{c}} \sum_{j_{1}=0}^{i_{1}} {i_{1} \choose j_{1}} \\ \cdot \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|e\|)}{\partial \|e\|} \right]^{-1} \right)^{(i_{1}-j_{1})} (E_{n1})^{(j_{1})} \\ = e^{(i_{1})} + \frac{1}{T_{c}} \sum_{j_{1}=0}^{i_{1}} {i_{1} \choose j_{1}} \\ \left[\sum_{j_{1}=0}^{\frac{(i_{1}-j_{1})!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{i_{1}-j_{1}}!}} \frac{\partial^{h_{1}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|e\|)}{\partial \|e\|} \right]^{-1}}{\partial (\|e\|)^{h_{1}}} \left(\frac{(\|e\|)^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_{1}} \\ \cdot \left(\frac{(\|e\|)^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|e\|)^{(i_{1}-j_{1})}}{(i_{1}-j_{1})!} \right)^{b_{i_{1}-j_{1}}} \right] (E_{n1})^{(j_{1})}$$
(58)

where $b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + (i_1 - j_1)b_{i_1 - j_1} = i_1 - j_1$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{i_1 - j_1} = h_1$.

Let $\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^2 = \boldsymbol{e}^T \boldsymbol{e}$, then:

$$(\boldsymbol{e}^{T}\boldsymbol{e})^{(l_{v1})} = \sum_{v1=1}^{n} (e_{v1}^{2})^{(l_{v1})}$$

$$= \sum_{v1=1}^{n} \sum_{v1=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{l_{v1}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v1}}!} \left[\frac{\partial^{h_{v1}}e_{v1}^{2}}{\partial(e_{v1})^{h_{v1}}} \right]$$

$$\cdot \left(\frac{\dot{e}_{v1}}{1!} \right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{\ddot{e}_{v1}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(e_{v1})^{(v1)}}{v1!} \right)^{b_{l_{v1}}} \right\}$$

$$(59)$$

where $\boldsymbol{e} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{v1} \ e_{v2} \ \cdots \ e_{vn} \end{bmatrix}^T$; $l_{v1} = 1, 2 \cdots, l_1$; $b_1 + 2b_2 + \cdots + l_{v1}b_{l_{v1}} = l_{v1}$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_{l_{v1}} = h_{v1}$.

The singular problem will be focused on the following:

$$\left[\frac{\partial^{h_{v1}} e_{v1}^2}{\partial (e_{v1})^{h_{v1}}}\right] = \begin{cases} \sum_{v1=1}^n |2e_{v1}|, h_{v1} = 1\\ \sum_{v1=1}^n 2, h_{v1} = 1\\ 0, h_{v1} \ge 3 \end{cases}$$
(60)

Then, by considering (58), (59) and (60), The singularity of controller about s_1 will not occur if $m_0 = 1$.

Steps $2, \cdots, k-1$:

Step k: $s_{k+1,\dots,n-1}^{(i_2)}$ will be be assumed to be bounded first for $i_k = 1, 2, \dots, n-k-j$. The singularity of

controller about s_k if $m_{k-1} = 1$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{s}_{k}^{(i_{k})} &= \boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}^{(i_{k})} + \frac{1}{T_{c}} \sum_{j_{k}=0}^{i_{k}} \begin{pmatrix} i_{k} \\ j_{k} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\cdot \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|} \right]^{-1} \right)^{(i_{k}-j_{k})} (\boldsymbol{E}_{n1})^{(j_{k})} \\ &= \boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}^{(i_{k})} + \frac{1}{T_{c}} \sum_{j_{k}=0}^{i_{k}} \begin{pmatrix} i_{k} \\ j_{k} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\left[\sum \frac{(i_{k}-j_{k})!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{i_{k}-j_{k}}!} \frac{\partial^{h_{k}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|} \right]^{-1}}{\partial (\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|)^{h_{k}}} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|)^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_{1}} \\ &\cdot \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|)^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}\|)^{(i_{k}-j_{k})}}{(i_{k}-j_{k})!} \right)^{b_{i_{k}-j_{k}}} \right] (\boldsymbol{E}_{n1})^{(j_{k})} \end{aligned}$$

where $b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + (i_k - j_k)b_{i_k - j_k} = i_k - j_k$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{i_k - j_k} = h_k$.

Let $\|s_{k-1}\|^2 = s_{k-1}^T s_{k-1}$, then:

$$(\boldsymbol{s}_{k-1}^{T} \boldsymbol{s}_{k-1})^{(l_{vk})} = \sum_{vk=1}^{n} (s_{k-1,vk}^{2})^{(l_{vk})}$$

$$= \sum_{vk=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{l_{vk}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{vk}}!} \left[\frac{\partial^{h_{vk}} s_{k-1,vk}^{2}}{\partial(s_{k-1,vk})^{h_{v2}}} \right]$$

$$\cdot \left(\frac{\dot{s}_{k-1,vk}}{1!} \right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{\ddot{s}_{k-1,vk}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(s_{k-1,vk})^{(vk)}}{vk!} \right)^{b_{l_{vk}}} \right\}$$

$$(62)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_{k-1} = \left[s_{k-1,v1} \ s_{k-1,v2} \ \cdots \ s_{k-1,vn} \right]^T$; $l_{vk} = 1, 2 \cdots, l_k$; $b_1 + 2b_2 + \cdots + l_{vk}b_{l_{vk}} = l_{vk}$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_{l_{vk}} = h_{vk}$.

with

$$\left[\frac{\partial^{h_{vk}} s_{k-1,vk}^2}{\partial (s_{k-1,vk})^{h_{vk}}}\right] = \begin{cases} \sum_{vk=1}^n |2s_{k-1,vk}|, h_{vk} = 1\\ \sum_{vk=1}^n 2, h_{vk} = 2\\ 0, h_{vk} \ge 3 \end{cases}$$
(63)

According to step 1 ((60) is substituted into (59), and (59) is substituted into (58)), it is clear that $s_{1,vk}^{(1),(2)\cdots,(vk)}$ will not be infinite if $m_{0,1,\dots,k-2} = 1$. Then, similar to step 1, by considering (61), (62) and (63), The singularity of controller about s_k will also not occur if $m_{k-1} = 1$.

Steps $k + 1 \cdots, n - 1$:

Step n: Make an identity: $\mathbf{s}_n = \mathbf{0}$ in (41). According to the above-mentioned n - 1 steps, $\mathbf{s}_{1,2,\dots,n-2}^{(i_2)}$ can be predefined to be bounded if $m_{0,1\dots,n-2} = 1$. The singularity of controller about $\mathbf{s}_n = \mathbf{0}$ if $m_{n-1} = 1$ can be expressed as:

$$\frac{1}{m_{n-1}T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\mathbf{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1})}{\partial \|\mathbf{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{s}_{n-1}}{\|\mathbf{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_{n-1}}} = \frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\mathbf{s}_{n-1}\|)}{\partial \|\mathbf{s}_{n-1}\|} \right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{E}_{n1}$$
(64)

It is clear that the singularity of controller about s_n will also not occur if $m_{n-1} = 1$.

÷

According to the above steps, the Assumption 3 is actually satisfied everywhere if $m_k = 1$. Hence, the control input will not infinite if $m_k = 1$.

The proof is complete.

However, according to the simulation in Fig.3 and Result 1. It is clear that the predefined-time stability cannot be guaranteed if $m_k = 1$ for everywhere. Hence, a switching decision similar to (17) will be discussed in the following.

Result 3: In order to ensure the predefined-time stability of the system, parameter switching can only occur on the sliding mode surface s_{k+1} relative to virtual system state s_k . Hence, in reaching stage of virtual system state s_k , the corresponding parameter switching cannot be made. In addition, the selection range of nonsingular parameters should be: $0 < m_k \leq \frac{1}{n-k}$ and $m_k = 1$

Proof of the selection range of nonsingular parameters Result 3 ($0 < m_k \leq \frac{1}{n-k}$):

According to the Faa di Bruno's formula, (52) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{u} &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \left\{ f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \frac{1}{m_k T_c} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{j} \right. \\ \left. \left(\sum \frac{(n-k-1-j)!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_{n-k-1-j}!} \frac{\partial^{h_p} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right]^{-1}}{\partial (\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})^{h_p}} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_1} \right. \\ \left. \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_2} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})^{(n-k-1-j)}}{n-k-1-j!} \right)^{b_{n-k-1-j}} \right) \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} \right) \\ \left. \cdot \left[(\boldsymbol{s}_k)^{(j-l)} \sum \left(\frac{l!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_l!} \left(\prod_{z=0}^{n-1} (-\frac{m_k}{2} - z) \right) \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{-m_k - 2h} \right. \\ \left. \cdot \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^2)^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_1} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^2)^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^2)^{(l)}}{l!} \right)^{b_l} \right) \right] \right) \right] \\ \left. + \frac{1}{m_{n-1} T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m_{k}})^{(n-k-1-j)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(n-k-1-j)!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{n-k-1-j}!} \left[\prod_{z=0}^{h_{p}-1} \left(\frac{m_{k}}{2}-z\right) \right] \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m_{k}-2h_{p}}$$

$$\cdot \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{(1)}}{1!}\right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{(2)}}{2!}\right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{2})^{(n-k-1-j)}}{(n-k-1-j)!}\right)^{b_{n-k-1-j}}$$

$$(66)$$

where $b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + lb_l = l$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_l = h$; $b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + (n-k-1-j)b_{n-k-1-j} = n-k-1-j$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{n-k-1-j} = h_p$.

Let $\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^2 = \boldsymbol{s}_k^T \boldsymbol{s}_k$, then:

$$(\boldsymbol{s}_{k}^{T}\boldsymbol{s}_{k})^{(l_{v})} = \sum_{v=1}^{n} (s_{k,v}^{2})^{(l_{v})}$$
$$= \sum_{v=1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{l_{v}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v}}!} \left[\frac{\partial^{h_{v}}s_{k,v}^{2}}{\partial(s_{k,v})^{h_{v}}} \right] \\ \cdot \left(\frac{\dot{s}_{k,v}}{1!} \right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{\ddot{s}_{k,v}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(s_{k,v})^{(v)}}{v!} \right)^{b_{l_{v}}} \right\}$$
(67)

where $\mathbf{s}_k = \begin{bmatrix} s_{k,1} & s_{k,2} & \cdots & s_{k,n} \end{bmatrix}^T$. $b_1 + 2b_2 + \cdots + l_v b_{l_v} = l_v$ and $b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_{l_v} = h_v$.

Step 0: By assuming that $s_0 \neq 0$ and $s_{1,2\dots,n-1} = 0$, then, according to the results of Lemma1 and (41), $(\dot{s}_1, \ddot{s}_1, \dots, (s_1)^{(n-1)})$ have to converge to zero in $t \ge (n-1)T_c$ if the system is predefined-time stable and $0 < m_0 \le \frac{1}{n}$. Then, the control input u can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{u} &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \left\{ f(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \frac{1}{m_0 T_c} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{j} \right. \\ \left. \cdot \left[\left(\sum \frac{(n-1-j)!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_{n-1-j}!} \frac{\partial^{h_p} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0}} \right]^{-1}}{\partial (\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})^{h_p}} \right] \right] \\ \left. \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_1} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_2} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})^{(n-1-j)}}{(n-1-j)!} \right)^{b_{n-1-j}} \right) \\ \left. \cdot \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} \right) \left[(\boldsymbol{e})^{(j-l)} \sum_{l=1}^{j} \left(\frac{l!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_l!} \left(\prod_{z=0}^{n-1} \left(-\frac{m_0}{2} - z \right) \right) \right) \\ \left. \cdot \left\| \boldsymbol{e} \right\|^{-m_0 - 2h} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^2)^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_1} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^2)^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_2} \cdots \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^2)^{(l)}}{l!} \right)^{b_l} \right) \right] \right) \right] \\ + \frac{1}{m_{n-1} T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m_n-1}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

According to (41), $\dot{s_0}$ can be replaced by a function about s_0 when $s_1 = 0$:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}_{\boldsymbol{0}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_0\|^{m_0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_0} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_0\|^{m_0})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_0} \right]^T \\ = \frac{1}{m_0 T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{e}}{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_0}}$$
(69)

Then, (67) can be written by considering (57) and (69) as:

$$(\boldsymbol{e}^{T}\boldsymbol{e})^{(l_{v})} = \sum_{v=1}^{n} \left(e_{v}^{2} \right)^{(l_{v})}$$

$$= \sum_{v=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{l_{v}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v}}!} \left| 2e_{v} \right| \left(\frac{1}{m_{0}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|e_{v}\|^{m_{0}})}{\partial \|e_{v}\|^{m_{0}}} \right]^{-1} e_{v}^{1-m_{0}} \right)^{b_{1}}$$

$$\left(\frac{\ddot{e}_{v}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(e_{v})^{(v)}}{v!} \right)^{b_{l_{v}}} \Big|_{h_{v}=1} + 2 \frac{l_{v}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v}}!} \left(\frac{1}{m_{0}T_{c}} \right)^{b_{1}}$$

$$\cdot \left[\frac{\partial W(\|e_{v}\|^{m_{0}})}{\partial \|e_{v}\|^{m_{0}}} \right]^{-1} e_{v}^{1-m_{0}} \right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{\ddot{e}_{v}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(e_{v})^{(v)}}{v!} \right)^{b_{l_{v}}} \Big|_{h_{v}=2}$$

$$(70)$$

with

$$\begin{cases} b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{l_v} = h_v \\ b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + l_v b_{l_v} = l_v \end{cases}$$
(71)

Consider a singularity expression: $\mathbf{e} \to \mathbf{0}$ with $\mathbf{e}^{(1,2\cdots,n-1)} = a$ bounded vector. According to (57), (66) and (70), the main singular term (the highest-order negative exponential) of controller in (68) about $\mathbf{s}_0 = \mathbf{e}$ can be simplified by considering $\|\mathbf{0}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{0}\|_2$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{e}\| & \sum_{v_{0}=1}^{n-1-j} b_{v_{0}} \left[m_{0} - 2h_{p} + \sum_{v_{0}=1}^{n-1-j} b_{v_{0}} (1 + b_{1}(1 - m_{0})) \right] e^{(j-l)} \\ & \cdot \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{-m_{0}-2h} \|\boldsymbol{e}\|_{v_{0}=1}^{l} b_{v_{0}} (1 + b_{1}(1 - m_{0})) \\ & \cdot \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{-m_{0}-2h} \|\boldsymbol{e}\|_{v_{0}=1}^{l} b_{v_{0}} (1 + b_{1}(1 - m_{0})) \\ & = \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{m_{0}(h_{p}(1 - b_{1}h_{p}) - 1 - hb_{1})} \|\boldsymbol{e}\|^{(h_{p}^{2} + h)(b_{1} - 1) + 1} \boldsymbol{E}_{n1} \Big|_{h_{v}=1,2} \end{aligned}$$
(72)

with

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{v=1}^{n-1-j} b_{v0} = h_p \le n-1-j \\ \sum_{v=1}^{l} b_{v0} = h \le l \\ h_v - (b_2 + \dots + b_{l_v}) = b_1 \le l_v \end{cases}$$
(73)

where j = l because the final exponential term of $e^{(j-l)}$ will be smaller than 1 if $j \neq l$ by considering the decomposition term $\sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\mathbf{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \mathbf{s}_k} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\mathbf{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \mathbf{s}_k} \right]^T \right)^{(n-k-1)}$ in (45).

Then, (72) will not be infinite if the following inequality is satisfied:

$$m_{0}(-h_{p}(1-b_{1}h_{p})+1+hb_{1}) \leq (h_{p}^{2}+h)(b_{1}-1)+(j-l)$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} m_{0} \leq (\frac{(h_{p}^{2}+h)+(j-l)}{(h_{p}(2h_{p}-1)+1+2h)}) \\ m_{0} \leq (\frac{(j-l)}{(h_{p}(h_{p}-1)+1+h)}) \\ \Rightarrow m_{0} \leq (\frac{1}{(1(1-1)+1+n-1)}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \end{cases}$$
(74)

where m_0 will be minimum by considering the inequality relationship in (73).

÷

Then the controller in condition of step 0 will not be singular if $0 < m \leq \frac{1}{n}$

Step $1, \cdots, k-1$:

Step k: By assuming that $\mathbf{s}_{k+1,k+2\cdots,n-1} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{s}_k \neq \mathbf{0}$, then, according to the results of Lemma1 and (41), $(\dot{\mathbf{s}}_{k+1}, \ddot{\mathbf{s}}_{k+1} \cdots (\mathbf{s}_{k+1})^{(n-k-1)})$ have to converge to zero in $t \ge (n-k-1)T_c$ if the system is predefined-time stable and $0 < m_k \le \frac{1}{n-k-1}$. Then, according to (41), it is clear that it is clear that . The control input \boldsymbol{u} can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{u} &= -b^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x},t) \left\{ f(\boldsymbol{x},t) + \frac{1}{m_0 T_c} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k-1} \binom{n-k-1}{j} \right. \\ \left. \left(\sum \frac{(n-k-1-j)!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_{n-k-1-j}!} \frac{\partial^{h_p} \left[\frac{\partial W(||\boldsymbol{s}_k||^{m_k})}{\partial ||\boldsymbol{s}_k||^{m_k}} \right]^{-1}}{\partial (||\boldsymbol{s}_k||^{m_k})^{h_p}} \right. \\ \left. \left(\frac{(||\boldsymbol{e}||^{m_k})^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_1} \left(\frac{(||\boldsymbol{e}||^{m_k})^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_2} \cdots \left(\frac{(||\boldsymbol{e}||^{m_k})^{(n-1-j)}}{(n-k-1-j)!} \right)^{b_{n-k-1-j}} \right) \\ \left. \cdot \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} \right) \left[(\boldsymbol{e})^{(j-l)} \sum \left(\frac{l!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_l!} \left(\prod_{z=0}^{h-1} \left(-\frac{m_k}{2} - z \right) \right) \right. \\ \left. \cdot \left\| \boldsymbol{e} \right\|^{-m_k - 2h} \left(\frac{(||\boldsymbol{e}||^2)^{(1)}}{1!} \right)^{b_1} \left(\frac{(||\boldsymbol{e}||^2)^{(2)}}{2!} \right)^{b_2} \cdots \left(\frac{(||\boldsymbol{e}||^2)^{(l)}}{l!} \right)^{b_l} \right) \right] \right) \right] \\ \left. + \frac{1}{m_{n-1} T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(||\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}||^{m_n-1})}{\partial ||\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}||^{m_n-1}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{||\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}||^{m_n-1}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

According to (41), $\dot{s_k}$ can be replaced by a function about s_0 when $s_{k+1} = 0$:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = -\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_k} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_k} \right]^T \\ = \frac{1}{m_k T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_k}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k}}$$
(76)

Then, (67) can be written by considering (57) and (76) as:

$$(\mathbf{s}_{k}^{T}\mathbf{s}_{k})^{(l_{v})} = \sum_{v=1}^{n} (s_{k,v}^{2})^{(l_{v})}$$

$$= \sum_{v=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{l_{v}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v}}!} \left| 2s_{k,v} \right| \left(\frac{1}{m_{k}T_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|s_{k,v}\|^{m_{k}})}{\partial \|s_{k,v}\|^{m_{k}}} \right]^{-1} s_{k,v}^{1-m_{k}} \right)^{b_{1}}$$

$$\left(\frac{\ddot{s}_{k,v}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(s_{k,v})^{(v)}}{v!} \right)^{b_{l_{v}}} \right|_{h_{v}=1} + 2 \frac{l_{v}!}{b_{1}!b_{2}!\cdots b_{l_{v}}!} \left(\frac{1}{m_{k}T_{c}} \right)^{b_{1}}$$

$$\cdot \left[\frac{\partial W(\|s_{k,v}\|^{m_{k}})}{\partial \|s_{k,v}\|^{m_{k}}} \right]^{-1} s_{k,v}^{1-m_{k}} \right)^{b_{1}} \left(\frac{\ddot{s}_{k,v}}{2!} \right)^{b_{2}} \cdots \left(\frac{(s_{k,v})^{(v)}}{v!} \right)^{b_{l_{v}}} \right|_{h_{v}=2}$$

$$(77)$$

with

$$\begin{cases} b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{l_v} = h_v \\ b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + l_v b_{l_v} = l_v \end{cases}$$
(78)

Consider a singularity expression: $\mathbf{e} \to \mathbf{0}$ with $\mathbf{e}^{(1,2\dots,n-1)} = a$ bounded constant. According to (57), (66) and (77), the main singular term (the highest-oder negative exponential) of controller in (75) about $\mathbf{s}_0 = \mathbf{e}$ can be simplified by considering $\|\mathbf{0}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{0}\|_2$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_{k}\| & \sum_{vk=1}^{n-k-1-j} b_{vk} \left[m_{k} - 2h_{p} + \sum_{vk=1}^{n-k-1-j} b_{vk} (1+b_{1}(1-m_{k})) \right]_{s_{k}} (j-l) \\ & \cdot \|s_{k}\|^{-m_{k}-2h} \|s_{k}\| \sum_{vk=1}^{l} b_{vk} (1+b_{1}(1-m_{k})) \\ & e \to 0 \\ & = \|s_{k}\|^{m_{k}} (h_{p}(1-b_{1}h_{p})-1-hb_{1}) \\ & \cdot \|s_{k}\|^{(h_{p}^{2}+h)(b_{1}-1)+1} E_{n1} \Big|_{h_{v}=1,2} \end{aligned}$$

$$(79)$$

with

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{\substack{vk=1\\vk=1\\ vk=1}}^{n-k-1-j} b_{vk} = h_p \le n-k-1-j\\ \sum_{\substack{vk=1\\vk=1}}^{l} b_{vk} = h \le l\\ h_v - (b_2 + \dots + b_{l_v}) = b_1 \le l_v \end{cases}$$
(80)

where j = l because the final exponential term of $e^{(j-l)}$ will be smaller than 1 if $j \neq l$ by considering the decomposition term $\sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{T_c} \left\| \frac{\partial W(\|\mathbf{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \mathbf{s}_k} \right\|^{-2} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\mathbf{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \mathbf{s}_k} \right]^T \right)^{(n-k-1)}$ in (45).

Then, (79) will not be infinite if the following inequality is satisfied:

$$m_{k}(-h_{p}(1-b_{1}h_{p})+1+hb_{1}) \leq (h_{p}^{2}+h)(b_{1}-1)+1$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} m_{k} \leq (\frac{(h_{p}^{2}+h)+1}{(h_{p}(2h_{p}-1)+1+2h)}) \\ m_{k} \leq (\frac{1}{(h_{p}(h_{p}-1)+1+h)}) \\ \Rightarrow m_{k} \leq (\frac{1}{(1(1-1)+1+n-k-1)}) \leq \frac{1}{n-k} \end{cases}$$
(81)

where m_k will be minimum by considering the inequality relationship in (80).

Then the controller in condition of step 0 will not be singular if $0 < m_k \leq \frac{1}{n-k}$

Step $k + 1, \cdots, n - 2$:



Fig. 4. Some examples: (1)The curve of y = u in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1$, m = 0.9 (2)The curve of y = u in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1$, m = 0.5. cos(t) is the tracking signal

Step n-1: it is cleat that the singular term of controller about s_{n-1} is the final term of controller in (68), and the singularity will not occur if $0 < m_{n-1} < 1$ by considering Lemma 2.

According to the these steps, a selection scheme of nonsingular parameters m_k can be designed as $0 < m_k \le \frac{1}{n-k}$ if Assumption 1 is satisfied.

The proof is completed.

According to Result 2 and Result 3, a final selection scheme of nonsingular parameters m_k which can guarantee the predefined-time can be designed as (42) and (43).

4 Simulation and Analysis

In order to show the effective of the proposed nonsingular sliding control method, two various-order control system will be shown in the following. In addition, the curve formed by singular parameters m_k cannot be shown, because singularity is inevitable. Even if it is simulated by luck, it will not pass the above-mentioned mathematical argument.

Example 2: Fig.4 shows a bad case: m = 0.9 in second-order system and m = 0.5 in third-order system. It is clear that the control input is infinite or very large in 1.143s in Fig.4 (1), and the control input is also very large in 0.805s in Fig.4 (2).

4.1 A Second-order MIMO System

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_1 = \boldsymbol{x}_2 \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_2 = -\boldsymbol{x}_2 + \boldsymbol{u} \\ \boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{x}_1 \end{cases}$$
(82)

where $\boldsymbol{x}_{1d} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(t) \ 1 \ -5 \ 5 \end{bmatrix}^T$, the tracking error is $\boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_{1d}$

A predefined-time function can be chosen as: $W_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = sin(arctan(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m))$. Then, a nonsingular predefined-time terminal sliding mode surface is designed by Corollary 2 as the following:

$$\boldsymbol{s} = \boldsymbol{e} + \frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W_1(\|\boldsymbol{e}\|^m)}{\partial \boldsymbol{e}} \right]^{-1}$$
(83)



Fig. 5. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of $y = x_1$ in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1, m = 1, 0.5, \dots 0.1$



Fig. 6. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of $y = x_2$ in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1, m = 1, 0.5, \dots 0.1$

with

$$m = \begin{cases} 1 + (m-1)sign(sat(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{e}\|}{\varepsilon})), & \|\boldsymbol{s}\| \neq 0\\ m, & \|\boldsymbol{s}\| = 0 \end{cases}.$$
(84)

where $T_c = 1$, $\varepsilon = 0.0001$, $u_{max} = 15$.

Then, according to (45), the control input \boldsymbol{u} can be designed as:

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{x}_{2} - \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{k}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|^{m}} \right)^{(n-k-1)} - \frac{1}{mT_{c}} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m})}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m}} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^{m}}$$
(85)

where n = 2.

According to Introduction, the case of Remark 4 was not considered in the method in [19], so the unnecessary buffeting will occur in control input caused by inappropriate singular risk parameter ε . As shown in Figs.5 and 6, it is clear that both methods can make the tracking error converge to zero within predefined-time $2T_c = 2s$ if m is satisfied the nonsingular parameter range deduced by this paper. As shown in Fig 7, it is also clear that the chattering of the proposed control input is lower than the controller in [19]. The tracking errors of second-order MIMO system can be shown in Figs. 8 and 9, and the tracking error e can not converge to zero within predefined-time if m = 1.



Fig. 7. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of y = u in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1, m = 1, 0.5, \cdots 0.1$



Fig. 8. $(1)x_{1d} = 1$ $(2)x_{1d} = -5$ $(3)x_{1d} = 5$ The curve of $y = x_1$ in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1, m = 1, 0.5, \dots 0.1$



Fig. 9. (1) $x_{1d} = 1$ (2) $x_{1d} = -5$ (3) $x_{1d} = 5$ The curve of $y = x_1$ in the $W_1(x)$. $T_c = 1, m = 1, 0.5, \dots 0.1$

4.2 A Third-order MIMO System

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_1 &= \boldsymbol{x}_2 \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_2 &= \boldsymbol{x}_3 \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}_3 &= -\boldsymbol{x}_2 - 2\boldsymbol{x}_3 + \boldsymbol{u} \\ \boldsymbol{y} &= \boldsymbol{x}_1 \end{aligned}$$
(86)



Fig. 10. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of $y = x_1$ in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \dots 0.1$



Fig. 11. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of x_2 in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \dots 0.1$

where $\boldsymbol{x}_{1d} = \left[\cos(t) \ 1 \ -5 \ 5\right]^T$, the tracking error is $\boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_{1d}$

A predefined-time function can be chosen as: $W_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = sin(arctan(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m_k}))$. Then, a nonsingular predefined-time terminal sliding mode surface is designed by Corollary 2 as the following:

$$\boldsymbol{s}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{s}_k + \frac{1}{T_c} \left[\frac{\partial W_1(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^{m_k})}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}_k} \right]^{-1}$$
(87)

with

$$m_{k} = \begin{cases} 1 + (m_{k} - 1)sign(sat(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{k}\|}{\varepsilon})), & \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k+1}\| \neq 0\\ m_{k}, & \|\boldsymbol{s}_{k+1}\| = 0 \end{cases}.$$
(88)

where $k = 0, 1, 2, s_3 = 0, s_0 = e, T_c = 5, \varepsilon = 0.001, u_{max} = 50$. For convenience, $m_k = m = 1, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1$.

Then, according to (45), the control input \boldsymbol{u} can be designed as:

$$u = x_2 - 2x_3 - \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{1}{mT_c} \left(\left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^m)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^m} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_k}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_k\|^m} \right)^{(n-k-1)} - \frac{1}{mT_c} \left[\frac{\partial W(\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^m)}{\partial \|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^m} \right]^{-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}}{\|\boldsymbol{s}_{n-1}\|^m}$$
(89)

where n = 3.

According to Introduction, the case of Remark 4 was not considered in the method in [19], so the unnecessary buffeting will also occur in control input caused by inappropriate singular risk parameter ε . As shown in Figs.10, 11



Fig. 12. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of u in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \dots 0.1$



Fig. 13. (1)the method in [19] (2)the proposed method The curve of $\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{x}_1$ in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \cdots 0.1$



Fig. 14. (1) $x_{1d} = 1$ (2) $x_{1d} = -1$ (3) $x_{1d} = 2$ The curve of \boldsymbol{x}_2 in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \dots 0.1$

and 12, it is clear that both methods can make the tracking error converge to zero within predefined-time $2T_c = 2s$ if m is satisfied the nonsingular parameter range deduced by this paper. As shown in Fig 13, it is also clear that the chattering of the proposed control input is also lower than the controller in [19]. The tracking errors of thirdorder MIMO system can be shown in Figs. 14, 15 and 16, and the tracking error e can not converge to zero within predefined-time if m = 1.



Fig. 15. (1) $x_{1d} = 1$ (2) $x_{1d} = -1$ (3) $x_{1d} = 2$ The curve of x_2 in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \dots 0.1$



Fig. 16. (1) $x_{1d} = 1$ (2) $x_{1d} = -1$ (3) $x_{1d} = 2$ The curve of x_2 in $W_1(x)$ $T_c = 5$, $m = 1, 0.3, \dots 0.1$

5 Conclusion

Generally, the terminal sliding mode of fixed-time-class is often accompanied by the inevitable singularity problem and many researches have been done to overcome the singularity, but often at the larger cost of some controller performance. In this paper, we discuss a selection problem of nonsingular parameter in a predefined-time terminal sliding mode control strategy in as much detail as possible. Firstly, we discuss the parameter selection of traditional general predefined-time system expression equation and improve some conditions to make the system have a better stable performance. Secondly, we study the selection problem of nonsingular parameter for second-order system: a switching strategy is improved to overcome the singularity of reaching stage of sliding mode and chattering caused by switching sliding mode (Remark 4), and then, a selection range of nonsingular parameter is found to ensure the non-singularity of the sliding stage(s=0). Thirdly, we try to choose a recursive terminal sliding mode control method to deal with the predefined-time sliding mode control problem of high-order system, in this subsection, a selection method of nonsingular parameter is studied to try to achieve nonsingular predefined-time terminal sliding mode control for a n-order system. In the end, we use some simple system model to carry on the relevant numerical simulation, the final results, to some extent, confirm our inference.

References

- Chun-Yi Su and Yury Stepanenko. Adaptive sliding mode control of robot manipulators: general sliding manifold case. Automatica, 30(9):1497–1500, 1994.
- K David Young, Vadim I Utkin, and Umit Ozguner. A control engineer's guide to sliding mode control. IEEE transactions on control systems technology, 7(3):328–342, 1999.
- [3] Abdelkrim Benchaib, Ahmed Rachid, Eric Audrezet, and Mohamed Tadjine. Real-time sliding-mode observer and control of an induction motor. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 46(1):128–138, 1999.

- [4] Shuanghe Yu, Xinghuo Yu, Bijan Shirinzadeh, and Zhihong Man. Continuous finite-time control for robotic manipulators with terminal sliding mode. Automatica, 41(11):1957–1964, 2005.
- [5] Shi-Hong Ding and Shi-Hua Li. A survey for finite-time control problems. Control and Decision, 26(2):161–169, 2011.
- [6] ST Venkataraman and S Gulati. Control of nonlinear systems using terminal sliding modes. 1993.
- [7] Andrey Polyakov. Nonlinear feedback design for fixed-time stabilization of linear control systems. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 57(8):2106–2110, 2011.
- [8] Juan Diego Sánchez-Torres, Edgar N Sanchez, and Alexander G Loukianov. Predefined-time stability of dynamical systems with sliding modes. In 2015 American control conference (ACC), pages 5842–5846. IEEE, 2015.
- [9] Esteban Jiménez-Rodríguez, Alexander G Loukianov, and Juan Diego Sánchez-Torres. Semi-global predefined-time stable systems. In 2017 14th International Conference on Electrical Engineering, Computing Science and Automatic Control (CCE), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- [10] Esteban Jiménez-Rodríguez, Juan Diego Sánchez-Torres, and Alexander G Loukianov. Semi-global predefined-time stable vector systems. In 2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 4809–4814. IEEE, 2018.
- [11] Esteban Jiménez-Rodríguez, Aldo Jonathan Muñoz-Vázquez, Juan Diego Sánchez-Torres, and Alexander G Loukianov. A note on predefined-time stability. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(13):520–525, 2018.
- [12] Juan D Sánchez-Torres, Esteban Jiménez-Rodríguez, David Gómez-Guitiérrez, and Alexander Loukianov. Non-singular predefinedtime stable manifolds. 2016.
- [13] R Aldana-López, D Gómez-Gutiérrez, E Jiménez-Rodríguez, JD Sánchez-Torres, and M Defoort. On the design of new classes of fixed-time stable systems with predefined upper bound for the settling time. arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.02782, 2019.
- [14] Esteban Jiménez-Rodríguez, Juan Diego Sánchez-Torres, David Gómez-Gutiérrez, and Alexander G Loukianov. Predefined-time stabilization of high order systems. In 2017 American Control Conference (ACC), pages 5836–5841. IEEE, 2017.
- [15] Zongyu Zuo. Non-singular fixed-time terminal sliding mode control of non-linear systems. IET control theory & applications, 9(4):545-552, 2014.
- [16] Yi Huang and Yingmin Jia. Fixed-time consensus tracking control for second-order multi-agent systems with bounded input uncertainties via nfftsm. IET Control Theory & Applications, 11(16):2900–2909, 2017.
- [17] Junkang Ni, Ling Liu, Chongxin Liu, Xiaoyu Hu, and Shilei Li. Fast fixed-time nonsingular terminal sliding mode control and its application to chaos suppression in power system. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 64(2):151–155, 2016.
- [18] Maria Letizia Corradini and Andrea Cristofaro. Nonsingular terminal sliding-mode control of nonlinear planar systems with global fixed-time stability guarantees. Automatica, 95:561–565, 2018.
- [19] Junkang Ni, Ling Liu, Yang Tang, and Chongxin Liu. Predefined-time consensus tracking of second-order multiagent systems. IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems, 2019.
- [20] Juan Diego Sánchez-Torres, David Gómez-Gutiérrez, Esteban López, and Alexander G Loukianov. A class of predefined-time stable dynamical systems. IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information, 35(Supplement_1):i1-i29, 2018.
- [21] L Hernández Encinas and J Munoz Masque. A short proof of the generalized faà di bruno's formula. Applied mathematics letters, 16(6):975–979, 2003.