Abstract

In general, standard multi-copters are classified as an underactuated system since their number of control inputs are insufficient to allow the control of position and orientation independently. In this context, this paper deals with the dynamical modeling of a tilted rotor multi-copter aerial vehicle and the project of a trajectory tracking controller using modern control techniques. The dynamic model is developed using Newton Euler Laws and it is assumed that each rotor is capable of two different movements (tilt laterally and longitudinally) introducing more control inputs to the system. Then, the equations of motion are linearized around the trimmed operating conditions (based on mission applications). Finally, linear modern MIMO (Multi-Input Multi-Output) control techniques are applied in order to allow the aircraft to follow a pre-defined trajectory. The control law is validated by a hardware-in-the-loop implementation using a real microcontroller integrated with a numerical real time simulation.

1 Introduction

Multi-rotors are included in the category of vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) vehicles having more than two propellers. The number of propellers or rotors defines the resulting thrust force and, consequently, the payload capacity of the aircraft. Over the past decades, the control capacity of these unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) has attracted the attention of researchers. This fact is due to their mechanical simplicity, simple dynamics and simple/low-cost maintenance; thus, they are considered as being ideal robotics platform for the development and testing control strategies [1].

However, standard multi-rotors UAVs possess a limited mobility due to their inherent underactuation [2]. A quadrotor, for instance, has 4 independent control inputs (the 4 propellers spinning velocities) and, on the other hand, 6 degrees of freedom (DOFs) which represents the system position/orientation in space. Thus, for quasi-hover conditions, a horizontal translation necessarily implies a change in the attitude, and the quadrotor can hover in place only when being in horizontal position with respect to the inertial coordinate frame.

Many authors have investigated different solutions for the underactuation problem [2], [3], [4]. Each work purposes a novel modification on the aircraft that increases the system’s number of DOFs and control inputs. [3] propose an actuation concept for a quadrotor UAV in which the propellers are allowed to tilt about the axes perpendicular to the arms. [2] and [5] developed a quadrotor UAV with eight control inputs that allow its independent position and attitude control by tilting the propellers around the axes connecting them to the main body frame. Lastly, some projects consider a different multi-rotor architecture where the propellers are tilted reorienting the whole vehicle before flight without the need of any additional hardware ([6] and [7]).

Further, in general, the UAVs construction may be costly and time consuming and safety is a primary issue when conducting actual flight tests in such manner that the experimental team and the aircraft integrity must be preserved. Thus, the UAV hardware-in-the-loop simulation is an effective way to detect and
prevent unnecessary malfunctions of the hardware, software and automatic control systems allowing the researchers to effectively evaluate the reliability of the overall UAV system. This method consists on a real-time simulation in which the UAV platform is reacting the same way as it in the real experiment while receiving input commands from an onboard hardware device. For instance, on [8] and [9] a real-time hardware-in-the-loop simulation framework was designed and implemented on a helicopter system UAV. The design was successfully exploited for several flight tests simulations including basic flight motions, full-envelope flight and multiple UAV formation flight.

The focus of this paper is therefore: develop a generic dynamic model for a tilt rotor multi-rotor considering the aircraft with \( n \) rotors and two possible tilt directions, project a MIMO controller for trajectory tracking using modern control theories, evaluate the system response via hardware-in-the-loop simulations.

### 2 Dynamical Modeling

The concept of this section is to derive the dynamical model of a generic multi-rotor with \( n \) rotors such that each rotor is capable of tilting in two different directions (laterally and longitudinally with respect to the rotor’s arm) introducing more control inputs to the system. Some considerations must be taken before the model development such as: the aircraft structure and propellers are supposed to be rigid, all the rotors and propeller blades are the same.

#### 2.1 Kinematic Relations

Three different reference frames will be used in order to model the aircraft dynamics coupled with the rotor tilting as illustrated on Figure 1. The first, an Earth fixed reference frame Inertial Coordinate System denoted by \( I_{\text{CS}} \) used to represent the absolute position of the aircraft. Secondly, a body fixed coordinate frame represented by \( B_{\text{CS}} \) attached to the aircraft. The origin of the body fixed reference frame coincides with the aircraft center of gravity (CG), and its translational velocity and angular velocity vectors are denoted by \( \dot{v} = \begin{bmatrix} u & v & w \end{bmatrix}^T \) and \( \dot{\omega} = \begin{bmatrix} p & q & r \end{bmatrix}^T \), respectively, such that \( p \), \( q \) and \( r \) are the angular velocities around the \( x_B \), \( y_B \) and \( z_B \) axis.

The aircraft attitude can be defined with respect to the \( B_{\text{CS}} \) using the Euler angles, which are represented by \( \Theta = \begin{bmatrix} \phi & \theta & \psi \end{bmatrix} \) corresponding to the roll, pitch and yaw angles, respectively. The Euler angles angular velocities are expressed as the time rate change of the Euler angles \( \dot{\Theta} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\phi} & \dot{\theta} & \dot{\psi} \end{bmatrix} \). It must be remarked that \( \omega \neq \dot{\Theta} \) since the \( \omega \) vector points in the rotation axis, while \( \dot{\Theta} \) only represents the time derivative of the attitude angles. However, these two vectors are correlated by a kinematic relation:

\[
\omega = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -\sin\theta \\ 0 & \cos\phi & \cos\phi \cos\theta \\ 0 & -\sin\phi & \cos\theta \cos\phi \end{bmatrix} \dot{\Theta}
\]

Any vector, defined at the body-fixed frame \( B_{\text{CS}} \), can be expressed at the \( I_{\text{CS}} \) by using the following rotation matrix \( R_B^I \) [10],

\[
I_{\text{CS}} = R_B^I \cdot I_{\text{BCS}}
\]
with \( R_B^i = R_z(\gamma)R_y(\alpha)R_x(\phi) \) and \( R_x(\phi) \), \( R_y(\alpha) \) and \( R_z(\gamma) \) are rotations around \( z_x \), \( y_x \) and \( x_x \) axis, respectively.

The motor reference axis \( MCS : \{ O_{M_i}, x_{m_i}, y_{m_i}, z_{m_i} \} \), \( i=1...n \) is the frame associated to each of the \( i^{th} \) propulsive group, with \( x_{m_i} \) representing the laterally tilting actuation axis, \( y_{m_i} \) the longitudinally tilting actuation axis and \( z_{m_i} \) the propeller actuated spinning axis that is coincident with the thrust force direction [2]. The lateral and longitudinal tilt angles are denoted by \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_i \), respectively. Further, the \( i^{th} \) propulsion system position w.r.t the \( BCS \) is denoted by \( \hat{r}_{CG/B} = \begin{bmatrix} l \cos \gamma_i & l \sin \gamma_i & z_{CG} \end{bmatrix} \), where \( l \) represents the multi-rotor arm length, \( \gamma_i \) the angle between the rotor’s arm and the \( x_x \) direction and \( z_{CG} \) the distance of the rotor center of gravity to the \( x_x/y_y \) plane. Also, any vector in the \( MCS \) reference frame can be written on the \( BCS \) by a rotational matrix, following the rotation sequence around \( z_{m_i}, y_{m_i} \) and \( x_{m_i} \), which can be represented by the matrices:

\[
R_{x_i}^i(\gamma_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \gamma_i & -\sin \gamma_i & 0 \\ \sin \gamma_i & \cos \gamma_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{3}
\]

\[
R_{y_i}^i(\alpha_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \alpha_i & 0 & \sin \alpha_i \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin \alpha_i & 0 & \cos \alpha_i \end{bmatrix} \tag{4}
\]

\[
R_{z_i}^i(\beta_i) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \beta_i & -\sin \beta_i \\ 0 & \sin \beta_i & \cos \beta_i \end{bmatrix} \tag{5}
\]

Consequently, a vector on the \( MCS \) can be written on the \( BCS \) using the rotational matrix \( R_{M_i}^i \) represented by the multiplication of (3), (4) and (5) matrices, respectively, as follows:

\[
\hat{q}_a = R_{M_i}^i(\gamma_i)R_{M_i}^i(\alpha_i)R_{M_i}^i(\beta_i)\hat{q}_u \tag{6}
\]

### 2.2 Equations of Motion

The multi-rotor equations of motion are derived using the Newton-Euler formulation for a generic six degrees of freedom rigid body system. Thus, the equations for linear and angular body motion, written on the \( BCS \), are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum F_x &= m \left( \dot{u} - R_v + Q_w \right) \\
\sum F_y &= \dot{v} - P_w + R_u \\
\sum F_z &= \dot{w} - Q_u + P_v
\end{align*} \tag{7}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum M_x &= I_{xx} \dot{\theta} + \dot{\gamma} \dot{\theta} - I_{zz} \dot{\phi} + I_{yx} \dot{\phi} - I_{xy} \dot{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_{prop}}^{r_{prop}} \Phi \, dr \dot{\phi} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_{prop}}^{r_{prop}} \Phi \, dr \dot{\gamma} \\
\sum M_y &= I_{yy} \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma} \dot{\phi} - I_{xz} \dot{\theta} + I_{yx} \dot{\theta} + I_{xy} \dot{\phi} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_{prop}}^{r_{prop}} \Phi \, dr \dot{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_{prop}}^{r_{prop}} \Phi \, dr \dot{\phi} \\
\sum M_z &= I_{zz} \dot{\phi} + \dot{\phi} \dot{\theta} - I_{xy} \dot{\gamma} + I_{yx} \dot{\gamma} - I_{yz} \dot{\theta} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_{prop}}^{r_{prop}} \Phi \, dr \dot{\phi} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{r_{prop}}^{r_{prop}} \Phi \, dr \dot{\gamma}
\end{align*} \tag{8}
\]

where \( F = \begin{bmatrix} F_x & F_y & F_z \end{bmatrix} \) and \( M = \begin{bmatrix} M_x & M_y & M_z \end{bmatrix} \) are the external force and moment applied at the center of mass of the vehicle. \( I_{xx}, I_{yy}, I_{zz}, I_{xy}, I_{xz}, I_{yz} \) and \( I_{Iz} \) are the components of the rotational inertia matrix of the vehicle with respect to the body coordinate frame.

Concerning the external forces, it is mainly composed of thrust, drag and gravitational components. Assuming the most commonly type of propulsion system used for UAVs (DC motors), the thrust force generated by the propeller can be considered as proportional to the propeller angular speed [11]:

\[
T = \left( \frac{K_r K_v \sqrt{\frac{2 \pi r_{prop}^2}{K_r}}}{K_r} \right) \omega^2 \tag{9}
\]

where \( K_r \) is a proportional constant relating the torque produced by the electric motor and its electrical current, \( K_v \) relates the motor voltage and its angular velocity, \( K_r \) is relative to the motor torque and thrust, \( r_{prop} \) is the blade disc radius, \( \rho \) the density of the surrounding air and \( \Omega \) the rotational velocity of the motor shaft.
Once the thrust $T$ acts in the $z$ direction of the MCS, the force generated by each rotor can be written on the BCS using the matrix transformation presented in Eq. (6).

As presented in Marques (2017), a drag force due to the viscosity of the vehicle surrounding air is considered in the model which be simplified by expressing this force as proportional to the linear velocity of the aircraft and always acting in the opposite direction of the body movement. Hence, the drag force on the BCS is written as:

$$ F_{D}^{BCS} = -k_{d} v = \begin{bmatrix} -k_{d, x} u \\ -k_{d, y} v \\ -k_{d, z} w \end{bmatrix} \tag{10} $$

where $k_{d}$ is a friction constant which can be split in three directions of the BCS ($x$, $y$, and $z$).

Also, a constant gravitational force pointing always to the $z$-direction of the ICS acts on the aircraft center of gravity. The components of this force at the BCS is obtained from the rotation matrix (Eq. (2)), as follows:

$$ F_{grav}^{BCS} = (R_{B}^{T})^{T} F_{grav}^{ICS} = \begin{bmatrix} mg \sin \theta \\ -mg \sin \phi \cos \theta \\ -mg \cos \phi \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \tag{11} $$

The moments acting in the BCS are mainly generated by propeller system actuation and how they are distributed on the UAV center of mass. Hence, the torque produced by the spinning propeller is obtained by the following relation:

$$ \bar{\tau}_{T} = \bar{r}_{CG} \times F_{T}^{BCS} \tag{12} $$

being $F_{T}^{BCS}$ the thrust force vector written on the $BCS$ and $\bar{r}_{CG}$ the motor position vector with respect to the multi-rotor center of gravity.

Afterward, since the mass of the aircraft is generally small, the gyroscopic effect of the blades must be accounted in the dynamic model. This torque is an outcome of the propellers angular momentum direction change along the flight [13], and is calculated with respect to the multi-rotor center of gravity considering the two tilting directions ($\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$). First, the motor angular velocity with respect to the aircraft $CG$ is written as:

$$ \bar{\omega}_{prop} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\alpha_i)\beta_i + \dot{\alpha}_i + \dot{Q} - \sin(\alpha_i)\dot{\beta} + R \end{bmatrix}^{T} \tag{13} $$

where $\dot{\alpha}_i$ and $\dot{\beta}_i$ are each rotor angular velocity rate of change.

Assuming that the propeller blades have the same moment of inertia ($I_{u}$) and are spinning around the $z_{u}$ direction of the $MCS$, the gyroscopic effect is obtained from by the cross product between the motor angular velocity (Eq. (13)) and the angular momentum generated by the $n$ propellers ($\bar{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \sum_{i=1}^{n} J_{u} \dot{\Omega}_i \end{bmatrix}^{T}$):

$$ \bar{\tau}_{c} = (\ddot{\bar{H}})_{ac} + \omega_{a} \times \bar{H} \tag{14} $$

Considering that the propeller angular speed variation is negligible and the propeller moment of inertia is constant, then $(d\bar{H}/dt)_{ac} = 0$. Further, the fan torque is also an external torque component due to the air aerodynamic drag on the propeller blades cross section that acts on the rotor spinning axis ($z_{u}$) and can be modeled as [14]:

$$ \bar{\tau}_{prop} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} -b\Omega_i^2 \end{bmatrix}^{T} \tag{15} $$

where $b$ is a proportional constant relating the resulting drag torque with the propeller angular speed. Equation (15) can be written on the $BCS$ using the relation on Eq. (6).

Thus, the total forces and toques applied to the aircraft are:

$$ \bar{F} = \bar{F}_{T}^{BCS} + \bar{F}_{D}^{BCS} + \bar{F}_{grav}^{BCS} \tag{16} $$

$$ \bar{M} = \bar{\tau}_{T}^{BCS} + \bar{\tau}_{c}^{BCS} + \bar{\tau}_{prop}^{BCS} $$
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The mathematical model of a generic tilt multi-rotor with \( n \) rotors is obtained substituting Eq. (16) in Eqs. (7) and (8) also considering the kinematic relations presented on Eq. (1) forming a nine degree of freedom dynamical system. The number of inputs depends on the number of motors and tilting actuators.

In order to apply modern control techniques, such as the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR), the derived equations of motion must be linearized in order to form a LTI (Linear Time Invariant) system [12]. The procedure of linearization is based on the small perturbation theory similarly to the application of fixed wing aircraft models as developed in [13]. Once the equations were linearized, the first order differential equations can be written in the state space format:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax + Bu \\
\dot{y} &= Cx + Du
\end{align*}
\]  

(17)

with \( x = \{u, v, w, P, Q, R, \phi, \theta, \psi\} \) being the state vector, \( \dot{y} \) the output measured signals, \( A \) the dynamic matrix and \( B \) the input matrix. Since the measured signals are considered to be exactly the state vector, then \( C \) is an identity matrix and \( D \) is a zero matrix.

In most applications concerning trajectory tracking problems, the position of the aircraft with respect to the ICS is the desired control variable [10]. In order to include the vehicle position, the state vector is expanded and three new kinematic relations are added to the problem. They concern the linear velocities (\( \dot{V}_x \), \( \dot{V}_y \) and \( \dot{V}_z \)) written as a function of the temporal derivatives of \( (x_E, y_E \text{ and } z_E) \) [15].

3 Modern Control

In terms of autonomous systems development, modern control theory has revealed to be a valuable control technique for multi-rotor autonomous flight applications as presented in [1] and [12]. Once this system configuration is classified as MIMO (Multiple Input Multiple Output), as presented on the dynamical equations, the numbers of control states and inputs in the multi-rotor dynamical model make classical control techniques as PID controllers a hard-working task since the controller is based on successively closed loops. Moreover, for multivariable or problems, modern control techniques can be more efficient since the control loop gains are calculated simultaneously while the stability condition are guaranteed.

Therefore, on this work, the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) with state feedback is applied to guarantee stability and good signal tracking capability. The LQR strategy control strategy consists in making zero order closed loop system that forces all the states to the equilibrium position. Mainly concerned with trajectory tracking characteristics, the tracking error \( (\hat{e}(t)) \) is defined as:

\[
\hat{e}(t) = \hat{r}(t) - \hat{x}(t)
\]

(18)

with \( \hat{r}(t) \) the tracking command vector containing the reference values for the states desired to be tracked which can be represented as a \( p \) order differential equation:

\[
\hat{r}^{(p)} = \sum_{i=0}^{p} a_i \hat{r}^{(p-i)}
\]

(19)

Furthermore, the LQR problem can be extended to the LQT (Linear Quadratic Tracking) problem increasing the system order following the internal model principle, where the error (Eq.(18)) is driven to zero. The problem can be treated as a servomechanism design which contains the reference model (Eq.(19)) written in the state space form as [16]:

\[
\hat{r}^{(p)} = \sum_{i=0}^{p} a_i \hat{r}^{(p-i)}
\]

(20)

where the vector \( \mu \) represents the plant input vector and \( \hat{z} \) is the expanded state vector containing the plant and \( p \) error derivatives (\( \hat{z} = \begin{bmatrix} e & \dot{e} & \ldots & (p-1)e & x \end{bmatrix}^T \)). Further, assuming that the control law is represented by:
The feedback gain matrix $K_c = [K_p, K_{p-1}, \ldots, K_1, K_0]$ is obtained solving a cost-function minimization problem in a manner that the closed loop matrix system $(\hat{A} - \hat{B}K_c)$ is stable (Burns, 2001):

$$J = \int_{0}^{\infty} \left( (z)^T Q(z) + \mu^T R \mu \right) dt$$

(22)

where $Q_k = Q_k^T \geq 0$, $R_k = R_k^T \geq 0$ and $(\hat{A}, Q_k^{1/2})$ are detectable.

Therefore, for a given state space LTI system, there is a gain matrix $K_c$ which can minimize the cost function and bring all states (including the error) to zero simultaneously. The cost function minimization problem (Eq. (22)) can be solved using the Riccati equation [17].

### 4 Hardware-in-the-loop Simulation

According to [8], the hardware-in-the-loop (HIL) technique is a real-time simulation method or framework, in which the UAV is reacting the same way as it would in the real experiment. This technique has been widely applied by researchers since it can be an effective way to detect and prevent unnecessary malfunctions of hardware, software and unexpected behavior of the aircraft when executing an experiment.

For instance, in [18], a Matlab®/Simulink interface was developed in such manner that factors such as wind, sensor noise and actuator slew were included in the model to facilitate a more realistic simulation environment. In general, the benefits of the HIL is that it can reduce the experiment’s cost, increase its safety, and it can be less time consuming. Using such method, the reliability of the overall UAV system can be evaluated principally the performance of designed automatic flight control algorithms.

In this sense, a HIL framework was established in order to join in the aircraft hardware to a Matlab® flight control module which executes the automatic control algorithms and integrates the aircraft equations of motion over time. This procedure enables the LQR/LQT control law to be tested using the real hardware preserving the MAV integrity.

The HIL simulation framework is depicted in Fig. 2. Briefly, the integrated framework works as follows: the first step is a handshake connection between the microcontroller and the Matlab® so the task commands (reference signal), initial states and number of iterations are defined. The BeagleBone microcontroller receives the states from the algorithm and, using the compiled control law, calculates the motor/actuators input signal (PWM). Later, the PWM signal returns to the Matlab® algorithm and goes to the aircraft actuators/motors. The equations of motion are integrated in the software using a ODE45 function being the defined time step as the simulation time interval. The output from the Matlab® function are the states which are transferred to the microcontroller so that the loop is completed. Simultaneously, the actuators/motors receive the PWM signal, while the aircraft is fixed, and the rotors speeds are monitored using a tachometer.

The definition of the time step depends on the time communication between the Matlab® software and the BeagleBone microcontroller. The standard procedure is based on serial communication on which the controller connects directly to the software. However, for this purpose, the connection between the microcontroller and the software via TCP/IP has proved to be faster, reducing the time communication in approximately 20 times. Thus, the sample time for the HIL application could be set as 20 ms.

Notwithstanding, the time for the Matlab® routine to execute the equations of motion integration function and calculate the states is variable. Differently from a real problem where they are obtained instantly. Though, from simulations experiments was verified that the calculation time does not exceed 4 ms. Hence, setting the sample time to 20 ms, there is time enough for the software to execute the algorithm and the microcontroller to calculate the input signal. The time difference between the sample time and the software calculations is the stand-by time for the microcontroller to send the output signal back to the software. In conclusion, the
proposed HIL procedure is performed as close as a real-time simulation.

5 Simulations and Results

Once the multi-rotor dynamical model equipped with a tilting mechanism was derived and a control law based on the linear state-space model was proposed, numerical simulations using the hardware-in-the-loop framework presented in Section 4 are presented in this section in order to illustrate the autonomous flight application.

As research object, a quadcopter configuration containing 4 longitudinal tilting mechanisms was chosen in order to exemplify the control application. In this case, the tilting mechanism are considered to actuate independently.

Further, the reference input for the three space positions is a unitary step signal represented by the following differential equation:

\[ \dot{r} = 0 \]  

with \( p = 1 \) and \( q_i = 0 \) on Eq. (20).

The position and attitude responses are presented on Figs. 3 and 4, respectively. From the figures, it can be inferred that the aircraft position converges to the reference value on the three directions simultaneously however the system has higher oscillations on \( x_E \) direction. The oscillations are also observed on the attitude position illustrated on Fig. 4. Furthermore, regarding the yaw angle response \( (\psi) \) on Fig. 4, it is observed that the system does not converge to the equilibrium position through the simulation. This phenomenon can be attributed to the system response efficiency due to the propeller drag [19].

Figures 5 and 6 show the input signal from the microcontroller to the rotors \( \Omega \) (\( rad/s \)) and tilt actuator \( \alpha \) (\( rad \)) on the numerical simulator, respectively, where one can observe that the control inputs tends to a steady state value which is not the same as the initial condition. Thus, it can be inferred that the system is at a new equilibrium condition as soon as the tilting angles are not zero (Fig. 6).
Once the hardware-in-the-loop simulation was performed, the performance of the system processing and communication was tested to guarantee that the time elapsed between each numerical integration is enough to guarantee that the states and control inputs are updated at each time step.

Considering the time sampling, Fig. 7 shows the variation of the time calculation over the simulation. One can state that there are some peaks which exceed the required sampling time (0.02s) since it is a non-real time system however the mean value is guaranteed. Hence, in real flight operations, the transmission conditions are improved assuming that the system does not have connection delay.

The sampling time is mainly composed of three parts: plant calculation (Matlab® numerical integration, controller calculation and communication time. Ideally, the plant calculation and communication time should be very small compared to the controller calculation such that the simulated model can approximate the real system. The communication time was obtained eliminating all the calculation and considering only the time expended for changing data, the value obtained was 5e-5s with a standard deviation of 5e-6s, equivalent of approximately 0.5% of all the processing time as presented on Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Percentage of total time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Numerical</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller Calculation</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, considering the table, one can deduce that the communication time is negligible compared to the controller calculation time. Therefore, the hardware-in-the-loop procedure permits to evaluate the controller behavior on real flight conditions and to test its robustness and performance for a specific mission.
6 Conclusions

In summary, the objective of this present work was to derive the dynamical model of a generic multi-rotor UAV equipped with a tilting rotor mechanism either on the longitudinal or lateral directions. The addition of the tilting mechanism to the system increases the number of signal inputs, hence the underactuation problem can be solved.

The equations of motion were then derived using Newton-Euler formulation considering the system as a rigid body with six degrees of freedom (3 translations and 3 rotations). The dynamic equations were later linearized so that modern control techniques could be applied. An LQR controller using servomechanism approximation for trajectory tracking was designed in a manner that the closed loop system stability is held and the plant is able to follow a desired tracking command.

The dynamical model and designed control were tested via hardware-in-the-loop simulations in order to evaluate the microcontroller performance. This analysis is a one step procedure for future experimental analysis and has given preliminary results for the controller behavior avoiding human and equipment risks.

However, for future work, other effects could be investigated for the proposed problem such as: the weighting matrix for different scenarios, the introduction of parameter uncertainties and external perturbations to the model, other control techniques application, the controller can be tested for different reference signals and input trajectories and, finally, the real experimental tests can be done.
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