**Delft Center for Systems and Control** 

Technical report 22-003

# A fixed-wing UAV formation algorithm based on vector field guidance\*

X. Wang, S. Baldi, X. Feng, C. Wu, H. Xie, and B. De Schutter

If you want to cite this report, please use the following reference instead: X. Wang, S. Baldi, X. Feng, C. Wu, H. Xie, and B. De Schutter, "A fixed-wing UAV formation algorithm based on vector field guidance," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 179–192, Jan. 2023. doi:10. 1109/TASE.2022.3144672

Delft Center for Systems and Control Delft University of Technology Mekelweg 2, 2628 CD Delft The Netherlands phone: +31-15-278.24.73 (secretary) URL: https://www.dcsc.tudelft.nl

\* This report can also be downloaded via https://pub.bartdeschutter.org/abs/22\_003.html

## A fixed-wing UAV formation algorithm based on vector field guidance

Ximan Wang, Simone Baldi Senior Member, IEEE, Xuewei Feng, Changwei Wu, Hongwei Xie, and Bart De Schutter Fellow, IEEE

Abstract—The vector field method was originally proposed to guide a single fixed-wing Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) towards a desired path. In this work, a non-uniform vector field method is proposed that changes in both magnitude and direction, for the purpose of achieving formations of UAVs. As compared to related work in the literature, the proposed formation control law does not need to assume absence of wind. That is, due to the effect of the wind on the UAV, one can handle the UAV air speed being different from its ground speed, and the UAV heading angle being different from its course angle. Stability of the proposed formation method is analyzed via Lyapunov stability theory, and validations are carried out in software-inthe-loop and hardware-in-the-loop comparative experiments.

*Note to Practitioners:* The software-in-the-loop and hardwarein-the-loop experiments, which are done with PX4 autopilot software and hardware, show that the proposed method can be implemented on board of UAVs and integrated with the control architecture of existing autopilot suites. Comparisons with standard formation algorithms show that the proposed method is effective in achieving formation in different path scenarios.

*Index Terms*—Formation control, Vector Field, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, hardware-in-the-loop, PX4 autopilot.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Fixed-wing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are becoming more and more popular for research and for applications in surveillance, search and rescue, photography, or entertainment [1]–[4]. Guidance algorithms are a crucial enabler to all these applications: the problem of UAV guidance has been examined in the literature from different points of view and recent surveys include [5]–[7]. Studies exist on exploiting communications or service-oriented characteristics of the surrounding environment to support UAV guidance tasks [8], [9]. However, despite the progress in the guidance for fixed-wing UAVs, up to now there are still limited or no established guidance tools for achieving formation tasks. To support this observation, notice that despite the several commercial or open-source autopilot suites developed for single UAVs (ArduPilot, PX4, DJI, NAVIO2, AscTec Trinity, etc.) none of them yet provides formation control functionalities. For a single fixed-wing UAV, the vector field method, formulated originally in [10], has become a well-established method for guidance towards a desired path. The vector field idea is based on generating a field of desired course inputs that become the reference input to the inner-loop attitude control laws. Extensions to the vector field idea include tracking targets [11], tracking general curved paths [12], tackling unmodeled course angle dynamics [13], or removing singularities in the vector field that prevent to achieve global convergence [14].

1

Motivated by these and other advances, the vector field method has gained popularity and studies have been made to extend it towards formation tasks: examples include circular formations with constant speed [15] or, when the velocity can be controlled, a non-uniform vector field whose vectors have different directions and magnitudes [16]. In this sense, the vector field method offers an alternative to formation-keeping methods based on PID control [17], inverse optimal control [18], Nash equilibrium [19], [20], model predictive control [21], [22], or consensus-based formation control [23]-[26]. It is worth mentioning that, while the vector field method has been originally developed for fixed-wing UAVs [27], not all the alternative methods are directly applicable to fixedwing UAVs: consensus- and Nash equilibrium-based methods have been studied mostly for quadrotors [28] or for vertical takeoff and landing UAVs [29]; methods based on inverse optimal control or model predictive control require a different architecture than the established open-source architectures of many autopilot suites (e.g. ArduPilot, PX4, NAVIO2).

Vector-field-based formation control offers the appealing possibility of being integrated with autopilot suites for fixedwing UAVs, which may be not straightforward with other approaches. For example, formation control laws based on the consensus approach are designed to deliver forces and torques (to affect velocities and angular rates). This is due to the fact that the dynamics of the UAV are derived from Newton's law as double integrators or similar dynamics (this approach is used for quadrotors [30]-[32] and sometimes also for fixedwing UAVs [33]). However, the typical control architecture of most of the aforementioned autopilot software suites is the successive loop closure, where inner loops are used to provide thrust and actuator deflections, while the guidance law (outer loop) is in charge of providing desired the velocity and the desired course [34], [35]. In some cases, the guidance law provides the velocity and the angular rate [36].

The approach that we take in this work is to consider that the autopilot is synthesized according to the successive loop

This research was supported by Natural Science Foundation of China grant 62073074, Double Innovation Plan grant 4207012004, and Special Funding for Overseas grant 6207011901. (*corresponding author: S. Baldi*).

X. Wang and B. De Schutter are with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, TU Delft, The Netherlands {X.Wang-15, b.deschutter}@tudelft.nl

X. Feng, C. Wu and H. Xie are with College of Software, Taiyuan University of Technology, Taiyuan, China {fengxuewei0941@link., wuchangwei1055@link., xiehongwei@}tyut.edu.cn S. Baldi is with School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing, China, and with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, TU Delft, The Netherlands s.baldi@tudelft.nl



(a) Vector fields for straight line and orbit paths.

(b) Wind triangle, vector sum between air speed and wind.

Figure 1: Preliminary concepts for the vector field method.

closure architecture: this is in line with standard literature [37], [38] and standard books [34]. We propose a non-uniform vector field that changes in both magnitude and direction: the main contributions as compared to related work are:

- Recent literature has proposed the use of backstepping control to implement the vector field for formation tasks [37], [38]: however, with this method an assumption on the absence of wind is required (see next item). In this work, in place of backstepping, we adopt a philosophy that is closer to the originally proposed vector field approach, which relies on a sliding mode control method;
- In related literature, the absence of wind was assumed so that the UAV ground speed coincides with its air speed and the UAV course angle coincides with its heading angle. This setting is restrictive and does not hold in practice. By adopting a philosophy closer to the originally proposed vector field approach, we do not require zero wind: sliding-mode-based control commands are designed under the scenario that the air speed can be different from ground speed, and the heading angle can be different from the course angle.
- Besides analyzing stability of the proposed method, comparative experiments are provided in both software-in-theloop and hardware-in-the-loop environments, using PX4 as software and hardware.

Comparisons with standard formation algorithms show that the proposed formation method is effective in different path scenarios, even with high-latency communication (2Hz).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Sect. II the vector field method for a single fixed-wing UAV is recalled. In Sect. III we provide the formation problem description and its solution. Software-in-the-loop and hardware-in-the-loop experiments are in Sect. IV: the method is implemented using PX4 as autopilot suite. Conclusions are Sect. V. Stability analysis is provided in the appendix by making use of Lyapunov theory.

### **II. PRELIMINARIES ON VECTOR FIELD**

The vector field describes a field guiding towards desired locations. Traditionally, the vector field was proposed to follow line or orbit paths (cf. Figure 1a), but this idea can be extended to navigate through obstacles or perform more complex tasks. We will use the subscript "l" to indicate that the vector field is applied to the leader UAV, using the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{1} &= V_{\rm al} \cos(\psi_{\rm l}) + W \cos(\psi_{\rm W}) = V_{\rm gl} \cos(\chi_{\rm l}) \\ \dot{y}_{\rm l} &= V_{\rm al} \sin(\psi_{\rm l}) + W \sin(\psi_{\rm W}) = V_{\rm gl} \sin(\chi_{\rm l}) \\ \dot{\chi}_{\rm l} &= \alpha_{\rm l} (\chi_{\rm l}^{\rm c} - \chi_{\rm l}). \end{aligned}$$
(1)

where  $\psi_{l}$  is the heading angle between the north and the air speed velocity  $V_{al}$ ;  $x_{l}$  and  $y_{l}$  are the coordinates of the UAV in the inertial frame; W and  $\psi_{W}$  are the wind speed and wind angle;  $\chi_{l}$  is the course and  $V_{gl}$  is the ground velocity, both resulting from the vector summation of air speed and wind, cf. the wind triangle in Figure 1b. In the last equation,  $\chi_{l}^{c}$ is the command course (to be designed), and  $\alpha_{l}$  is a positive constant that defines the inverse of the time constant of the course-hold loop. The interested reader is referred to standard literature [27], [34], [39]–[41] describing how dynamics (1) can be obtained for guidance purposes.

For a vector field described by a function  $\chi_1^d(e_1)$ , where  $e_1$  is the cross-track error, the guidance law takes the form

$$\chi_{l}^{c} = \chi_{l} - \frac{\dot{\chi}_{l}^{d}}{\alpha_{l}} - \frac{\kappa}{\alpha_{l}} \operatorname{sat}\left(\frac{\tilde{\chi}_{l}}{\varepsilon}\right)$$
(2)

where  $\tilde{\chi}_1 = \chi_1 - \chi_1^d$  is the course error with respect to the desired vector field,  $\kappa$  and  $\varepsilon$  are parameters governing control aggressiveness and boundary layer, and

$$\operatorname{sat}(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| < 1, \\ \operatorname{sgn}(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(3)

To clarify (2), let us consider the standard examples in Figure 1a. For a straight line vector field we have

$$\chi_{l}^{d}(e_{l}) = -\chi_{\infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(ke_{l})$$
(4)

$$\chi_{\rm l}^{\rm c} = \chi_{\rm l} - \frac{\chi_{\infty}}{\alpha_{\rm l}} \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{kV_{\rm gl}}{1 + (ke_{\rm l})^2} \sin(\chi_{\rm l}) - \frac{\kappa}{\alpha_{\rm l}} \operatorname{sat}\left(\frac{\tilde{\chi}_{\rm l}}{\varepsilon}\right)$$
(5)

where  $e_1$  denotes the cross-track error with respect to the desired line (sometimes the notation  $e_y$  is used to indicate this error [27]),  $\chi_{\infty} \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$  is the course reference when the error is large, and k governs the vector field smoothness.

For another standard scenario, an orbit vector field, we have

$$\chi_{1}^{d}(e_{1}) = \gamma + \lambda \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \tan^{-1}(ke_{1})\right)$$

$$\chi_{1}^{c} = \chi_{1} + \frac{V_{g1}}{\alpha_{1}d} \sin(\chi_{1} - \gamma)$$

$$+ \frac{V_{g1}}{\alpha_{1}} \frac{k}{1 + (ke_{1})^{2}} \cos(\chi_{1} - \gamma) - \frac{\kappa}{\alpha_{1}} \operatorname{sat}\left(\frac{\tilde{\chi}_{1}}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

$$(6)$$

$$(7)$$

where  $e_1$  denotes the cross-track error with respect to the desired orbit (sometimes the notation  $\tilde{d} = d - R$  is used to indicate this error, where d is the distance of the UAV from the orbit center, R is the desired orbit radius [27]), R is the orbit radius, and  $\gamma$  is the angle between the north and the UAV position with respect to the orbit center. The parameters k,  $\kappa$ ,  $\varepsilon$  have similar meanings as in the straight-line case.

### **III. VECTOR FIELD FOR FORMATION CONTROL**

This section explains how the vector field can be used to solve the formation control problem. To this purpose, consider the scenario in Figure 2 with a leader and a follower UAV (indexed with subscripts "l" and "f"). Their positions in the inertial frame are  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_f, y_f)$ . The vectors  $V_{gl}$  and  $V_{gf}$ are their ground speeds. Note from Figure 2 that the position to be tracked by the follower UAV is shifted by a vector that represents the desired formation gap. We refer to Table I for a list of symbols used in this work.

The dynamics of the leader are represented as in (1), with  $\chi_1^c$  resulting from the standard vector field. Accordingly, the dynamics of the follower UAV are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{\rm f} &= V_{\rm gf} \cos(\chi_{\rm f}) \\ \dot{y}_{\rm f} &= V_{\rm gf} \sin(\chi_{\rm f}) \\ \dot{\chi}_{\rm f} &= \alpha_{\rm f} (\chi_{\rm f}^{\rm c} - \chi_{\rm f}) \\ \dot{V}_{\rm gf} &= \beta_{\rm f} (V_{\rm gf}^{\rm c} - V_{\rm gf}). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The main difference between (8) and (1) is given by the last equation, which represents a velocity-hold loop, where  $\beta_{\rm f}$  is the inverse of the time constant of the velocity-hold loop, and  $V_{\rm gf}^{\rm c}$  the speed command. In other words, we allow the follower to change its velocity  $V_{\rm gf}$  in such a way as to achieve the formation. In several open-source autopilot suites (e.g. ArduPilot, PX4, NAVIO2) commanding the velocity is



Figure 2: Coordinates for formation error.

### Table I: Notation

| Description                           | Unit  |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Coordinates of UAV <sub>1</sub> and   |   |  |
| UAV <sub>1</sub> in inertial frame    | 111   |  |
| Ground speed                          | m/s   |  |
| Course angle                          | rad   |  |
| Desired speed                         | m/s   |  |
| Desired course angle                  | rad   |  |
| Speed command                         | m/s   |  |
| Course angle command                  | rad   |  |
| Inverse time constant                 | $s^{-1}$  |  |
| of course-hold loop                   |   |  |
| Inverse time constant                 | e <sup>-1</sup>   |  |
| of velocity-hold loop                 | 3   |  |
| Desired gap in                        | m   |  |
| leader's body frame                   |   |  |
| Distance of $UAV_f$ from $UAV_l$      | m   |  |
| Angle between North and $UAV_{\rm f}$ | rad   |  |
| with respect to leader position       |   |  |
| Formation error                       |   |  |
| in leader's body frame                | 111   |  |
|                                       | DescriptionCoordinates of UAV1 andUAV1 in inertial frameGround speedCourse angleDesired speedDesired course angleSpeed commandCourse angle commandCourse angle commandInverse time constantof course-hold loopInverse time constantof velocity-hold loopDesired gap inleader's body frameDistance of UAVf from UAV1Angle between North and UAVfwith respect to leader positionFormation errorin leader's body frame |  |

possible thanks to the Total Energy Control System (TECS), which controls velocity and altitude. The interested reader is again referred to standard literature [27], [34], [39]–[41] describing how dynamics (8) can be obtained.

In place of defining the formation error in the inertial frame, it is more convenient to express it in the leader's frame. Therefore, let  $(g_x, g_y)$  be the desired formation gap expressed in the leader's frame. In other words, the leader's frame represents the reference frame for the follower, which calculates the formation error in this frame as:

$$x_{\rm E} = g_x + d_f \sin(\gamma_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l})$$
  

$$y_{\rm E} = g_y + d_f \cos(\gamma_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l})$$
(9)

where  $d_{\rm f}$  is the distance of the follower UAV from the leader UAV, and  $\gamma_{\rm f}$  is the angle between the north and the follower UAV position with respect to the leader position. The formation control problem can be formulated as:

**Control Problem**: Given the leader dynamics (1) and the follower dynamics (8), design the follower commands  $\chi_{\rm f}^{\rm c}$ ,  $V_{\rm gf}^{\rm c}$  such that the errors  $x_{\rm E}$ ,  $y_{\rm E}$ ,  $\chi_{\rm f} - \chi_{\rm f}^{\rm d}$  and  $V_{\rm gf} - V_{\rm gf}^{\rm d}$  converge to zero asymptotically. Here,  $\chi_{\rm f}^{\rm d}$ , and  $V_{\rm gf}^{\rm d}$  are vector fields to be designed appropriately.

### A. Error Dynamics

We first need to derive the error dynamics of the leaderfollower system. These dynamics are useful to prove stability of the proposed approach. To describe the position of the follower with respect to the leader we use

$$x_{\rm f} = x_{\rm l} + d_{\rm f} \cos(\gamma_{\rm f})$$
  

$$y_{\rm f} = y_{\rm l} + d_{\rm f} \sin(\gamma_{\rm f})$$
(10)

where  $d_{\rm f}$  is the distance of the follower UAV from the leader UAV, and  $\gamma_{\rm f}$  is the angle between the north and the follower UAV position with respect to the leader position.

We can now obtain the dynamics for  $\gamma_{\rm f}$  and  $d_{\rm f}$  in these coordinates by taking the derivative of (10) and using the dynamics of the follower in (8):

$$V_{\rm gf}\cos(\chi_{\rm f}) = \dot{x}_{\rm l} + d_{\rm f}\cos(\gamma_{\rm f}) - d_{\rm f}\sin(\gamma_{\rm f})\dot{\gamma}_{\rm f}$$

$$V_{\rm gf}\sin(\chi_{\rm f}) = \dot{y}_{\rm l} + \dot{d}_{\rm f}\sin(\gamma_{\rm f}) + d_{\rm f}\cos(\gamma_{\rm f})\dot{\gamma}_{\rm f}.$$
(11)

To obtain the dynamics  $\dot{d}_{\rm f}$ , we multiply the first equation in (11) by  $\cos(\gamma_f)$  and the second equation by  $\sin(\gamma_f)$ . Next, we sum the two resulting equations:

$$V_{\rm gf}\cos(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) = \dot{x}_{\rm l}\cos(\gamma_{\rm f}) + \dot{y}_{\rm l}\sin(\gamma_{\rm f}) + d_{\rm f}$$
$$\dot{d}_{\rm f} = V_{\rm gf}\cos(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) - \dot{x}_{\rm l}\cos(\gamma_{\rm f}) \qquad (12)$$
$$- \dot{y}_{\rm l}\sin(\gamma_{\rm f}).$$

Substituting  $\dot{x}_1$  and  $\dot{y}_1$  in (12) with the leader dynamics (1) gives:

$$\dot{d}_{\rm f} = V_{\rm gf} \cos(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) - V_{\rm gl} \cos(\chi_{\rm l}) \cos(\gamma_{\rm f}) - V_{\rm gl} \sin(\chi_{\rm l}) \sin(\gamma_{\rm f})$$
(13)  
$$= V_{\rm gf} \cos(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) - V_{\rm gl} \cos(\chi_{\rm l} - \gamma_{\rm f}).$$

In order to obtain  $\dot{\gamma}_{\rm f}$  we take (11) and multiply the first equation by  $\sin(\gamma_f)$  and the second equation by  $\cos(\gamma_f)$ . Then, we subtract the first from the second so as to obtain

$$V_{\rm gf}\sin(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) = -\dot{x}_{\rm l}\sin(\gamma_{\rm f}) + \dot{y}_{\rm l}\cos(\gamma_{\rm f}) + d_{\rm f}\dot{\gamma}_{\rm f}$$
$$\dot{\gamma}_{\rm f} = \frac{V_{\rm gf}}{d_{\rm f}}\sin(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) + \frac{\dot{x}_{\rm l}}{d_{\rm f}}\sin(\gamma_{\rm f})$$
$$- \frac{\dot{y}_{\rm l}}{d_{\rm f}}\cos(\gamma_{\rm f})$$
$$= \frac{V_{\rm gf}}{d_{\rm f}}\sin(\chi_{\rm f} - \gamma_{\rm f}) - \frac{V_{\rm gl}}{d_{\rm f}}\sin(\chi_{\rm l} - \gamma_{\rm f}).$$
(14)

Using (9) we finally derive the error dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{\rm E} &= \dot{d}_{\rm f} \sin(\gamma_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l}) + d_{\rm f} \cos(\gamma_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l}) \dot{\gamma}_{\rm f} \\ &= V_{\rm gf} \sin(\chi_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l}) + V_{\rm gl} \\ \dot{y}_{\rm E} &= \dot{d}_{\rm f} \cos(\gamma_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l}) - d_{\rm f} \sin(\gamma_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l}) \\ &= V_{\rm gf} \cos(\chi_{\rm f} - \frac{\pi}{2} - \chi_{\rm l}). \end{aligned}$$
(15)

The error dynamics depend on the difference between the course of the leader and the follower, the ground speed of the follower, and the ground speed of the leader, as one could intuitively expect. An alternative way to arrive at (15) is by using polar coordinates: however, this would require to introduce extra notation that might decrease readability. The error dynamics (15) will play a role in analyzing the stability of the formation control law.

### B. Guidance Law for Follower

The vector field for the follower is defined in the leader frame and can be written as follows

$$\chi_{\rm f}^{\rm d} = \chi_{\rm l} + \chi_{\infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k_y y_{\rm E}) \tag{16}$$

## Algorithm 1 Vector-field-based Formation Control

**Input:**  $V_{\text{gf}}, V_{\text{gl}}, \chi_{\text{f}}, \chi_{\text{l}}, (g_x, g_y), (x_1, y_1), (x_{\text{f}}, y_{\text{f}})$ 

- 1:  $\gamma_{\rm f} \leftarrow \operatorname{atan}((x_{\rm f}, y_{\rm f}) (x_{\rm l}, y_{\rm l}))$
- 2:  $d_{\rm f} \leftarrow ||((x_{\rm f}, y_{\rm f}) (x_{\rm l}, y_{\rm l}))||$

- 2.  $w_1 \leftarrow m((w_1,y_1) \leftarrow (w_1,y_1))$ 3.  $x_E \leftarrow g_x + d_f \sin(\gamma_f \frac{\pi}{2} \chi_1)$ 4.  $y_E \leftarrow g_y + d_f \cos(\gamma_f \frac{\pi}{2} \chi_1)$ 5.  $\chi_f^d \leftarrow \chi_1 + \chi_\infty \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k_y y_E)$ , follower's desired course 6.  $V_{gf}^d \leftarrow V_{gl} + V_\infty \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k_x x_E)$ , follower's desired ground
- 7:  $\chi_{\rm f}^c \leftarrow \chi_{\rm f} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \dot{\chi}_{\rm f}^d \frac{\kappa}{\alpha} \operatorname{sat}\left(\frac{\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}}{\epsilon}\right)$ , where  $\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} \leftarrow \chi_{\rm f} \chi_{\rm f}^d$ 8:  $V_{\text{gf}}^c \leftarrow V_{\text{gf}} + \frac{1}{\beta} \dot{V}_{\text{gf}}^d + \frac{1}{\rho\beta} x_{\text{E}} - \frac{\kappa}{\beta} \text{sat} \left( \frac{\tilde{V}_{\text{gf}}}{\epsilon} \right)$ , where  $\tilde{V}_{\text{gf}} \leftarrow V_{\text{gf}} - V_{\text{gf}}^d$  **Output:**  $\chi_{\text{f}}^c, V_{\text{gf}}^c$

$$V_{\rm gf}^{\rm d} = V_{\rm gl} + V_{\infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k_x x_{\rm E})$$
 (17)

where  $V_{\infty}$  is the maximum ground speed correction of the follower when the tracking error is very large (the maximum ground speed is  $V_{\rm gl} + V_{\infty}$  and the minimum one is  $V_{\rm gl} - V_{\infty}$ );  $k_x$  is a gain that defines how aggressive the feedback action is. The parameters in (16) have similar meanings as in the guidance law for a straight line in (4).

**Remark 1.** The proposed control law can be interpreted as a double vector field. One vector field is (16), which depends only on  $y_{\rm E}$ : this has the structure of a standard vector field for a line that allows the follower to approach the line with the same course as the leader course and passing through the desired course point. The second vector field is for the velocity (17) and it depends only on  $x_{\rm E}$ : it allows the follower to accelerate or decelerate in order to reach the desired point.

A convenient way to visualize the proposed double vector field is to use a vector field similar to the straight-line vector field, but where the arrows of the vector field have different length: each arrow in the space that has a length proportional to the desired ground speed.



Figure 3: The flowchart of the algorithm.



(b) Formation error, straight path.

Figure 4: Proposed method: SITL experiment without wind, straight path.

The guidance law for the follower solving the formation problem is

$$\chi_{\rm f}^c = \chi_{\rm f} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \dot{\chi}_{\rm f}^d - \frac{\kappa}{\alpha} \text{sat}\left(\frac{\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}}{\epsilon}\right) \tag{18}$$

$$V_{\rm gf}^c = V_{\rm gf} + \frac{1}{\beta} \dot{V}_{\rm gf}^d + \frac{1}{\rho\beta} x_{\rm E} - \frac{\kappa}{\beta} \text{sat}\left(\frac{\tilde{V}_{\rm gf}}{\epsilon}\right)$$
(19)

where the derivatives in (18), (19) can be calculated as

$$\dot{V}_{\rm gf}^d = -V_\infty \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{k}{1 + (k_x x_{\rm E})^2} \dot{x}_{\rm E}$$
(20)

$$\dot{\chi}_{\rm f}^d = -\chi_\infty \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{k}{1 + (k_x d_{\rm f})^2} \dot{y}_{\rm E} - \dot{\chi}_\infty \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k_y y_{\rm E}) \quad (21)$$

and  $\chi_{\infty} = \gamma_{\rm f} - \pi - \chi_{\rm l}$ . The following theorem holds:

**Theorem 1.** The closed-loop system given by the leader (1), the follower (8), the commands (18), (19) with vector field (16), (17) is asymptotically stable if

$$\min\left(\frac{\rho\kappa}{V_{\rm gf}}, \frac{\overline{y_{\rm E}}}{2}\right) > \frac{\pi\epsilon\mu}{4\chi_{\infty}k} \tag{22}$$

where  $\overline{y_{\rm E}}$  and  $\mu$  are defined in the Appendix.



Figure 5: Proposed method: SITL experiment with wind, straight path.

**Proof:** See Appendix. The flowchart of the proposed algorithm is given in Figure 3. Communication between the leader and the follower is established to calculate the errors used by the controller. The formation vector field controlling the follower's velocity and course can be easily integrated with the velocity-hold loop and course-hold loop on top of the low-level controllers (attitude controllers). In other words, the proposed architecture is compatible with most open-source architectures such as ArduPilot, PX4, NAVIO2. The pseudo-code is shown in Algorithm 1: since the algorithm involves simple additions, multiplications, and static nonlinearities, its computational complexity is  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ .

### IV. VALIDATION

The algorithm is programmed in ROS and validated in software-in-the-loop (SITL) and hardware-in-the-loop (HITL) environments, using the PX4 autopilot suite. PX4 interacts with a companion PC (for SITL) or with Raspberry pi 3B+ (for HITL) by using the MAVROS communication package, while the 3D physical simulators of the UAV dynamics are Gazebo (for SITL) and X-plane (for HITL) [42]–[44]. The controllers



Figure 6: Proposed method: SITL experiment without wind, orbit path.

run at 20Hz in SITL and 2Hz in HITL. The communication frequency between leader and followers is 2Hz in all tests. For comparison purposes, we adopt two methods:

- The state-of-the-art method proposed in [38] under the assumption of absence of wind. This method, abbreviated as "wind-absence method", assumes that the UAV air speed coincides with its ground speed, and that the UAV heading angle coincides with its course angle;
- The state-of-the-art method based on unicycle dynamics [45]. The method, abbreviated as "unicycle method" exploits the fact that the guidance dynamics for UAVs are analogous to the kinematic model of a unicycle mobile robot, cf. the survey [5].

### A. Software-In-The-Loop (SITL) Experiments

To assess the difference without and with wind, the wind plugin of Gazebo is used to create a wind scenario, using: WindForceMean = 2.5, WindForceMax= 3.5, WindGuestMean = 7, WindGuestMax = 10, WindDirectionMean =  $45^{\circ}$ .

1) Line and orbit paths: The experiments are first performed with two UAVs for a line and an orbit path (without and with wind). The desired gap between leader and follower is (-2, -2)m. In the straight path scenario, the leader flies at



Figure 7: Proposed method: SITL experiment with wind, orbit path.

18 m/s along a straight path, while the follower starts from a perpendicular position with respect to the path. In the orbit path scenario, the orbit has a radius of 400m. The follower starts from the bottom left region.

The results without wind are reported in Figures 4 and 5. The results in the presence of wind are reported in Figures 6 and 7. The formation errors below each path show that the presence of wind leads to larger errors. In particular, the wind makes the orbit scenario more challenging for two reasons: first, depending on the course, the wind affects the UAV with different intensity along the orbit; second, in order to keep the gap, the follower should perform an orbit of smaller radius and at smaller velocity which makes the flight harder.

2) Mixed path: The mixed path is a combination of lines and orbits so that an 8-like shape is formed. We consider 1 leader with 4 followers, with desired gaps between leader and followers being (-2, -2,), (-4, -4), (-6,-6), (-8, -8) respectively. In order to evaluate the transient performance, we let the 4 followers start from different regions.

To conclude the SITL part, we report the results (in the presence of wind) of the wind-absence guidance [38] for a straight line (Figure 10), an orbit (Figure 11), and a mixed path (Figure 12), and of the unicycle guidance [45] for a



(b) Formation error, mixed path.

Figure 8: Proposed method: SITL experiment without wind, mixed path.

straight line (Figure 13), an orbit (Figure 14) and a mixed path (Figure 15). Comparisons show that the proposed method performs more than 36% better than [38] and more than 120% better than [45] (see also Table II). The proposed method performs better than the wind-absence method because the wind-absence method cannot not properly handle the effect of the wind on UAV air speed and heading angle: the fact that these quantities are different from ground speed and course angle creates some bias in the formation error. The proposed method performs better than the unicycle method because with the unicycle method the follower UAV tries to imitate the course of the leader independently from its gap. On the other hand, with the proposed method, the follower UAV tries first to reduce the gap when the gap is large and then it will aim at aligning its course to the leader when the gap is smaller.

### B. Hardware-In-The-Loop (HITL) Experiments

In the HITL environment, the code runs on PX4 hardware interfaced to the rest of the system as shown in Figure 16a.



(b) Formation error, mixed path.

Figure 9: Proposed method: SITL experiment with wind, mixed path.

X-plane provides the fixed-wing dynamics, and connects with the Pixhawk board by a serial port. The proposed method runs in ROS in a Raspberry pi 3B+. The WiFi module in the Raspberry pi 3B+ is used for communication between the leader and the followers. The HITL setting allows to check the compatibility of the implementation with the true hardware. Most importantly, HITL allows to test the algorithm in the presence of realistic communication time delays and packet losses, which will inevitable influence the algorithm results. Because X-plane only supports 1 UAV for each PC, we tested 2 UAVs at same time as shown in Figure 16b.

Similarly to the SITL scenario, we test a straight line path, an orbit path and a mixed path, all of them in the presence of wind. The results for the straight line are in Figure 17; the results for the orbit are in Figure 18; the results for the mixed path are in Figure 19. All the results are summarized in Table II: notice that all the results are steady-state formation errors, i.e. after removing the transient. The performance of the HITL degrades as compared to the corresponding SITL, which can be explained at least in two ways: first, the control



Figure 10: State-of-the-art method assuming absence of wind: experiments with wind, straight path.



Figure 11: State-of-the-art method assuming absence of wind: experiments with wind, orbit path.



Figure 12: State-of-the-art method assuming absence of wind: experiments with wind, mixed path.



Figure 13: State-of-the-art method assuming unicycle dynamics: experiments with wind, straight path.



Figure 14: State-of-the-art method assuming unicycle dynamics: SITL experiments with wind, orbit path.



Figure 15: State-of-the-art method assuming unicycle dynamics: experiments with wind, mixed path.



(a) Architecture of different modules.

(b) Hardware architecture

Figure 16: Setup for Hardware-In-The-Loop experiments, with PX4 as autopilot suite.

Table II: RMS formation error at steady-state (after convergence) under different scenarios. In the last line, the performance of three algorithms (proposed, absence, and unicycle) in SITL with wind are compared.

|               | Line path | Orbit path | Mixed path      |
|---------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|
|               | RMS error | RMS error  | RMS error       |
| SITL: no wind | 0.826m    | 3.295m     | 1.804m, 1.906m, |
| (proposed)    |           |            | 2.132m, 2.168m  |
| SITL: wind    | 1.889m    | 5.228m     | 4.973m, 4.833m, |
| (proposed)    |           |            | 5.750m, 6.701m  |
| HITL: wind    | 5.468m    | 6.191m     | 7.782m          |
| (proposed)    |           |            |                 |
| SITL: wind    | 2.562m    | 8.411m     | 7.884m          |
| (absence)     | (+36%)    | (+61%)     | (+63%)          |
| SITL: wind    | 6.278m    | 13.996m    | 11.009m         |
| (unicycle)    | (+232%)   | (+168%)    | (+121%)         |
| (unicycle)    | (+232%)   | (+168%)    | (+121%          |

Table III: RMS error comparison

frequency in HITL is 2Hz (in SITL it is 20Hz); second, time delays and packet losses become non-negligible in HITL. In fact, the USB, serial port, WiFi, and ROS node give a cumulative time delay which we have estimated to be between 20ms and 300ms. This is in line with results reported in the literature about ROS node operation [46], [47]. According to the leader air speed, these delays can result in 3-5m distance error [48], [49]. Therefore, the presented results provide a realistic validation of the proposed method. As a matter of fact, Table I shows that the errors of the proposed algorithm with HITL implementation are much smaller than the kinematicbased method with SITL implementation: this shows good performance even with high-latency communication.

### V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has proposed a vector field method to formation control of fixed-wing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, by means of a non-uniform vector field (the field can change in both magnitude and direction). Stability of the proposed method was analyzed. Validations have been carried out in softwarein-the-loop and hardware-in-the-loop comparative experiments using PX4 autopilot. It was shown that the proposed formation control law can work even with high-latency communication.

Future work goes along similar lines as the recent progress of the vector field method, e.g. tracking targets while achieving formation, handling more general curved paths, or tackling the inevitable uncertainty in the course dynamics.

### VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author would like to thank mr. Zobeer Mohammad for assistance on the kinematic algorithm, and for a preliminary investigation of this topic during his M.Sc. at TU Delft.

### APPENDIX

We consider the following candidate Lyapunov function:

$$W = \frac{1}{2}x_{\rm E}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho\tilde{V}_{\rm gf}^2 + \frac{1}{2}y_{\rm E}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}^2$$
(23)

where  $\tilde{V}_{\rm gf} = V_{\rm gf} - V_{\rm gf}^{\rm d}$  is the difference between the ground speed of the follower and its desired ground speed, while  $\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} = \chi_{\rm f} - \chi_{\rm f}^{\rm d}$  is the difference between the follower course and its desired course. In the following, we will analyze the proposed approach by splitting the Lyapunov function into two parts

$$W_y = \frac{1}{2}y_{\rm E}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}^2, \quad W_x = \frac{1}{2}x_{\rm E}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho\tilde{V}_{\rm gf}^2 \qquad (24)$$

where the first part refers to lateral dynamics, and the second part refers to longitudinal dynamics. The stability analysis is done inside the boundary layer of the saturation function. The analysis outside the boundary layer, can be easily done along similar lines as [34].

### A. Lateral error and course

We start by analyzing  $W_y$ : for this part, an approach similar to the analysis of the standard vector field can be adopted [34]. First, starting from (24), we calculate the time derivative

$$\begin{split} \hat{W}_{y} &= y_{\rm E} \dot{y}_{\rm E} + \rho \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} \tilde{\chi}_{f} \\ &= V_{\rm gf} y_{\rm E} \sin(\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} + \chi_{\rm f}^{\rm d} - \chi_{\rm l}) - \rho \frac{k}{\epsilon} \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}^{2} \\ &\leq -\rho \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}^{2} + V_{\rm gf} y_{\rm E} \sin(\hat{\chi}_{\rm f}^{\rm d}) \\ &+ V_{\rm gf} y_{\rm E} \sin(\hat{\chi}_{\rm f}^{\rm d} + \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}) - \sin(\hat{\chi}_{\rm f}^{\rm d}) \end{split}$$
(25)



Figure 17: HITL experiment with wind, straight path.



Figure 18: HITL experiment with wind, orbit path.



(a) Formation along mixed path.

(b) Formation error, mixed path.

Figure 19: HITL experiment with wind, mixed path.

where we have defined  $\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d} = \chi_{f}^{d} - \chi_{l}$  for compactness. The Case 2: On the other side, for  $y_{E} > \overline{y_{E}}$ , we have following inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sin(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d} + \tilde{\chi}_{f}) - \sin(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d})| \\ &= |\sin(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d})\cos(\tilde{\chi}_{f}) + \cos(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d})\sin(\tilde{\chi}_{f}) - \sin(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d})| \\ &= |\sin(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d})(\cos(\tilde{\chi}_{f}) - 1) + \cos(\hat{\chi}_{f}^{d})\sin(\tilde{\chi}_{f})| \\ &\leq |\cos(\tilde{\chi}_{f} - 1) + \sin(\tilde{\chi}_{f})| \leq 2|\tilde{\chi}_{f}|. \end{aligned}$$

The time derivative of  $W_y$  becomes

$$\begin{split} \dot{W}_{y} &\leq -\rho \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}^{2} + 2V_{\rm gf} \left| y_{\rm E} \right| \left| \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} \right| + V_{\rm gf} y_{\rm E} \sin(\chi_{\rm f}^{\rm d} - \chi_{\rm l}) \\ &= -\rho \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}^{2} + 2V_{\rm gf} \left| y_{\rm E} \right| \left| \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} \right| \\ &- V_{\rm gf} y_{\rm E} \sin(\chi_{\infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(ky_{\rm E}) - \frac{\pi}{2}). \end{split}$$
(26)

In order to have  $\dot{W}_y$  negative, we can distinguish two cases. The two cases are obtained by defining the function

$$\phi(y_{\rm E}) = y_{\rm E} \sin\left(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(ky_{\rm E}) - \frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$
 (27)

We note that  $\phi(y_{\rm E}) \rightarrow (2\chi_\infty k/\pi) y_{\rm E}^2$  for  $ky_{\rm E} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\phi(y_{\rm E}) \rightarrow (\sin \chi_{\infty}) y_{\rm E}$  for large value of  $k y_{\rm E}$ . Consider a new function defined as:

$$\varphi(y_{\rm E}) = \begin{cases} \frac{2\chi_{\infty}k}{\mu\pi}y_{\rm E}^2, & \text{if } |y_{\rm E}| \le \overline{y_{\rm E}} \\ \frac{2\chi_{\infty}k\overline{y_{\rm E}}}{\mu\pi}(2|y_{\rm E}| - \overline{y_{\rm E}}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(28)

Then we have to find  $\mu$  such that  $0 < \varphi(y_{\rm E}) \le \phi(y_{\rm E})$ . Since the functions are symmetric, we will restrict our attention to  $y_{\rm E} \geq 0$  and aim to show that  $\varphi(y_{\rm E}) \leq \phi(y_{\rm E})$ . Given this reasoning, the following two cases are defined

- Case 1:  $0 \le y_{\rm E} \le \overline{y_{\rm E}}$
- Case 2:  $y_{\rm E} > \overline{y_{\rm E}}$

which are analyzed in the following.

Case 1: For  $0 \le y_{\rm E} \le \overline{y_{\rm E}}$ , we have

$$\phi'(y_{\rm E}) = \sin\left(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}}{\pi}\tan^{-1}\left(ky_{\rm E}\right) - \frac{\pi}{2}\right) + \frac{2k\chi_{\infty}}{\pi}y_{\rm E}\left[\frac{\cos\left(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}\tan^{-1}\left(ky_{\rm E}\right)}{\pi}\right)}{1 + \left(ky_{\rm E}\right)^{2}}\right] \geq \frac{4\chi_{\infty}k}{\pi}y_{\rm E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\frac{\cos\left(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}\tan^{-1}\left(ky_{\rm E}\right)}{\pi}\right)}{1 + \left(ky_{\rm E}\right)^{2}}\right] \geq \frac{4\chi_{\infty}k}{\pi}y_{\rm E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\frac{\cos\left(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}\tan^{-1}\left(ky_{\rm E}\right)}{\pi}\right)}{1 + \left(k\overline{y_{\rm E}}\right)^{2}}\right] \geq \frac{4\chi_{\infty}k}{\pi}y_{\rm E} = \varphi'(y_{\rm E})$$

$$(29)$$

so if we select  $\mu$  such that

$$\mu \ge \frac{2(1 + (k\overline{y_{\rm E}})^2)}{\cos\left(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}}{\pi}\tan^{-1}\left(k\overline{y_{\rm E}}\right)\right)} \tag{30}$$

then  $\varphi'(y_{\rm E}) \leq \phi'(y_{\rm E})$ .

$$\phi(y_{\rm E}) = y_{\rm E} \sin(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(ky_{\rm E}))$$
  

$$\geq y_{\rm E} \sin(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k\overline{y_{\rm E}}))$$
(31)

This implies that  $\phi(y_{\rm E}) \ge \varphi(y_{\rm E})$  if:

$$u \ge \frac{4\chi_{\infty}k\overline{y_{\rm E}}}{\pi\sin(\frac{2\chi_{\infty}}{\pi}\tan^{-1}(k\overline{y_{\rm E}}))}.$$
(32)

So we obtain that  $\varphi(y_{\rm E}) \leq \phi(y_{\rm E})$  for both cases. Case 1: For  $|y_{\rm E}| \leq \overline{y_{\rm E}}$ , the time derivative is

$$\dot{W}_{y} \leq -V_{\rm gf} \left( |\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}| \quad |y_{\rm E}| \right) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\rho k}{\epsilon V_{\rm gf}} & -1\\ -1 & \frac{2\chi_{\infty} k}{\mu \pi} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\tilde{\chi}|\\ |y_{\rm E}| \end{pmatrix}$$
(33)

which is negative definite if the following holds:

$$\frac{\rho k 2 \chi_{\infty} \kappa}{\epsilon V_{\rm gf} \mu \pi} > 1 \tag{34}$$

Case 2: If  $|y_{\rm E}| \ge \overline{y_{\rm E}}$ , the fact that  $\varphi(y_{\rm E}) \le \phi(y_{\rm E})$  implies:

$$\dot{W}_{y} \leq -\frac{\rho\kappa}{\epsilon} \tilde{\chi}_{f}^{2} + 2V_{gf}|y_{E}||\tilde{\chi}_{f}| - V_{gf}\varphi(y_{E})$$
(35)

which is negative definite i.e.

$$\dot{W}_{y} \leq 2V_{\text{gf}}y_{\text{E}}\left(\epsilon - \frac{\chi_{\infty}k\overline{y_{\text{E}}}|y_{\text{E}}|}{\mu\pi}\right)$$
 (36)

when the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{\chi_{\infty}k\overline{y_{\rm E}}}{\mu\epsilon\pi} > 1 \tag{37}$$

The inequalities (34) and (37) (resulting in (22)) can both be satisfied with  $\epsilon$  small enough, i.e. selecting the boundary layer small enough.

### B. Longitudinal error and ground speed

The rest of the analysis can be performed using  $y_{\rm E},\, \tilde{\chi}_{\rm f} 
ightarrow$ 0 for the design described previously. Define the difference between the follower ground speed and the desired one:

$$\tilde{V}_{\rm gf} = V_{\rm gf} - V_{\rm gf}^{\rm d} = V_{\rm gf} - V_{\rm gl} - V_{\infty} \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(kx_{\rm E}).$$
(38)

This brings to the Lyapunov time derivative

$$\dot{W}_{x} = x_{\rm E} \dot{x}_{\rm E} + \rho \tilde{V}_{\rm gf} \tilde{V}_{\rm gf} = x_{\rm E} (V_{\rm gf} \sin(\chi_{\rm f} - \chi_{\rm l} - \frac{\pi}{2}) + V_{\rm gl}) + \rho \tilde{V}_{\rm gf} (\dot{V}_{\rm gf} - \dot{V}_{\rm gf}^{\rm d}).$$
(39)

Using the convergence property of  $\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}$ , we obtain

$$\dot{W}_x = x_{\rm E}(V_{\rm gl} - V_{\rm gf} + \delta_x) + \rho \tilde{V}_{\rm gf}(\dot{V}_{\rm gf} - \dot{V}_{\rm gf}^{\rm d}) \qquad (40)$$

Where  $\delta_x = V_{\rm gf} + V_{\rm gf} \sin(\chi_{\rm f} - \chi_{\rm l} - \frac{\pi}{2}) \rightarrow 0$  thanks to convergence of  $\tilde{\chi}_{\rm f}$ ,  $y_{\rm E}$  and can be neglected. We continue the analysis of the time derivative by substituting the dynamics of

 $V_{\rm gf}$  in (8) and expressions of  $V_{\rm gf}^{\rm c}$  in (19)

$$\dot{W}_{x} = x_{\rm E}(V_{\rm gl} - V_{\rm gf}) + \rho \tilde{V}_{gf}(\beta (V_{\rm gf}^{\rm c} - V_{\rm gf}) - \tilde{V}_{\rm gf}^{\rm d})$$

$$= x_{\rm E}(V_{\rm gl} - V_{\rm gf}) + \rho \tilde{V}_{gf}(\beta (\frac{1}{\rho\beta}x_{\rm E} - \frac{\kappa}{\beta\epsilon}\tilde{V}_{\rm gf}))$$

$$= -x_{\rm E}\tilde{V}_{\rm gf} + x_{\rm E}(V_{\rm gl} - V_{\rm gf}^{\rm d}) + \rho\beta \frac{1}{\rho\beta}x_{\rm E} - \rho \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon}\tilde{V}_{\rm gf}^{2}$$
(41)

$$= -V_{\infty} x_{\rm E} \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(k_x x_{\rm E}) - \rho \frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} \tilde{V}_{\rm gf}^2.$$

By noticing that  $x_{\rm E}$  and  $\tan^{-1}(k_x x_{\rm E})$  are both functions in the 1st and 3rd quadrant, it is straightforward to conclude that the time derivative is negative definite, resulting in asymptotic stability. This concludes the analysis.

### REFERENCES

- H. Huang, A. V. Savkin, and W. Ni, "Online UAV trajectory planning for covert video surveillance of mobile targets," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, pp. 1–12, 2021.
- [2] R. Rysdyk, "Unmanned aerial vehicle path following for target observation in wind," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 1092–1100, 2006.
- [3] J. Keller, D. Thakur, M. Likhachev, J. Gallier, and V. Kumar, "Coordinated path planning for fixed-wing UAS conducting persistent surveillance missions," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 17–24, 2017.
- [4] M. F. Bornebusch and T. A. Johansen, "Autonomous recovery of a fixedwing UAV using a line suspended between two multirotor UAVs," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 90–104, 2021.
- [5] P. Sujit, S. Saripalli, and J. B. Sousa, "Unmanned aerial vehicle path following: A survey and analysis of algorithms for fixed-wing unmanned aerial vehicless," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 42–59, 2014.
- [6] A. Atyabi, S. MahmoudZadeh, and S. Nefti-Meziani, "Current advancements on autonomous mission planning and management systems: An auv and uav perspective," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 46, pp. 196– 215, 2018.
- [7] T. Konrad, J.-J. Gehrt, J. Lin, R. Zweigel, and D. Abel, "Advanced state estimation for navigation of automated vehicles," *Annual Reviews* in Control, vol. 46, pp. 181–195, 2018.
- [8] D. Sikeridis, E. E. Tsiropoulou, M. Devetsikiotis, and S. Papavassiliou, "Wireless powered public safety iot: A uav-assisted adaptive-learning approach towards energy efficiency," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 123, pp. 69–79, 2018.
- [9] P. A. Apostolopoulos, G. Fragkos, E. E. Tsiropoulou, and S. Papavassiliou, "Data offloading in uav-assisted multi-access edge computing systems under resource uncertainty," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, pp. 1–1, 2021.
- [10] D. Nelson, D. Barber, T. McLain, and R. Beard, "Vector field path following for small unmanned air vehicles," in 2006 American Control Conference, 2006, pp. 7 pp.–.
- [11] H. Chen, K. Chang, and C. S. Agate, "UAV path planning with tangentplus-Lyapunov vector field guidance and obstacle avoidance," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 840–856, 2013.
- [12] S. Zhao, X. Wang, Z. Lin, D. Zhang, and L. Shen, "Integrating vector field approach and input-to-state stability curved path following for unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 2897–2904, 2020.
- [13] S. Fari, X. Wang, S. Roy, and S. Baldi, "Addressing unmodelled pathfollowing dynamics via adaptive vector field: a UAV test case," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 2019.
- [14] W. Yao, H. G. de Marina, B. Lin, and M. Cao, "Singularity-free guiding vector field for robot navigation," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- [15] H. G. de Marina, Z. Sun, M. Bronz, and G. Hattenberger, "Circular formation control of fixed-wing uavs with constant speeds," in 2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2017, pp. 5298–5303.

- [16] T. Z. Muslimov and R. A. Munasypov, "Consensus-based cooperative circular formation control strategy for multi-UAV system," in 2019 International Russian Automation Conference (RusAutoCon), 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [17] R. Singh and B. Bhushan, "Evolving intelligent system for trajectory tracking of unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, pp. 1–14, 2021.
- [18] J. Wang and M. Xin, "Integrated optimal formation control of multiple unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 1731–1744, 2013.
  [19] W. Lin, "Distributed UAV formation control using differential game
- [19] W. Lin, "Distributed UAV formation control using differential game approach," Aerospace Science and Technology, vol. 35, pp. 54–62, 2014.
- [20] O. Thakoor, J. Garg, and R. Nagi, "Multiagent uav routing: A game theory analysis with tight price of anarchy bounds," *IEEE Transactions* on Automation Science and Engineering, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 100–116, 2020.
- [21] Y. Liu, J. M. Montenbruck, D. Zelazo, M. Odelga, S. Rajappa, H. H. Bülthoff, F. Allgöwer, and A. Zell, "A distributed control approach to formation balancing and maneuvering of multiple multirotor UAVs," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 870–882, 2018.
- [22] J. Zhang, J. Yan, and P. Zhang, "Multi-UAV formation control based on a novel back-stepping approach," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 2437–2448, 2020.
- [23] Z. Zhen, G. Tao, Y. Xu, and G. Song, "Multivariable adaptive control based consensus flight control system for UAVs formation," *Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 93, p. 105336, 2019.
- [24] D. Yue, S. Baldi, J. Cao, Q. Li, and B. De Schutter, "A directed spanning tree adaptive control solution to time-varying formations," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, pp. 1–1, 2021.
- [25] Y. Zou and Z. Meng, "Coordinated trajectory tracking of multiple vertical take-off and landing UAVs," *Automatica*, vol. 99, pp. 33–40, 2019.
- [26] J. Wang, Z. Zhou, C. Wang, and Z. Ding, "Cascade structure predictive observer design for consensus control with applications to UAVs formation flying," *Automatica*, vol. 121, p. 109200, 2020.
- [27] D. R. Nelson, D. B. Barber, T. W. McLain, and R. W. Beard, "Vector field path following for miniature air vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 519–529, 2007.
- [28] X. Dong, B. Yu, Z. Shi, and Y. Zhong, "Time-varying formation control for unmanned aerial vehicles: Theories and applications," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 340– 348, 2015.
- [29] Y. Zou, Z. Zhou, X. Dong, and Z. Meng, "Distributed formation control for multiple vertical takeoff and landing UAVs with switching topologies," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1750–1761, 2018.
- [30] J. Wang, L. Han, X. Dong, Q. Li, and Z. Ren, "Distributed sliding mode control for time-varying formation tracking of multi-UAV system with a dynamic leader," *Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 111, p. 106549, 2021.
- [31] X. Dong, Y. Hua, Y. Zhou, Z. Ren, and Y. Zhong, "Theory and experiment on formation-containment control of multiple multirotor unmanned aerial vehicle systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 229–240, 2019.
- [32] S. Rathinam, R. Sengupta, and S. Darbha, "A resource allocation algorithm for multivehicle systems with nonholonomic constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 98–104, 2007.
- [33] J. Zhang, J. Yan, and P. Zhang, "Fixed-wing UAV formation control design with collision avoidance based on an improved artificial potential field," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 78342–78351, 2018.
- [34] R. W. Beard and T. W. McLain, Small Unmanned Aircraft: Theory and Practice. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [35] F. Liao, R. Teo, J. L. Wang, X. Dong, F. Lin, and K. Peng, "Distributed formation and reconfiguration control of VTOL UAVs," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 270–277, 2017.
- [36] Y. Wang, M. Shan, and D. Wang, "Motion capability analysis for multiple fixed-wing UAV formations with speed and heading rate constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 977–989, 2020.
- [37] T. Z. Muslimov and R. A. Munasypov, "Adaptive decentralized flocking control of multi-UAV circular formations based on vector fields and backstepping," *ISA Transactions*, vol. 107, pp. 143–159, 2020.
- [38] —, "Consensus-based cooperative control of parallel fixed-wing UAV formations via adaptive backstepping," *Aerospace Science and Technol*ogy, vol. 109, p. 106416, 2021.

- [39] P. Sujit, S. Saripalli, and J. B. Sousa, "Unmanned aerial vehicle path following: A survey and analysis of algorithms for fixed-wing unmanned aerial vehicless," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 42–59, 2014.
- [40] J. Gutmann, E. Eade, P. Fong, and M. E. Munich, "Vector field SLAM—localization by learning the spatial variation of continuous signals," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 650–667, 2012.
- [41] J. Kwon and D. Chwa, "Hierarchical formation control based on a vector field method for wheeled mobile robots," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1335–1345, 2012.
  [42] PX4, "Gazebo simulation," https://docs.px4.io/master/en/simulation/
- [42] PX4, "Gazebo simulation," https://docs.px4.io/master/en/simulation/ gazebo.html Accessed February, 2021.
- [43] —, "PX4-SITL\_gazebo, plane.sdf.jinja," https://github.com/PX4/PX4-SITL\_gazebo/blob/ e580bbcd1eb6902c658ed3ece3b3b28dfd57eb17/models/plane/plane. sdf.jinja Accessed February, 2021.
- [44] Gazebo, "Gazebo: Tutorials," http://gazebosim.org/tutorials Accessed February, 2021.
- [45] D. Kostić, S. Adinandra, J. Caarls, N. van de Wouw, and H. Nijmeijer, "Collision-free tracking control of unicycle mobile robots," in *Proceedings of the 48h IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2009, pp. 5667–5672.
- [46] D. Tardioli, R. Parasuraman, and P. Ögren, "Pound: a ros node for reducing delay and jitter in wireless multi-robot networks," arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.07540, 2017.
- [47] R. Bottura, D. Babazadeh, K. Zhu, A. Borghetti, L. Nordström, and C. A. Nucci, "SITL and HLA co-simulation platforms: Tools for analysis of the integrated ICT and electric power system," in *Eurocon 2013*, 2013, pp. 918–925.
- [48] J. N. Gross, Y. Gu, and M. B. Rhudy, "Robust UAV relative navigation with DGPS, INS, and Peer-to-Peer radio ranging," *IEEE Transactions* on Automation Science and Engineering, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 935–944, 2015.
- [49] L. Fusini, T. I. Fossen, and T. A. Johansen, "Nonlinear observers for GNSS- and camera-aided inertial navigation of a fixed-wing UAV," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1884– 1891, 2018.