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Abstract: Contrary to the classical (time-triggered) principle that calculates the control signal in a periodic fashion, an event-driven control is computed and updated only when a certain condition is satisfied. This notably enables to save computations in the control task while ensuring equivalent performance. In this paper, we develop and implement such strategies to control a nonlinear and unstable system, that is the inverted pendulum. We are first interested on the stabilization of the pendulum near its inverted position and propose an event-based control approach. This notably demonstrates the efficiency of the event-based scheme even in the case where the system has to be actively actuated to remain upright. We then study the swinging of the pendulum up to the desired position and propose a low-cost control law based on an energy function. The switch between both strategies is also analyzed. A real-time experimentation is realized and shows that a reduction of about 98% and 50% of samples less than the classical scheme is achieved for the swing up and stabilization parts respectively.
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the same final performance. Some stability and robustness properties are exploited in [14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. An alternative approach consists in taking events related to the variation of a Lyapunov function – and consequently to the state too – between the current state and its value at the last sampling, like in [19], or in taking events related to the time derivative of the Lyapunov function, like in [20, 21, 22]. In the latter reference in particular, the updates ensure the strict decrease of the Lyapunov function, and so is asymptotically stable the closed-loop system.

In this paper, we propose to develop event-based strategies to control an inverted pendulum, for both swinging up and stabilizing its arm. Such approaches have never been addressed in the literature. More particularly, an event-based scheme is especially designed for the swinging up part.

The rest of the document is organized as follows. In section 1., the model of the inverted pendulum is given and the event-based formulation is introduced. The problem is also stated and the proposed control algorithms for both swinging up the pendulum and stabilizing its arm are intuitively presented. The main contributions are detailed in section 2.: subsection 2.1. and subsection 2.2. deal with stabilization and swing up problems respectively, and the switch from the one to the other is treated in subsection 2.3.. Some experimental results are presented in section 3. to highlight the capabilities of the proposed approaches and some discussions finally conclude the paper.

1. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1. Model of the inverted pendulum

\[ I \ddot{\theta} + k \dot{\theta} - mg \sin(\theta) - ml \dot{\rho} \cos(\theta) = 0 \]  
(1)

and the equation of motion of the cart is

\[ (M + m) \ddot{\rho} + f \dot{\rho} - ml \dot{\theta} \cos(\theta) + ml \dot{\theta}^2 \sin(\theta) = \rho u \]  
(2)

where \( M \) is the mass of the cart, \( m \) is the mass of the pendulum and \( l \) is the distance from the pivot to the center of this mass, \( I = J + ml^2 \) where \( J \) is the moment of inertia with respect to the pivot point, \( g \) is the acceleration of gravity, \( f \) and \( k \) are the friction force and friction coefficient of the pendulum respectively, \( \theta \) is the angle between the vertical and the pendulum, where \( \theta \) is positive in the trigonometric direction and zero in the upright position, and \( u \) is a horizontal acceleration of the cart (the input), where \( u \) is positive if it is in the direction of the positive \( x \)-axis. Also, \( \rho \) is a parameter used to convert a voltage into a force applied on the cart. This model is notably based on assuming that the pendulum is a rigid body and there is no limitation on the velocity of the pivot. One could refer to [2] for further information.

Reformulating (1) and (2) gives the dynamics of the complete system

\[ \ddot{\theta} = \lambda_1(\theta) \left[ \kappa_1 \lambda_2(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\rho}, u) + l \cos(\theta) \lambda_3(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\rho}, u) + \kappa_2 \lambda_4(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\rho}, u) \right] \]  
(3)

with

\[ \lambda_1(\theta) := \frac{l}{M} \quad \lambda_2(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\rho}, u) := \frac{1}{\kappa_2 I - ml^2 \cos^2(\theta)} \]

\[ \lambda_3(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\rho}, u) := ml \sin(\theta) - k \theta \quad \lambda_4(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\rho}, u) := \rho u - f \dot{\rho} - ml \dot{\theta}^2 \sin(\theta) \]

which is a four-state system, whose states are the position of the cart \( \rho \) and the angle of the pendulum \( \theta \), as well as the velocity of the cart \( \dot{\rho} \) and the angular speed \( \dot{\theta} \). As a result, let

\[ x := \left[ \theta \quad \dot{\theta} \quad \rho \quad \dot{\rho} \right]^T \]

be the state vector of the system.

Linearized model

Let consider the linear time-invariant dynamical system

\[ \dot{x} = Ax + Bu \]  
(5)

Such a linearized state-space representation of the pendulum close to the equilibrium point can be obtained from (3). In fact, two equilibriums exist, that are when the pendulum is in its stable position (i.e. \( \theta = \pi \)) and when it is in the upright – and unstable – position (i.e. \( \theta = 0 \)). We consider the latter one. This yields the linearized matrices are defined by

\[ A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \kappa_2 mgl & -\kappa_2 k & 0 & -f \rho \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ mgl & -k \rho & 0 & -k_1 \rho \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \rho l \\ 0 \\ \rho \kappa_1 \rho \end{bmatrix} \]

with \( \kappa_3 := \kappa_2 I - ml^2 \)

This linearized model will be used in the sequel for the stabilizing part.
1.2. Event-based control

The model of the inverted pendulum (3) can be written as a nonlinear affine-in-control system

\[ \dot{x}(t) = \xi(x(t)) + \psi(x(t))u(t) \quad (7) \]

with \( x(0) = x_0 \)

where \( \xi \) and \( \psi \) are smooth functions and \( \xi \) vanishes at the origin, \( x \in \mathbb{R}^4 \) and \( u \in \mathbb{R} \) in this particular case.

**Definition 1.1** (Event-based feedback): By event-based feedback we mean a set of two functions, that are i) an event function \( \varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R} \) that indicates if one needs (when \( \varepsilon \leq 0 \)) or not (when \( \varepsilon > 0 \)) to recompose the control law, and ii) a feedback function \( \gamma : \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R} \).

The solution of (7) with event-based feedback \( (\varepsilon, \gamma) \) starting in \( x_0 \) at \( t = 0 \) is then defined as the solution (when it exists) of the differential system

\[ \dot{x}(t) = \xi(x(t)) + \psi(x(t))\gamma(x(t)) \quad \forall t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}] \quad (8) \]

where the time instants \( t_i \), with \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) (determined when the event function \( \varepsilon \) vanishes) are considered as events and

\[ x_i := x(t_i) \quad (9) \]

is the memory of the state value at the last event.

With this formalization, the control value is updated each time \( \varepsilon \) becomes negative. Usually, one tries to design an event-based feedback so that \( \varepsilon \) can not remain negative (and so is updated the control only punctually). In addition, one also wants that two events are separated with a non vanishing time interval avoiding the Zeno phenomenon. All these properties are encompassed with the Minimal inter-Sampling Interval (MSI) property introduced in [22].

**Property 1.2:** An event-driven feedback is said uniformly MSI if and only if there is some non zero minimal sampling interval for any initial condition \( x_0 \).

A uniformly MSI event-based control is a piecewise constant control with non zero sampling intervals. In the same paper [22], it is also proved that nonlinear systems affine in the control – like the one of the present study case in (7) – and admitting a Control Lyapunov Function (CLF) can be globally asymptotically stabilized by means of such an event-based feedback (this seminal result is derived from the Sontag’s universal formula in [23]). An linear version was also developed in [24].

1.3. Intuitive presentation of the proposed control algorithms

In this paper, event-based strategies are developed for the control of the inverted pendulum and experimentally tested, for both swinging it up and stabilizing its arm near the upright position. In particular, the seminal results in [22, 24] can be directly applied for the stabilization of the linearized expression (5)-(6) of the inverted pendulum (see subsection 2.1.). As briefly explained before, in these works the event function is related to a given control Lyapunov function whose control law renders the closed-loop system globally asymptotically stable. We then extend such a principle for the swing up control where an energy function is used in such a way the pendulum achieves the inverted position. This extension is easily obtained since a Lyapunov function is an energy function too. Based on that, an event-based scheme is especially designed for the swinging up part (see subsection 2.2.) and the resulting algorithm is really low cost since the control law is only updated once the pendulum changes its direction of rotation in its balancing. Finally, the switch from balancing to stabilizing is study (see subsection 2.3.) and show that the transition is stable by construction of both control techniques.

2. CONTROL OF THE INVERTED PENDULUM

2.1. Event-based stabilization near the upright position

Since we are interested here in the stabilization of the pendulum near its equilibrium position, the event-based feedback developed in [22] can be restricted to the stabilization of a linear system in this subsection. The adaptation of the previous work in such a particular case is trivial. Let consider the linear time-invariant dynamical system (5). A positive definite matrix \( P \) solution of the Riccati equation

\[ PA + A^TP - 4PBB^TP = -P \quad (10) \]

exists since \((A, B)\) is a stabilizable pair. Then

\[ V_1(x) := x^TPx \quad (11) \]

is a CFL for system (5) since for all \( x \neq 0 \), \( u = -2B^TPx \) renders \( V_1 \) strictly negative. It is then known that it is possible to design a feedback control that asymptotically stabilizes the system (5). The following theorem is a particular case of the event-based universal formula proposed in [22] for linear systems:

**Theorem 2.1** (Event-based stabilization of linear system): Taking the CLF \( V_1 \) in (11) for system (5), where \( P \) is a positive definite matrix solution of the Riccati equation (10), then the event-based feedback \( (\varepsilon_1, \gamma_1) \) defined by

\[ \gamma_1(x) := -2B^TPx \quad (12) \]

\[ \varepsilon_1(x, x_i) := (\sigma - 1)x^T(PA + A^TP)x - 4x^TPBB^TP(\sigma x - x_i) \quad (13) \]

where \( x_i \) is defined in (9) and \( \sigma \in [0, 1], \sigma > 0 \) are some tunable parameters, is uniformly MSI and asymptotically stable.

**Proof:** The proof was given in [22] for nonlinear affine in the control systems. The particular case of linear systems is hence trivial. \( \square \)
The idea behind the construction of the event function (13) is to compare the time derivative of the Lyapunov function (10) in the event-based case, that is applying \( x(t_i) \) in the feedback control law, like in (12), and ii) in the classical case, that is applying \( x(t) \) instead of \( x(t_i) \). The event function is the weighted difference between both, where \( \sigma \) is the weighted value. By construction, an event is enforced when the event function vanishes to zero, that is hence when the stability of the event-based scheme does not behave as the one in the classical case. One can refer to [22] for further details. The control parameters impact is

- \( \sigma \) changes the frequency of events: the smaller \( \sigma \) is, faster is the convergence but more frequent are events in return;
- \( \varepsilon \) changes how fast is the control signal: the larger \( \varepsilon \) is, larger is the control signal and smaller is the output of the controlled system (this parameter was identified as an event-based LQR parameter in [24]).

Finally, this theorem can be directly applied for the stabilization of the inverted pendulum near its upright position using its linearized state-space representation (5)-(6). Indeed, choosing a positive definite matrix \( P \) satisfying (10) for \( A \) and \( B \) defined in (6) and applying the feedback control given in (12)-(13) will render the inverted pendulum stable near its upright position. This theorem can be directly applied for the stabilization of the inverted pendulum near its upright position, as proved in [2].

2.2. Event-based swing up by energy control

Whereas the previous subsection details the stabilization of the inverted pendulum near its upright position, another control strategy is before required in order to swing the pendulum up to this equilibrium. This was notably presented in [2] – using an energy function – for the classical (time-triggered) case that we propose to adapt here as an event-based strategy.

Classical strategy

Let us consider here only the equation of motion of the pendulum (1) where the friction forces are neglected. This leads

\[
I \ddot{\theta} - mgl \sin(\theta) - ml \dot{v} \cos(\theta) = 0
\]

where \( v := \dot{p} \) is a horizontal acceleration of the pivot (the input in this particular case). Note that \( v \) is positive if it is in the direction of the positive x-axis. The uncontrolled pendulum state space can be represented as a cylinder (since the origin of the system is assumed to be fixed, because \( v = 0 \), and the pendulum of the study can only move in two dimensions). In this case, the system has two equilibria corresponding to \( \theta = \pi, \dot{\theta} = 0 \) (stable position) and \( \theta = 0, \dot{\theta} = 0 \) (unstable position). The energy of the uncontrolled pendulum is

\[
E(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} I \dot{\theta}^2 + mgl(\cos(\theta) - 1)
\]

which is hence defined to be zero when the pendulum is stationary in the upright position. One way to swing the pendulum up to this upward position then consists in giving it an energy that corresponds to the upright position. However, this cannot be done in one swing due to limitation of the actuator. Actually, to perform energy control it is necessary to understand how the energy is influenced by the acceleration of the pivot. Computing the derivative of \( E \) with respect to time, and substituting \( \dot{\theta} \) from (14), we find

\[
E = I \ddot{\theta} - mgl \dot{\theta} \sin(\theta) = ml \dot{v} \theta \cos(\theta).
\]

Controlling the energy is easy since the system is a simple integrator with varying gain, however the controllability is lost when the right-hand side of (16) vanishes. This occurs for \( \theta = \pm \pi/2 \) or \( \dot{\theta} = 0 \), that is when the pendulum is horizontal or when it reverses its velocity. Also, to increase energy the acceleration of the pivot \( v \) should be positive when the quantity \( \dot{\theta} \cos(\theta) \) is positive, and inversely. A control strategy can be found using the Lyapunov method, as proved in [2].

Theorem 2.2 (Swing up a pendulum by energy control): Taking the Lyapunov function

\[
V_2(\theta, \dot{\theta}) := \frac{1}{2} (E(\theta, \dot{\theta}) - \varepsilon)^2
\]

for system (14), where \( E \) is defined in (15) and \( \varepsilon \) is a given (desired) energy value, then the control law

\[
v = -\alpha (E - \varepsilon) \dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)
\]

with \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \)

where \( \alpha \) is a tunable parameter, drives the energy towards its desired value \( \varepsilon \).

Proof: Substituting (18) in (16), and substituting this result in the derivative of the Lyapunov function (17) with respect to time gives

\[
V_2 = \dot{E} (E - \varepsilon) = -\alpha ml \left( (E - \varepsilon) \dot{\theta} \cos(\theta) \right)^2
\]

The Lyapunov function (17) hence decreases as long as \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( \cos(\theta) \neq 0 \). Moreover, since the pendulum cannot maintain a stationary position with \( \theta = \pm \pi/2 \) then the control law \( v \) drives the energy towards \( \varepsilon \).

One could note that once the energy of the pendulum is close “enough” to the desired value \( \varepsilon \), the control switch to the strategy depicted in subsection 2.1. in order to stabilize the inverted pendulum near the upright position. This will be discussed in subsection 2.3.. Nevertheless, the value of \( \varepsilon \) can be defined by the designer from (15) for a given angle and rate of change of the angle, afterwards denoted \( \theta_{e} \) and \( \dot{\theta}_{e} \).
Event-based proposal

In this paper we propose to adapt the classical control strategy in order to prove that the pendulum can swing up to its upright position when applying an event-based feedback. As explained in subsection 2.1., an event-based strategy means to keep constant the control signal between two events, as follows

\[ v = \gamma_2(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \quad \forall t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}] \]  
\[ \theta_i := \theta(t_i) \]  
\[ \dot{\theta}_i := \dot{\theta}(t_i) \]  

making the analogy with the principle detailed in (9), and \( \gamma_2 \) is the feedback function defined next.

Let analyze in detail how varies the Lyapunov function (17) used to swing the pendulum up to its inverted position. As already explained in the proof of Theorem 2.2, the Lyapunov function decreases as long as \( \dot{\theta} \neq 0 \) and \( \cos(\theta) \neq 0 \). Therefore, why not to enforce events when these conditions are met (since one does not really need to update the control law while one of these two conditions is achieved). This is the main idea of our proposal. Making the assumption that only the one or the other changes at a given time, an event can hence be simply detected when changes the function

\[ \text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)) \]  
\[ \text{sgn}(z) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } z = 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } z < 0 \end{cases} \]  

Based on this idea and on Theorem 2.1, we propose the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.3** (Event-based swing up of the inverted pendulum): Making the assumption that only \( \dot{\theta} \) or \( \cos(\theta) \) changes at a given time and taking the Lyapunov function \( V_2 \) in (17) for system (14), where \( E \) in (15) describes the energy of the system, then the event-based feedback \( (\varepsilon_2, \gamma_2) \) defined by

\[ \gamma_2(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\theta}) := -\alpha(E - \varepsilon) \ \text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)) \]  
\[ \varepsilon_2(\dot{\theta}, \dot{\theta}, \varepsilon_2, \gamma_2) := |\text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)) - \text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta))| \]  

where \( \dot{\theta}_i, \theta_i, \) and \( \alpha \) are defined in (21) and (18) respectively, is uniformly MSI and drives the energy towards its desired value \( \varepsilon \).

**Proof:** The proof for the energy driving is trivial and based on proof of Theorem 2.2. Substituting (23) in (16) and then in the time derivative of the Lyapunov function (17) gives

\[ \dot{V}_2 = -\alpha \left( E - \varepsilon \right) \dot{\theta} \cos(\theta) \left( E_i - \varepsilon \right) \text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)) \]  

where \( E_i := E(\theta_i, \dot{\theta}_i) \). The Lyapunov function (17) decreases as long as \( \dot{\theta} \neq 0, \cos(\theta) \neq 0, \text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)) = \text{sgn}(\dot{\theta} \cos(\theta)) \) and \( \text{sgn}(E - \varepsilon) = \text{sgn}(E_i - \varepsilon) \). As before, the pendulum cannot maintain a horizontal position, which solves the problem for the two first conditions. Also, the problem of the third one is solved thanks to the event function \( \varepsilon_2 \) since an event is enforced when it occurs. As regards the latter one, \( E - \varepsilon < 0 \) could only occur when the energy is towards the upright position (if \( \varepsilon \) was defined with respect to the switching condition, this is discussed later in subsection 2.3.), and so is switched the control strategy for the stabilization of the pendulum. As a consequence, the event-based feedback proposed in (23)-(24) drives the energy towards its desired value \( \varepsilon \).

As regards the uniformly MSI property of the event-based feedback (23)-(24), one knows that an event is enforced when the pendulum reverses its velocity by construction and, consequently, two events cannot successively occur due to inertia. This ends the proof.

Finally, note that the event-based swing up control strategies can also be easily adapted to take into account the maximum acceleration of the pivot, as detailed in [2] for the classical scheme.

2.3. Switch from balancing to stabilizing

In previous subsections, we detailed how to i) swing the inverted pendulum up to its upright position and then ii) stabilize it near this unstable position. The switch between both is done when the angle is in a given region, which can be summarized by

\[ (\varepsilon, \gamma) = \begin{cases} (\varepsilon_1, \gamma) & \text{if } |\theta| \leq \Theta \\ (\varepsilon_2, \gamma_2) & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases} \]  

where \( \Theta \) is a tunable parameter. Actually, its value as to be defined with respect to the value of \( \theta_e \) used to define the energy to achieve during the swing up strategy, i.e. \( \varepsilon \) obtained by (15) for a given \( \theta_e \) and \( \dot{\theta}_e \). Such a solution is to choose \( \dot{\theta}_e = 0 \) and \( \theta_e \) as the desired angle for switching. However, the switch could not occur when \( \Theta = \theta_e \), due to frictions and some other perturbations. Also, if \( \Theta \) is lower than \( \theta_e \) then the balancing will not swing the pendulum up to this angle and so never will occur the switch. As a result, \( \Theta \) has to be higher than and close “enough” to \( \theta_e \), since with a high \( \Theta \) the strategy would switch whereas the rate of the angle of the pendulum is still important.

In order to facilitate the switch between balancing and stabilizing strategies, the designer has to guarantee that the rate of change of the angle is small enough and so is kept the pendulum in this region when using the stabilizing control strategy. In other words, whereas stabilizing feedback control proposed in (12)-(13) renders the time derivative of the Lyapunov function (11) strictly negative – and so is decreasing the energy of the whole system – it is also ensured the decrease of the pendulum only?
Let define

\[ x_\theta := [\theta \ \dot{\theta}]^T \quad \text{and} \quad x_p := [p \ \dot{p}]^T \]  

(27)

Using this notation, the linearized system of the inverted pendulum becomes (when neglecting the friction forces)

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} x_\theta \\ x_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ A_3 & A_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_\theta \\ x_p \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} w
\]  

(28)

with \( A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ a_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \), \( A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \), \( A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a_3 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \)

and \( B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ b_1 \end{bmatrix} \), \( B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix} \)

where \( w \) is the new control input and \( a_i, b_i > 0 \) can be found back from (5)-(6).

**Theorem 2.4** (Stability of the switch from event-based balancing to event-based stabilizing): Taking the Lyapunov function

\[ V_3(x_\theta, x_p) := x_\theta^T P_0 x_\theta + x_p^T P_p x_p \]  

(29)

for the linearized system (28), where \( x_\theta \) and \( x_p \) are defined in (27), where \( P_0 \) and \( P_p \) are some positive definite matrices solution of the Riccati equations defined as follows

\[
P_0 A_1 + A_1^T P_0 - 4P_0 B_1 B_1^T P_0 = -P_0
\]

\[
P_p A_2 + A_2^T P_p - 4P_p B_2 B_2^T P_p = -P_p
\]  

(30)

and taking the control law defined by

\[ w := -\frac{a_3}{b_2} \theta + u \]  

(31)

where the control law for \( u \) is given in (12), then the switch from event-based balancing defined in Theorem 2.3 to event-based stabilizing defined in Theorem 2.1, using the switching condition (26), is stable.

**Proof**: The derivative of the Lyapunov function (29) with respect to time is

\[
V_3 = x_\theta^T P_0 \left( A_1 x_\theta + B_1 w \right) + x_p^T P_p \left( A_2 x_p + A_3 x_\theta + B_2 w \right)
\]

Substituting (31) yields

\[
V_3 = x_\theta^T P_0 \left( A_1 - \frac{b_1}{b_2} A_3 \right) x_\theta + B_1 u
\]

\[
+ x_p^T P_p \left( A_2 x_p + B_2 u \right)
\]  

(32)

This means that the decrease of \( V_3 \) implies the decrease of the energy of the pendulum. Also, the stability of the event-based feedback (12)-(13) using (31) for system (28) is still ensured. \( \square \)

The principle intuitively remains true taking into account the friction forces \( f \) and \( k \) since they can only slow down the motion of the pendulum. Furthermore, one could note that the only condition to ensure the stability of the switch in Theorem 2.4 consists in taking the Lyapunov function in (11) as defined by

\[
P := \begin{bmatrix} P_0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_p \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(33)

This condition benefits by doing more simple the computing – reducing by four the number of products in the Lyapunov function – and, consequently, the event function (13). The one for balancing in (23) requires small computing too. As a consequence, the whole event-based proposal can be said low cost.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this last section, we implement and test our proposal on a practical inverted pendulum, depicted in Fig. 2. The system runs in real-time in the Matlab/Simulink environment. As already explained, two steps are required: **i)** a first controller swings the pendulum up to its upright position (the control strategy is based on an energy function, as explained in section 2.2.) and then, **ii)** another strategy stabilizes the pendulum near this unstable equilibrium (state-feedback control, see section 2.1.). Actually, the complete identification of the system and the classical (time-triggered) control strategies were already done for the present inverted pendulum study case (one could refer to [25] for further details). The different parameters of the model are \( M = 2.57kg \), \( m = 1.47kg \), \( l = 0.028m \),

![Fig 2: Inverted pendulum system used for the experiments](image-url)
An important reduction of the number of samples is achieved (about 98% less) with similar performance since the cart achieves a given position \( (p = 0) \) in almost the same time. Moreover, whereas the control is kept constant during two events (which can be several times the time-triggered sampling period) – like at time 46.5 s – an unstable system can be stabilized anyway.

Switch

The switch between balancing and stabilization is done for \( \Theta = 0.2 \text{rad} \). It can be seen in Fig. 4 at about 18 s when the angle arises about \( 2\pi \) and so changes the control strategies.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

The main contribution of this paper is to propose event-based control strategies for a highly nonlinear and unstable system, that is the inverted pendulum. The principle consists in only updating the control signal when required from a stability point of view. Some strategies were thus presented to control both the swing of the pendulum up to its upright position and its stabilization near this unstable equilibrium. The first setup is based on an energy function which allows to drive the pendulum towards the upright position, the second is an event-based state feedback whose event function is built from a Lyapunov function. The switch between both strategies is also studied. The proposals are tested on a real-time testbed, where the number of samples is clearly reduced (about 98% and 50% less than in the classical scheme when respectively swinging and stabilizing the pendulum) with similar final performance. As a result, the encouraging results strongly confirm the interest for developing event-based control strategies. Next step is to develop nonlinear event-based control strategies in the spirit of [22].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been performed while S. Durand was Ph.D. fellow in the joint NeCS Team, INRIA/GIPSA-lab, and making an internship in the Autonomous University of Puebla (BUAP), Puebla, Mexico. It has received partial funding from the “Explorator Program” from INRIA, which invites young researchers to explore other research teams to develop collaborations. It has been conducted in cooperation with the Faculty of Electronics and the Faculty of Physics and Mathematics of the BUAP.

REFERENCES

Fig 3: Swing up and stabilization of the inverted pendulum using some time-triggered control laws.

Fig 4: Swing up and stabilization of the inverted pendulum using the event-based proposals.
Fig 5: Zooms of the event-based proposals.


