

Communications and Control Engineering

Series editors

Alberto Isidori, Roma, Italy

Jan H. van Schuppen, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Eduardo D. Sontag, Piscataway, USA

Miroslav Krstic, La Jolla, USA

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/61>

Bernard Brogliato

Nonsmooth Mechanics

Models, Dynamics and Control

Third Edition

 Springer

Bernard Brogliato
INRIA Rhône-Alpes
Saint-Ismier
France

ISSN 0178-5354 ISSN 2197-7119 (electronic)
Communications and Control Engineering
ISBN 978-3-319-28662-4 ISBN 978-3-319-28664-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-28664-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015959938

Mathematics Subject Classification: 70Q05, 70E18, 70E50, 70E55, 70E60, 70H30, 70H14, 93C10, 49J53, 93D05

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 1996, 1999, 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by SpringerNature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

*The original version of the book was revised:
For detailed information please see erratum.
The erratum to this chapter is available at
[10.1007/978-3-319-28664-8_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28664-8_9).*

To my son and my wife

Preface

Thank you for opening the third edition of this monograph. The first edition [202] was published in 1996 in the Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences series (vol. 220), and the second edition [203] in 1999 in the Communications and Control Engineering series, both at Springer Verlag London. The third edition, written almost 20 years after the first one, is a significantly revised and updated version. Indeed Nonsmooth Mechanics has witnessed intense research during the last two decades, in the fields of Applied Mathematics (existence and uniqueness of solutions, contact complementarity problem well-posedness, numerical analysis, bifurcation analysis), Mechanics (impact modeling, Painlevé paradoxes analysis), Systems and Control (regulation and trajectory tracking), Granular Matter, Robotics, etc. Software packages dedicated to nonsmooth mechanical systems also appeared here and there. It was therefore needed to report about all these novelties.

This book is devoted to the study of a class of nonsmooth dynamical systems of the general form:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = g(x(t), u) \\ f(x, t) \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the system's state vector, $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the vector of inputs, and the function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ represents a set of m_u unilateral constraints which are imposed on the system. More precisely, the main topic is a subclass of such systems, namely mechanical systems subject to unilateral and bilateral constraints on the position (with or without friction), whose dynamical equations may be in a first instance written as:

$$\begin{cases} M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t) + F(q(t), \dot{q}(t), t, \lambda(t)) = 0 \\ f(q(t), t) \geq 0, \lambda_u(t) \geq 0, \lambda_u(t)^T f(q(t), t) = 0 \\ h(q(t), t) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $q(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of generalized coordinates of the system. The inertia matrix $M(q)$ will be assumed to be always symmetric, but not necessarily full rank (it may be positive semi-definite). The system may be constrained by a set of m_b bilateral constraints $h(q, t) = 0$ (this is the most common case in multibody dynamics). The vector function $f(q, t)$ represents a signed distance between the system and some environment, or more simply a condition for non-penetration between the bodies that constitute the system. The *contact forces* are represented through a *Lagrange multiplier* vector λ , which is split into λ_b for bilateral constraints, and λ_u for unilateral constraints. The multiplier λ_u satisfies a specific set of conditions with the distance function: they have to be both nonnegative (excluding penetrations between the bodies, as well as gluing effects, i.e., only nontensile contact interactions are modeled), and they have to be orthogonal one to each other (excluding distance effects like magnetic forces). These conditions are called *complementarity constraints*, and we will write them more compactly as:

$$0 \leq f(q, t) \perp \lambda_u \geq 0, \quad (3)$$

where inequalities are understood componentwise, so that we may equivalently write $0 \leq f_i(q, t) \perp \lambda_{u,i} \geq 0$ for each i . Complementarity is an ubiquitous concept all through this book. Mechanical systems composed of rigid bodies interacting with each other, fall into this subclass of systems, and may be named *nonsmooth multibody systems*. One particular feature of systems as in (2) is that they are of variable structure, or changing topology, because their dimension may vary due to complementarity constraints (from a certain point of view, this is similar to sliding mode controlled systems where attractive sliding surfaces make the system's dimension decrease or increase, and is met when Coulomb's friction or another tangent forces model imposes sticking modes).

Another feature of systems as in (1) and (2) is that their solutions are nonsmooth (with respect to time): nonsmoothness arises primarily from the occurrence of *impacts* (or *collisions*, or *percussions*) in the dynamical behavior, when the trajectories attain the surface $f(q, t) = 0$. They create velocity discontinuities, and are necessary to keep the trajectories within the subspace $\Phi(t) = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^n | f(q, t) \geq 0\}$ of the system's state space (or configuration space if one adopts a more geometrical point of view). Nonsmoothness may also be due to frictional effects, like when Coulomb's friction model is adopted: then the acceleration may suffer from discontinuities. It is therefore necessary, when dealing with such classes of dynamical systems, to focus on collision dynamics, with or without friction. But this is not sufficient: indeed, another important feature of systems as in (2) is their *hybridness*, where the word hybrid means that both continuous and discrete-event-like dynamics are mixed. Roughly speaking, the continuous dynamics are due to the vector field in (2), whereas the modes correspond to the algebraic constraints ($f(q, t)$ in (2) may be a vector) that may be active or inactive. Without going into further details at this stage (it is the goal of this monograph to provide a complete

tour of such nonsmooth systems), let us already notice that the dynamics will generally be composed of ODEs, DAEs, MDEs¹ and finite automata. The particular feature of nonsmooth systems is that the automaton dynamics is ruled by the complementarity conditions. This renders their analysis so exciting, because it relies on complementarity theory, convex analysis, nonsmooth analysis, and variational inequalities. Actually, notice that nonsmooth models similar as the ones we shall describe here overstep the framework of mechanical systems, since they also apply for instance to electrical circuits [10].

What follows in this paragraph is a not an introduction to the history of nonsmooth phenomena study in mechanics. It only aims at briefly recalling some celebrated names who have been involved one way or another in this topic. The interested (French speaking) readers may have a look at [366, 1050, 1307] for a more complete exposition of history of mechanics. It is worth noting that the problems related to impact dynamics have attracted the interest of physicists for at least three centuries (much more if one includes the studies of ancient Greek engineers and mathematicians like Aristotle and Heron). In the “modern” times, a strong interest about shock phenomena was motivated by the well-known contest organized by the Royal Society of London in 1668. The impact physical laws were in particular discussed, studied, and used initially by scientists like² R. Descartes (F, 1596–1650), G. Leibniz (D, 1646–1716), I. Newton (UK, 1642–1727) [246, 925], Jacob Bernoulli [135] (CH, 1654–1705) [519], Jean le Rond d’Alembert (F, 1717–1783) [320] S.D. Poisson (F., 1781–1840) [1008], Ch. Huygens (NL, 1629–1695) [566], G. Coriolis (F., 1792–1843) [301, 302], J. Wallis (UK, 1616–1703), Ch. Wren (UK, 1632–1723), E. Mariotte (F, 1620–1684), L. Carnot (F, 1753–1823), H. Navier (F, 1785–1836) [920], MacLaurin (Scotland, 1698–1746) [920], the well-known Newton’s and Poisson’s restitution coefficients being still well alive as basic models for rigid bodies collisions. Shock processes were also widely used in the debates between Leibnizians and Newtonians or Cartesians [434, 571, 572], in their controversies about the definition of forces. The first book entirely dedicated to shock theory has been published by Edme Mariotte (F, 1620–1684) intitled *Traité de la Percussion ou Choc des Corps dans Lequel les Principales Règles du Mouvement, Contraires à celles que M. Descartes et quelques Autres Modernes ont Voulu Etablir, sont démontrées par leurs Véritables Causes* in 1673. He was inspired by Wallis, Huygens, and Wren.³ Huygens wrote in *Projet Inachevé d’un Préface pour un Traité sur le Choc des Corps et la Force Centrifuge* (1689) that he was irritated by Mariotte and accused him of plagiarism:

¹Measure Differential Equations.

²In reality, it seems that the first “published” works on impact dynamics have been those of Thomas Hariot (around 1610–1620) [640] and the Dutch scientist Beeckman (around November–December 1618) who, contrarily to Descartes whose ideas on impact dynamics were almost all false, proposed theories that were not so incoherent when replaced in the early seventeenth century context [640, 1230].

³In *Mariotte, savant et philosophe (1684): analyse d’une renommée*, Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, Paris, 1986.

“Mariotte a tout pris de moy... Je le luy dis un jour et il ne su que respondre.” (Mariotte took everything from me... I told him once and he was not able to answer).

Later G. Darboux (F, 1842–1917) [326, 327], E.J. Routh (UK, 1831–1907) [1049], P. Appell (F, 1855–1930) [54], J.W. Gibbs (USA, 1839–1903) [446], A.M. Lyapunov (Ru, 1857–1918) [776], L. Poinsoot (F, 1777–1859) [1006, 1007], and others [765, 904, 1265] worked on impact dynamics.⁴ Although this fact has been a little forgotten now, rigid body (or more exactly particles) shock dynamics were extensively used in the seventeenth century to study light models [566] and also by artillerists [798] to predict the flight of cannon balls and their impacts. As we pointed out above, much of this scientific excitement was due to the will of the Royal Society of London whose scientists wanted to settle a coherent theory of motion.

Nonsmooth Mechanics belongs to Solid Mechanics. However, several other scientific communities have strong interests in this field. Applied Mathematicians, for problems related to existence and uniqueness of solutions, analysis of complex dynamics of certain impacting systems like billiards,⁵ bifurcation analysis, researchers from Mechanical and Civil Engineering, as well as Physicists (the study of granular matter—sandpiles, gravels, planetary rings—has become a very important field that involves these three scientific communities), Robotics (to study the effect of impacts in the joints or the motion of the system after the impact, like in robot manipulators, bipeds, juggling or hopping robots, multifingered hands, ...), Electromechanics (electromechanical contacts are a major source of failures in many systems like automotives, aircraft, machine tools, consumer electronics, and therefore motivate the study of accurate models for simulation and design purposes), Computer Sciences (graphics, virtual reality) are scientific communities interested in nonsmooth multibody dynamical systems. These models are also used in Chemistry and Biology [285, 647, 1135, 1260, 1273], in Sports Dynamics for the analysis of tennis ball/racket or golf ball/club dynamics [55, 200, 201, 311, 597, 1113], and in Ecology for forest fire modeling [264, 339, 786].

I would like to end this introduction by mentioning two papers that have been, in my opinion, the most important ones in the field of “modern” nonsmooth mechanics:

G. Darboux, 1880 “Etude géométrique sur les percussions et le choc des corps,” *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques et Astronomiques*, deuxième série, tome 4, pp. 126–160 and J.J. Moreau, 1988 “Unilateral contact and dry friction in finite freedom dynamics”, in J.J. Moreau, P.D. Panagiotopoulos, (Eds.), *Nonsmooth Mechanics and Applications*, CISM Courses and Lectures no 302, International Centre for Mechanical Sciences, Springer-Verlag, pp. 1–82.

⁴It is worth recalling that so many great scientists found an interest in impact dynamics. Indeed most of them are not known for their contributions in this field.

⁵In the literature, it seems that the word *vibro-impact systems* is used in the mechanical engineering field to name various types of systems that involve percussions. The word *billiards* refers to theoretical models of particles colliding in a closed domain, and is used mainly in mathematical physics.

The paper by the Mathematician Gaston Darboux (1842–1917) proposes a way to model the shock process and analytical developments that have been, and are still widely used in impact mechanics, more than one century later. The paper by Jean Jacques Moreau (1923–2014), who is one of the founders of Convex Analysis⁶ together with R.T. Rockafellar,⁷ settles a general framework for the modeling of mechanical systems with unilateral constraints, based on convex analysis tools. It has motivated subsequent works on both the mathematical (well-posedness) and the numerical simulation sides (in particular concerning granular matter), which have considerable importance in this field.

This choice (both are French...) only reflects my own opinion. Finally, readers who want to learn more about frictionless multiple impact models should have a look at [929], and those who desire to learn about the numerical analysis and simulation of nonsmooth mechanical systems may read [13].

This book deals a lot with *modeling*. Let me quote the following:

Remember that all models are wrong; the practical question is how wrong do they have to be to not be useful. (in G.E.P. Box and N.R. Draper, *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces*, 1987).

A deep (not superficial) understanding of engineering and physics is required to develop useful mathematical and computational models; the importance of models and their limitations is often given insufficient attention by control researchers. (N.H. McClamroch, *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, October 2014).

The way a scientist may describe contact laws depends on his research area, and on the results he desires. [614]

Some authors, arguing that instantaneous forces do not exist, prefer not to use the notion of percussion and subsequent theory that determine their effects. There does not exist neither points nor straight lines in nature. Nevertheless we find such abstract objects useful and interesting. Certainly when passing to applications one has to quantify the errors that one may make by applying theorems derived from pure Science. But this problem is independent of the development of Science itself. [327]

Acknowledgments

This book is the result of more than 20 years of research in the area of nonsmooth mechanical systems. It would not have been possible without fruitful exchanges with the following colleagues and students, whom I warmly thank (hopefully no one is forgotten...): M. Abadie, V. Acary, S. Adly, M. di Bernardo, F. Bertails-Descoubes, A. Blumentals, J.M. Bourgeot, R.M. Brach, C. Georgescu,

⁶A Mechanician capable of doing Mathematics without any accent, according to his own words.

⁷R.T. Rockafellar developed Convex Analysis with Mathematical Programming motivations, while J.J. Moreau did it with Nonsmooth Mechanics objectives in mind.

F. Génot, C. Glocker, D. Goeleven, M. Heemels, O. Huber, Y. Hurmuzlu, G. James, R. Kikuuwe, C. Lamarque, B.K. Le, R.I. Leine, C. Liu, M. Mata Jimenez, M. Monteiro-Marques, C.I. Morarescu, N.S. Nguyen, S.I. Niculescu, L. Paoli, C. Prieur, M. Schatzman, A. Tanwani, L. Thibault, A. Vieira, A. Zavala-Rio, H. Zhang, Z. Zhao.

Contents

1	Impulsive Dynamics and Measure Differential Equations	1
1.1	Impulsive Forces	1
1.2	Measure Differential Equations (MDEs)	7
1.2.1	A First Class of MDEs	8
1.2.2	A Second Class of MDEs: ODEs Driven by Measure Inputs	11
1.2.3	Further Reading	15
1.2.4	A Third Class of MDEs: ODEs with State Jump Mappings	16
1.2.5	Further Reading	18
1.3	Systems Subject to Unilateral Constraints	19
1.3.1	General Considerations	19
1.3.2	Flows with Collisions (Vibro-Impact Systems)	26
1.3.3	Unilaterally Constrained Systems: A Geometric Approach	34
1.3.4	Bilaterally Constrained Mechanical Systems and Impulsive Dynamics	38
1.4	Changes of Coordinates in MDEs	39
1.4.1	From Measure to Carathéodory Systems	39
1.4.2	Decoupling of the Impulsive Effects (Commutativity Conditions)	42
1.4.3	From Unilaterally Constrained Mechanical Systems to Filippov's Differential Inclusions: the Zhuravlev–Ivanov Method	44
2	Viscoelastic Contact/Impact Rheological Models	51
2.1	Simple Examples	52
2.1.1	From Elastic to Hard Impact	52
2.1.2	From Damped to Plastic Impact	55
2.1.3	The General Case	56

2.2	Viscoelastic Contact Models and Restitution Coefficients.	66
2.2.1	Linear Spring-Dashpot	66
2.2.2	Nonlinear Elasticity and Viscous Friction: Simon-Hunt-Crossley and Kuwabara-Kono Dissipations	68
2.2.3	Conclusions	77
2.3	Viscoelastic Models with Dry Friction Elements: Viscoelasto-Plastic Models.	78
2.3.1	Conclusions and Further Reading	82
2.4	Penalizing Functions in Mathematical Analysis	83
2.4.1	The Elastic Rebound Case	83
2.4.2	The Case with Dissipation (Linear Viscous Friction).	84
2.4.3	Uniqueness of Solutions	89
2.4.4	Further Existence and Uniqueness Results	92
2.5	Some Comments on Compliant Models.	93
3	Variational Principles	95
3.1	Virtual Displacements, Velocities, and Accelerations Principles	95
3.1.1	The “Classical” Presentation	95
3.1.2	Using Variational and Quasi-Variational Inequalities Formalisms	98
3.2	A Coordinate Invariance Principle	102
3.2.1	Perfect Constraints	103
3.3	Gauss’ Principle	104
3.3.1	Further Reading	105
3.4	Lagrange Dynamics	107
3.4.1	External Impulsive Forces	107
3.4.2	Example: Flexible Joint Manipulators	108
3.5	Hamilton’s Principle and Unilateral Constraints	110
3.5.1	Hamilton’s Principle Without Impacts	110
3.5.2	Hamilton’s Principle With Impacts	111
3.5.3	Modified Set of Curves	115
3.5.4	Modified Lagrangian Function	119
3.5.5	Additional Comments and Studies	122
4	Two Rigid Bodies Colliding.	127
4.1	Dynamical Equations of Two Rigid Bodies Colliding	127
4.1.1	General Considerations	127
4.1.2	The Local Kinematics	129
4.1.3	The Gap Function.	132
4.1.4	The Two-Body System Dynamics.	135
4.1.5	Dynamical Equations and Energy Loss at Collision Times	137
4.1.6	The Percussion Center.	142

- 4.2 Restitution Laws 143
 - 4.2.1 Elastoplastic Impacts and Restitution Coefficients 147
 - 4.2.2 Adhesive Effects. 158
 - 4.2.3 Beyond Hertz: Conformal Contact Models. 162
 - 4.2.4 Conditions for Quasistatic Impacts 164
 - 4.2.5 Incorporating Friction Effects 168
 - 4.2.6 Conclusions 171
 - 4.2.7 Material Parameters: Some Values 172
- 4.3 Impacts with Friction 173
 - 4.3.1 Simple Examples 173
 - 4.3.2 Kinematic CoR: Brach’s Method 188
 - 4.3.3 Additional Comments and Studies 193
 - 4.3.4 Kinematic CoR: Frémond’s approach 198
 - 4.3.5 First Order Impact Dynamics: Darboux-Keller’s Shock Equations. 200
 - 4.3.6 The Energetic Coefficient of Restitution. 217
 - 4.3.7 Examples. 222
 - 4.3.8 Other Energetical Coefficients 225
 - 4.3.9 Additional Comments and Studies 225
 - 4.3.10 Multiple Microcollisions Phenomenon: Toward a Global Coefficient 227
 - 4.3.11 Conclusion 231
 - 4.3.12 The Thomson-and-Tait Formula 232
 - 4.3.13 Graphical Analysis of the Shock Dynamics 233
- 4.4 Impacts in Flexible Structures 236
 - 4.4.1 Multimodal Modeling Approach 236
 - 4.4.2 Infinite Dimensional System Approach 238
 - 4.4.3 Further Reading 239
- 4.5 General Comments 239
- 5 Nonsmooth Lagrangian Systems 241**
 - 5.1 Lagrange Dynamics with Multiple Constraints 241
 - 5.1.1 Frictionless Bilateral Constraints: The Contact Problem 244
 - 5.1.2 Frictionless Unilateral Constraints: The Contact Problem 247
 - 5.1.3 Mixed Bilateral/Unilateral Frictionless Constraints: The Contact Problem 251
 - 5.1.4 Singular Mass Matrix: From Singular Lagrange’s to Singular Hamilton’s Dynamics 254
 - 5.2 Moreau’s Sweeping Process. 256
 - 5.2.1 First-Order Sweeping Process. 256
 - 5.2.2 Second-Order Sweeping Process: Frictionless Mechanical Systems 258

5.2.3	Well-Posedness Results	277
5.2.4	Continuous Dependence on Initial Data	284
5.3	Coulomb’s Friction	285
5.3.1	Coulomb’s Friction Model	286
5.3.2	Coulomb–Moreau’s Disk	288
5.3.3	De Saxcé’s Associated Formulation	290
5.3.4	Coulomb’s Friction at the Acceleration Level	292
5.3.5	Further Comments on Friction Models	293
5.3.6	Sweeping Process with Friction	294
5.3.7	Additional Comments and Studies	297
5.4	Complementarity Formulations	297
5.4.1	Two Bodies: Signorini’s Conditions	298
5.4.2	Linear Complementarity Problem (LCP)	299
5.4.3	Relationships with Quadratic Problems	302
5.4.4	Linear Complementarity Systems (LCS)	304
5.4.5	Controllability of LCS	324
5.4.6	Observability and Observers for LCS	327
5.4.7	Complementarity Systems and Hybrid Dynamical Systems	327
5.5	The Contact Problem with Coulomb’s Friction	329
5.5.1	Introduction	329
5.5.2	Dissipativity of the Constrained Lagrange Dynamics	330
5.5.3	Extension of the Results of Sects. 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3?	331
5.5.4	The Contact Problem for a Planar Particle	332
5.5.5	A Second Simple Mechanism with Friction	335
5.5.6	Non-Uniqueness of the Contact Force	339
5.5.7	Comments	341
5.6	Painlevé’s Paradoxes: Sliding Rod Example	342
5.6.1	The Dynamics of Painlevé’s Example	342
5.6.2	The Contact LCP	344
5.6.3	Analysis of the Dynamical Singularities	347
5.6.4	Further Reading	352
5.6.5	Conclusions	355
5.7	Numerical Simulation	356
5.7.1	Event-Driven Algorithms	356
5.7.2	Compliant Contact/Impact Models	357
5.7.3	Time-Stepping (Event-Capturing) Numerical Algorithms	358
6	Generalized Impact Laws and Multiple Impacts	371
6.1	Particular Features of Multiple Impacts	371
6.1.1	Some Specific Features of Multiple Impacts	372
6.1.2	Han-Gilmore’s and Binary Collisions Models	379
6.1.3	Penalization at Contacts (Compliance)	383
6.1.4	Multiplicity of Multiple Impacts	385

- 6.2 Kinematic Multiple-Impact Law (Generalized Newton) 386
 - 6.2.1 The Quasi-Lagrange Equations 386
 - 6.2.2 The Kinetic Energy 390
 - 6.2.3 The Contact Forces Power 392
 - 6.2.4 Restitution Law for Frictionless Systems 394
 - 6.2.5 Restitution Law with Tangential Effects 398
 - 6.2.6 Tangential Restitution 402
 - 6.2.7 Comments 402
- 6.3 Energetic-CoR Multiple-Impact Law 403
 - 6.3.1 Presentation of the LZB Impact Dynamics 404
 - 6.3.2 Applications and Validations 407
 - 6.3.3 Comparison of Different Multiple Impact Mappings 412
- 6.4 Further Reading 413
 - 6.4.1 Kinetic Restitution (Poisson) 413
 - 6.4.2 Kinematic Restitution (Newton and Moreau) 414
 - 6.4.3 Other Approaches 414
- 7 Stability of Nonsmooth Dynamical Systems 417**
 - 7.1 Stability of Measure Differential Equations 417
 - 7.1.1 Stability of Impulsive ODEs 417
 - 7.1.2 Stability of Measure Driven ODEs (MDEs) 419
 - 7.1.3 Additional Comments and Studies 420
 - 7.2 Stability of the Discrete Dynamic Equations 421
 - 7.2.1 The Bouncing-Ball with Fixed Obstacle 422
 - 7.2.2 Lyapunov Stability of Discrete-Time Systems 425
 - 7.3 Impact Oscillators 426
 - 7.3.1 Existence of Periodic Trajectories 426
 - 7.3.2 Further Reading 430
 - 7.3.3 Comments on the Poincaré Impact Map Stability Analysis 432
 - 7.3.4 Other Studies on Stability 436
 - 7.3.5 Bouncing-Ball with Moving Base 437
 - 7.3.6 Additional Comments and Studies 438
 - 7.4 Grazing or C-Bifurcations 440
 - 7.4.1 The Stroboscopic Poincaré Map Discontinuities 442
 - 7.4.2 The Stroboscopic Poincaré Map Around Grazing-Motions 445
 - 7.4.3 Further Comments and Studies 447
 - 7.5 Complementarity Lagrangian Systems: Stability of Fixed Points 448
 - 7.5.1 The Dynamical System 449
 - 7.5.2 The Stability Analysis 451
 - 7.5.3 Dissipativity Properties 454
 - 7.5.4 Further Reading and Comments 457

7.5.5	Global Finite-Time Stability <i>via</i> the Zhuravlev-Ivanov Transformation	460
7.6	Stabilization of Impacting Systems: From Compliant to Rigid Models	462
7.6.1	System's Dynamics	462
7.6.2	Lyapunov Stability Analysis	464
7.6.3	Analysis of Quadratic Stability Conditions for Large Stiffness Values	465
7.6.4	A Stiffness-Independent Convergence Analysis	469
7.7	Stability of Linear Complementarity Systems	473
7.8	Further Reading	475
8	Trajectory Tracking Feedback Control	477
8.1	Trajectory Tracking: Rigid-Joint Rigid-Body Systems	477
8.1.1	Basic Concepts	479
8.1.2	Controller Design	485
8.1.3	Tracking Control Framework	487
8.1.4	Design of the Desired Contact Force During Constraint Phases	490
8.1.5	Strategy for Takeoff at the End of Constraint Phases Ω_k^I	492
8.1.6	Closed-Loop Stability Analysis	494
8.1.7	Illustrative Examples	495
8.1.8	Proof of Lemma 8.1	499
8.1.9	Proof of Theorem 8.1	503
8.2	Short Bibliography	506
8.3	Trajectory Tracking: Flexible-Joint Rigid-Link Systems	508
8.3.1	Basic Concepts	509
8.3.2	Tracking Control Framework	512
8.3.3	Desired Contact Force During Constraint Phases	515
8.3.4	Strategy for Takeoff at the End of Constraint Phases Ω_{2k+1}^{Bk}	517
8.3.5	Closed-Loop Stability Analysis	518
8.3.6	Illustrative Example	519
8.3.7	Proof of Proposition 8.7	523
8.3.8	Proof of Lemma 8.2	524
8.3.9	Proof of Lemma 8.3	524
8.3.10	Proof of Theorem 8.2	526
8.4	A Unified Point of View	529
8.5	Further Results	529
8.5.1	Experimental Control of the Transition Phase	529
8.5.2	Juggling Robots Analysis and Control	531
8.5.3	Mechanisms with Joint Clearance	532
8.5.4	Observability and State Observers	533

Contents	xxi
Erratum to: Nonsmooth Mechanics	E1
Appendix A: Distributions, Measures, Functions of Bounded Variations	535
Appendix B: Elements of Convex Analysis	547
References	563
Index	619

Notation

- A matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive (semi) definite if $x^T M x > 0$ for all $x \neq 0$ (resp. ≥ 0 for all x): $M \succ 0$ (resp. $M \succeq 0$). M is negative (semi) definite if $-M \succ 0$ (resp. $\succeq 0$): $M \prec 0$ (resp. $\preceq 0$). It is not necessarily symmetric.
- A matrix M is positive (resp. nonnegative) if all its entries M_{ij} are positive (resp. nonnegative).
- Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ be a differentiable function. Its Jacobian at x is $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, its gradient $\nabla f(x) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x)\right)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$.
- Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $x > 0$ (resp. ≥ 0) means that each component $x_i > 0$ (resp. ≥ 0).
- The kinetic energy of a Lagrange system with generalized coordinate vector q , velocity \dot{q} , and inertia matrix $M(q) = M(q)^T \succeq 0$, is denoted $T(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^T M(q) \dot{q}$.
- The $n \times n$ identity matrix is I_n .
- Lexicographical inequalities: $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \succcurlyeq 0$ means that if $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_{i-1} = 0$ for $i - 1 < n$, then $x_i \geq 0$ (the first nonzero entry is > 0 , or all entries are zero); $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \succ 0$ means that not all entries are zero, and the first nonzero entry $x_i > 0$.
- Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M = M^T \succeq 0$ a $n \times n$ matrix, and $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ a nonempty set. The orthogonal projection of x on K in the metric defined by M is denoted as $\text{proj}_M[K; x] \triangleq \text{argmin}_{z \in K} \frac{1}{2} z^T M z$. If K is convex and $M \succ 0$ it is unique.
- The boundary of a nonempty set Φ is denoted as $\text{bd}(\Phi)$ (perhaps rarely as $\partial\Phi$ not to confuse with the subdifferential).
- The unit ball is $\mathbb{B} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$ where $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm.
- Let $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a function which has right and left limits at t . Then $\sigma_u(t) \triangleq u(t^+) - u(t^-)$.
- Subscripts λ_n refer to normal direction, λ_t to tangential directions, while in λ_n the subscript $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is for a sequence of reals.

- The usual notation $A: \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ is employed for multivalued functions, i.e., functions such that $A(x)$ may be a subset of \mathbb{R}^m for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- A function such that $\left(\int_{[a,b]} |f(t)|^p dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < +\infty$, $1 \leq p < +\infty$, is said to belong to the space $L^p([a, b])$ (or sometimes denoted $L_p([a, b])$). When $p = +\infty$, the space $L_\infty([a, b])$ contains functions such that $\text{ess sup}|f(t)| < +\infty$, i.e., functions which are bounded except on a set of measure zero.
- We say that $f \in C^p(I)$ if it is p times differentiable on I , and $f^{(p)}(\cdot)$ is continuous on I .
- $\text{diag}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, is the $m \times m$ diagonal matrix D with diagonal entry $D_{ii} = x_i$.
- Coefficients of restitution (CoRs): e_n : Newton (or kinematic) CoR, e_p Poisson (or kinetic) CoR, e_\star energetic CoR.
- Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, its largest and smallest eigenvalues are denoted $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$, respectively. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, singular values are defined as $\sigma_i = \sqrt{\lambda_i(AA^T)} = \sqrt{\lambda_i(A^T A)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \min(n, m)$, and the largest singular value is $\sigma_{\max}(A) = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(AA^T)}$. One has $\sigma_{\max}(A) = \|A\|_2$ where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is an induced matrix norm, also denoted $\|\cdot\|_{2,2}$: $\|A\|_{2,2} = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|}$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm.