

Corrigendum to “Cascaded incremental nonlinear dynamic inversion control for MAV disturbance rejection”[Journal of Control Engineering Practice 73 (2018) 79–90, (S0967066118300030), (10.1016/j.conengprac.2018.01.003)]

Smeur, E. J.J.; de Croon, G. C.H.E.; Chu, Q.

DOI

[10.1016/j.conengprac.2022.105093](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conengprac.2022.105093)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Control Engineering Practice

Citation (APA)

Smeur, E. J. J., de Croon, G. C. H. E., & Chu, Q. (2023). Corrigendum to “Cascaded incremental nonlinear dynamic inversion control for MAV disturbance rejection”[Journal of Control Engineering Practice 73 (2018) 79–90, (S0967066118300030), (10.1016/j.conengprac.2018.01.003)]. *Control Engineering Practice*, 141, Article 105093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conengprac.2022.105093>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Corrigendum

Corrigendum to “Cascaded incremental nonlinear dynamic inversion control for MAV disturbance rejection” [Journal of Control Engineering Practice 73 (2018) 79–90]

E.J.J. Smeur^{*}, G.C.H.E. de Croon, Q. Chu

Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands



The authors regret to inform that an incorrect transfer function was included in Eq. (12). The correct transfer function is:

$$TF_{\eta_{\text{ref}} \rightarrow \eta} = \frac{K_{\eta} K_{\Omega} \alpha T_s^2 z^2}{z^3 + (K_{\Omega} \alpha T_s + K_{\eta} K_{\Omega} \alpha T_s^2 + \alpha - 3) z^2 + (3 - 2\alpha - K_{\Omega} \alpha T_s) z - 1 + \alpha} \quad (12)$$

The selected gains were $K_{\Omega} = 28.0$ and $K_{\eta} = 21.4$. This leads to a real pole at 0.964 and two complex poles at $0.965 \pm 0.0445i$. The difference of the model compared to the measured step response has now reduced, the largest difference being 4.8% of the final step value at 0.14 s. The mistake does not influence any of the conclusions drawn in the paper.

The authors would like to apologize for any inconvenience caused.

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conengprac.2018.01.003>.

^{*} Correspondence to: Kluyverweg 1, 2629HS Delft, the Netherlands.

E-mail address: e.j.smeur@tudelft.nl (E.J.J. Smeur).