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Abstract—This paper deals with reduced-order observers with stator-resistance adaptation for motion-sensorless permanent-magnet synchronous motor drives. An analytical solution for the stabilizing observer gain and stability conditions for the stator-resistance adaptation are derived. The proposed observer design is experimentally tested using a 2.2-kW motor drive; stable stator-resistance adaptation are derived. The proposed observer is demonstrated.

Index Terms—Observer, stability conditions, sensorless, stator resistance estimation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Motion-sensorless permanent-magnet synchronous motor (PMSM) drives may have an unstable operating region at low speeds. Since the back electromotive force (EMF) is proportional to the rotational speed of the motor, parameter errors have a relatively high effect on the accuracy of the estimated back EMF at low speeds [1], [2]. Improper observer gain selections may cause unstable operation of the drive even if the parameters are accurately known [3], [4].

In practice, the stator resistance varies with the winding temperature during the operation of the motor. The stator resistance can be estimated by injecting a test signal into the stator winding, or by using the fundamental excitation in combination with a machine model. For PMSMs, a dc-current signal has been used in [6]. In [7], a model-reference adaptive system (MRAS) is applied for on-line stator-resistance estimation in order to improve the sensorless control. Usually, an in-depth stability analysis of these methods is omitted since the resulting closed-loop systems become very complicated.

In this paper, a reduced-order position observer is augmented with stator-resistance adaptation, based on the fundamental excitation, and analytical stability conditions and design rules are derived for the augmented observer. Based on these stability conditions, an easy-to-tune observer design is proposed. The proposed design is very simple, and it results in a robust and well-damped closed-loop system. The performance of the proposed observer design is evaluated using laboratory experiments with a 2.2-kW PMSM drive.

II. PMSM MODEL

Real space vectors will be used throughout the paper. Space vectors will be denoted by boldface lowercase letters and matrices by boldface uppercase letters. The matrix transpose will be marked with the superscript T. The identity matrix and the orthogonal rotation matrix are defined as

I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)

respectively. Since J corresponds to the imaginary unit j, the notation is very similar to that obtained for complex space vectors.

To simplify the analysis in the following sections, the PMSM model will be expressed in the estimated rotor reference frame, whose d axis is aligned at \( \hat{\theta}_m \) with respect to the stator reference frame. The voltage and flux equations are

\[
\frac{d\psi_s}{dt} + \hat{\omega}_m J \psi_s = u_s - R_s i_s \quad (2a)
\]

\[
\psi_s = L i_s + \psi_{pm} \quad (2b)
\]

where \( u_s = [u_d, u_q]^T \) is the stator voltage vector, \( i_s = [i_d, i_q]^T \) the stator current vector, \( R_s \) the stator resistance, and \( \hat{\omega}_m = d\hat{\theta}_m/dt \) is the angular speed of the reference frame. The stator inductance and the permanent-magnet flux vector are

\[
L = e^{-\hat{\theta}_m J} \begin{bmatrix} L_d & 0 \\ 0 & L_q \end{bmatrix} e^{\hat{\theta}_m J}, \quad \psi_{pm} = e^{-\hat{\theta}_m J} \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{pm} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)
\]

respectively, where \( \hat{\theta}_m = \hat{\theta}_m - \theta_m \). The electrical position of the permanent-magnet flux is \( \hat{\theta}_m \) and the angular speed of the rotor is \( \omega_m = d\hat{\theta}_m/dt \).

In the following, the back EMF induced by the permanent-magnet flux,

\[
e = \frac{d\psi_{pm}}{dt} + \hat{\omega}_m J \psi_{pm} \quad (4a)
\]

will be used to formulate the rotor position observer. Based on (2), this back EMF can be expressed as

\[
e = u_s - R_s i_s - \frac{d}{dt} (L i_s) - \hat{\omega}_m J L i_s \quad (4b)
\]

III. ROTOR-POSITION OBSERVER

To avoid forbiddingly complicated equations, which would prevent analytical results from being derived, accurate parameter estimates \( \hat{L}_d, L_q, \) and \( \hat{\psi}_{pm} \) are assumed, with the exception of the stator-resistance estimate \( \hat{R}_s \). Without loss of generality, the observer in estimated rotor coordinates is considered. Since
Using (6), an observer can be formulated:

\[ \hat{e} = \hat{\omega}_m \mathbf{J} \hat{\psi}_{pm} \]

\[ e' = u_s - \dot{R}_s i_s - \dot{L} \frac{di_s}{dt} - \hat{\omega}_m \mathbf{J} \dot{L} \]

where \( \hat{\psi}_{pm} \) is assumed. Since the current derivative \( \frac{di_s}{dt} \) is known (either measured or calculated in the discrete observer using the sample from the previous time step), the rotor speed estimate \( \hat{\omega}_m \) can be evaluated using an algebraic relation. Using (6), an observer can be formulated:

\[ k^T (\hat{e} - e') = 0 \]

where \( k \) is a gain vector. It can be seen from (7) that the magnitude of the gain vector is irrelevant: \( k = [g, 1]^T \) can be selected without loss of generality. From (7) and \( \hat{\omega}_m = \frac{d\hat{\theta}_m}{dt} \), the differential equation for the rotor position estimate can be solved:

\[ \frac{d\hat{\theta}_m}{dt} = \frac{k^T \left( \mathbf{u}_s - \hat{R}_s \dot{i}_s - \dot{L} \frac{di_s}{dt} \right)}{k^T \mathbf{J} (\hat{\psi}_{pm} + \dot{L} \dot{i}_s)} = \hat{\omega}_m \]

or expressed using components:

\[ \frac{d\hat{\theta}_m}{dt} = \frac{u_s - \hat{R}_s i_q - L_q \frac{di_q}{dt} + g(u_d - \hat{R}_s i_d - L_d \frac{di_d}{dt})}{\psi_{pm} + L_d \dot{i}_d - g L_q i_q} \]

Choosing \( g = 0 \) leads to the pure voltage model. Naturally, the same observer (8) would be obtained by using the back EMF induced by the stator flux in the derivation. The rotor-position observer is of the first order, and there is only one gain, \( g \), to select.

### B. Stabilizing Observer Gain

As shown in Appendix A, the closed-loop system consisting of (2) and (9) is locally stable if the gain is given by

\[ g = \frac{\beta - \alpha}{\beta \alpha / \omega_m + 1} \]

where \( \alpha > 0 \) corresponds to the bandwidth of the position estimation and

\[ \beta = \frac{(L_d - L_q) i_q}{\psi_{pm} + (L_d - L_q) i_d} \]

As a special case, (11) reduces to \( \beta = 0 \) for non-salient PMSMs.

It is necessary that the bandwidth \( \alpha \) depends on the operating point. For \( \hat{\omega}_m = 0 \), \( \alpha = 0 \) has to be selected to avoid division by zero, giving only marginal stability for zero frequency. Furthermore, the denominator of the gain (10) should be nonzero:

\[ \alpha \neq -\hat{\omega}_m / \beta \]

For typical salient and non-salient PMSMs, the bandwidth can be selected as

\[ \alpha = \lambda |\hat{\omega}_m| \]

where \( \lambda \) is a positive constant that should be smaller than any expected value for \( 1/|\beta| \). This selection corresponds to the gain

\[ g = \frac{\beta - \lambda \text{sign}(\hat{\omega}_m)}{\beta \lambda \text{sign}(\hat{\omega}_m) + 1} \]

It is to be noted, however, that if the saliency ratio is large while the permanent-magnet flux is small, the condition \( \lambda < 1/|\beta| \) cannot always be fulfilled. As a worst-case example, a synchronous reluctance motor—for which \( \beta = i_q / i_d \) holds—can be considered. If the current component \( i_q \) is kept constant, \( 1/\beta \) becomes close to zero at high values of \( i_q \). Therefore, a very small value for \( \lambda \) should be selected, resulting in the problems typical to the pure voltage model. It seems that a slightly more complex observer structure is necessary for this kind of machines [8].

### C. Conventional Designs for Non-Salient PMSMs

In [9], a similar observer was proposed for non-salient PMSMs. The gain was selected as

\[ g = -\lambda \text{sign}(\hat{\omega}_m) \]

where \( \lambda \) is a positive constant. According to (14) with \( \beta = 0 \), this selection results in the stable system having the bandwidth of \( \alpha = \lambda |\hat{\omega}_m| \).

In [2], the observer was made insensitive to the stator resistance at low speeds by using the observer gain

\[ g = -i_q / i_d \]
This gain removes the stator-resistance estimate from the observer (9). In order to stabilize the observer, the current component \( i_d \) was controlled according to

\[
i_d = i_q \frac{\text{sign}(\hat{\omega}_m)}{\lambda}
\]  

(17)

The observer gain (16) together with the control law (17) leads to the stable system having the position-estimation bandwidth

\[
\alpha = \lambda |\hat{\omega}_m|.
\]

IV. STATOR-RESISTANCE ADAPTION

Since (7) is used for position estimation, the component of the back-EMF estimation error is zero in the direction of the gain vector. The component perpendicular to \( k \), however, can be used for the stator-resistance adaptation,

\[
\frac{d\hat{R}_x}{dt} = \gamma k^T J (\hat{e} - e')
\]  

(18)

where \( \gamma \) is a gain. The stability conditions for the position observer (9) augmented with (18) are derived in Appendix B. These conditions are fulfilled by choosing

\[
\gamma = \begin{cases} 
L, & \text{if } 0 < L < \gamma' \text{sign}(x) \\
L, & \text{if } \gamma' \text{sign}(x) < L < 0 \\
\gamma' \text{sign}(x), & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(19)

where \( \gamma' \) is a positive design parameter. The sign of the gain \( \gamma \) depends on

\[
x = g(\alpha i_q - \hat{\omega}_m i_d) - \alpha i_d - \hat{\omega}_m i_q
\]  

(20)

Furthermore, the limiting value is

\[
L = \frac{\alpha \hat{\omega}_m}{g(\alpha i_d - \hat{\omega}_m i_q) + \alpha i_q - \hat{\omega}_m i_d}
\]  

(21)

where the parameter \( 0 < r < 1 \) affects the stability margin of the system; choosing \( r = 1 \) would lead to a marginally stable system (in the operating points where \( \gamma \) is determined by \( L \)).

The adaptation should be disabled in the vicinity of no-load operation and at higher stator frequencies due to poor signal-to-noise ratio (which is a fundamental property common to all stator-resistance adaptation methods based only on the fundamental-wave excitation). Hence, parameter \( \gamma' \) in (19) can be selected as

\[
\gamma' = \begin{cases} 
\gamma'' \left( 1 - \frac{|\omega_m|}{\omega_\Delta} \right) i_s, & \text{if } i_s > i_\Delta \text{ and } |\hat{\omega}_m| < \omega_\Delta \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(22)

where \( \gamma'' \) is a positive constant, \( \omega_\Delta \) is the transition frequency, and

\[
i_s = \sqrt{i_d^2 + i_q^2}
\]  

(23)

is the magnitude of the stator-current vector.

V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND PARAMETERS

The operation of the proposed observer and stator-resistance adaptation was investigated experimentally using the setup shown in Fig. 2. The motion-sensorless control system was implemented in a dSPACE DS1103 PPC/DSP board. A 2.2-kW six-pole PMSM is fed by a frequency converter that is controlled by the DS1103 board. The rated values of the PMSM are: speed 1500 r/min; frequency 75 Hz; line-to-line rms voltage 370 V; rms current 4.3 A; and torque 14 Nm. The base values for angular speed, voltage, and current are defined as \( 2\pi \cdot 75 \text{ rad/s}, \sqrt{2/3} \cdot 370 \text{ V}, \) and \( \sqrt{2} \cdot 4.3 \text{ A} \), respectively.

A servo PMSM is used as a loading machine. The rotor speed \( \omega_m \) and position \( \vartheta_m \) are measured using an incremental encoder for monitoring purposes. The total moment of inertia of the experimental setup is 0.015 kgm² (2.2 times the inertia of the 2.2-kW PMSM rotor).

The stator resistance of the 2.2-kW PMSM is approximately 3.3 \( \Omega \) at room temperature. Additional 1-\( \Omega \) resistors were added between the frequency converter and the PMSM. The resistance can be changed stepwise by opening or closing a manually operated three-phase switch (S) connected in parallel with the resistors. Unless otherwise noted, switch S is in the closed position.

The block diagram of the motion-sensorless control system implemented in the DS1103 board is shown in Fig. 1. The stator currents and the DC-link voltage are measured, and the reference voltage obtained from the current controller is used for the observer. The sampling is synchronized to the modulation, and both the switching frequency and the sampling frequency are 5 kHz. A simple current feedforward compensation for dead times and power device voltage drops is applied. The control system shown in Fig. 1 is augmented with a speed controller, whose feedback signal is the speed estimate \( \hat{\omega}_m \) obtained from the proposed observer. The bandwidth of this PI speed controller, including active damping [10], is 0.08 p.u. The estimate of the per-unit electromagnetic torque is evaluated as

\[
T_e = \psi_{pm} i_q + (L_d - L_q) i_d i_q.
\]
VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Fig. 3 shows results of medium-speed no-load operation. The speed reference was stepped from 0 to 1200 rpm, then to −1200 rpm and finally back to 0. According to (22), the stator-resistance adaptation was only active in the beginning of the acceleration and at the end of the deceleration. Even though there is an initial error of approximately 20 electrical degrees in the rotor position estimate, it can be seen that the position estimate quickly converges close to the actual position in the beginning of the acceleration. The position error increases slightly at the end of the deceleration (t > 2.5 s) since the stator current, voltage and frequency approach zero and, therefore, there is no information available on the position. However, it is worth noticing that the position estimate remains stable at zero speed and the drive could be accelerated again.

Fig. 4 depicts a rated load torque step and its removal at the speed of 750 rpm. It can be seen that the response against these load-torque disturbances is well damped.
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laboratory experiments with a 2.2-kW PMSM drive. Stable operation at very low speeds under different loading conditions was demonstrated. Furthermore, it was experimentally verified that the stator-resistance estimate can track stepwise changes in the actual resistance.

**APPENDIX A**

**DERIVATION OF A STABILIZING OBSERVER GAIN**

From (2) and (9), the nonlinear dynamics of the estimation error are obtained:

\[
\frac{d\hat{\vartheta}_m}{dt} = -\frac{k^T}{k^T} \left[ \omega_m J(\hat{\psi}_{pm} + \dot{L} i_s) + L \frac{di_s}{dt} + \dot{R}_s i_s \right]
\]

where \( \hat{\vartheta}_m = \hat{\vartheta}_m - \vartheta_m \) is the estimation error of the rotor position, \( \psi_{pm} = \psi_{pm} - \dot{\psi}_{pm} \) is the error in the permanent-magnet flux vector, \( L = L - \dot{L} \) is the error in the inductance matrix, and \( \dot{R}_s = \ddot{R}_s - \dot{R}_s \) is the error in the stator resistance estimate. It is worth noticing that the errors \( \hat{\psi}_{pm} \) and \( \dot{L} \) originate only due to the angle error \( \hat{\vartheta}_m \) (since accurate parameter estimates are assumed).

The local stability of the system (24) can be studied via small-signal linearization. The operating-point quantities will be marked by the subscript 0. The operating-point inductance matrix and permanent-magnet flux are

\[
L_0 = \begin{bmatrix} L_d & 0 \\ 0 & L_q \end{bmatrix}, \quad \psi_{pm0} = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{pm} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

respectively. To simplify the notation, a fictitious flux is defined

\[
\psi_0 = \psi_{pm0} + (L_0 + JL_0J) i_{s0} = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{pm} + (L_d - L_q) i_{d0} \\ -(L_d - L_q) i_{q0} \end{bmatrix}
\]

When \( \dot{R}_s = 0 \) and \( (di_s/dt)_0 = 0 \) are assumed, the linearization results in

\[
\frac{d\hat{\vartheta}_m}{dt} = -\alpha_0 \hat{\vartheta}_m
\]

where the coefficient

\[
\alpha_0 = -\frac{\omega_m k^T \psi_0}{k^T J \psi_0} = \frac{\omega_m (\beta_0 - g_0)}{1 + \beta_0 g_0}
\]

corresponds to the bandwidth of the position estimation. The nonlinear closed-loop system (24) is locally stable if \( \alpha_0 > 0 \). From (28), the stabilizing gain can be solved:

\[
g_0 = \frac{\beta_0 \omega_m - \alpha_0}{\beta_0 \alpha_0 + \omega_m}
\]
The closed-loop system consisting of (24) and (31) can be linearized:

\[
\frac{d\tilde{\omega}_m}{dt} = -\alpha_0 \tilde{\omega}_m - \frac{k_0^T \tilde{t}_s}{k_0^T \tilde{J}} \tilde{\omega}_m - \tilde{R}_s \tag{32a}
\]

\[
\frac{d\tilde{R}_s}{dt} = \gamma_0 k_0^T (\alpha_0 I - \omega_{\text{m}0} J) \tilde{\psi}_0 \tilde{\omega}_m
- \frac{k_0^T (\alpha_0 I - \omega_{\text{m}0} J) \tilde{t}_s}{\omega_{\text{m}0}} \tilde{R}_s \tag{32b}
\]

Using the Routh–Hurwitz stability criterion, the stability conditions are

\[
\gamma_0 k_0^T (\alpha_0 J + \omega_{\text{m}0} I) \tilde{t}_s < 0 \tag{33a}
\]

\[
\gamma_0 k_0^T (\alpha_0 I - \omega_{\text{m}0} J) \tilde{t}_s > -\alpha_0 \tag{33b}
\]
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