

ASME Journal of Computational and Nonlinear Dynamics Online journal at: https://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/computationalnonlinear



Jessica S. M. Nunes

Department of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0280 e-mail: jsnunes@crimson.ua.edu

Weihua Su¹

Mem. ASME Associate Professor Department of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0280 e-mail: suw@eng.ua.edu

Tianyi He

Mem. ASME Assistant Professor Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322 e-mail: tianyi.he@usu.edu

Nonlinear Model Predictive Control of Urban Air Mobility Aircraft With Gust Disturbance

The paper explores improving the ride quality of urban air mobility (UAM) aircraft by using a nonlinear model predictive controller (NMPC) for trajectory tracking in the presence of gusts. A hybrid UAM aircraft with traditional control surfaces and multiple rotors is studied. The aircraft's free-flight behavior is governed by a set of nonlinear rigid-body dynamic equations that consider the gyroscopic and inertial effects of the tiltrotors. The control inputs for the aircraft include the spin rate and acceleration of the rotors, their tilt angle and rate, and the deflections of traditional control surfaces, such as the elevator, aileron, and rudder. This research numerically studies the effects of NMPC in actively suppressing aircraft's dynamic responses to continuous stochastic gusts or discrete "1-cosine" gusts, which are applied symmetrically and asymmetrically on the lifting surfaces. The findings indicate that NMPC can effectively maintain the aircraft on its desired flight path, closely resembling the undisturbed level flight when it experiences moderate-intensity gusts. However, the controller's effectiveness decreases as the intensity of the gusts increases. The NMPC can no longer constrain the flight path deviation within a bounded range due to an increased pitch rate when the gust intensity surpasses a certain threshold. In addition, the discrete "1cosine" gusts present more significant challenges, resulting in pitch angle deviations from the desired value, even at low gust magnitudes. [DOI: 10.1115/1.4068426]

1 Introduction

The urban air mobility (UAM) market is projected to experience significant growth, expanding from \$7.1 billion in 2021 to \$90 billion by 2050. This growth is driven by UAM's potential to revolutionize transportation [1]. UAM applications are expected to be diverse, encompassing personal commuting, on-demand air taxis with passenger-defined routes, air metro systems with fixed public transport routes, airport and company shuttles, regional public transport, air ambulances, package delivery, law enforcement, and military operations [2,3]. These applications will have a considerable impact on services provided by both public and private institutions across various sectors. As the development progresses, enhancing flight safety, automation, and ride quality is more crucial than ever to integrate these new aircraft safely into urban airspace [4–6].

A key segment of UAM is the distributed electric propulsion enabled vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) vehicles, commonly known as eVTOLs [7]. These vehicles employ a fixed-wing design with multiple tiltrotors to enable vertical takeoff and landing. The tilt and spin of the rotors also function as actuators, enhancing safety through redundancy, i.e., with multiple rotors, these vehicles can continue operating even in case of motor or rotor failure, thereby reducing the risk of serious incidents. eVTOLs also hold significant potential for autonomous and semi-autonomous flight, which could reduce accidents caused by human error, which is a significant factor in aviation incidents, and improve navigation in complex urban environments by enabling aircraft to avoid obstacles and adapt to dynamic conditions [8,9].

Ride quality is essential for urban passenger transportation, one of the significant functions of UAM aircraft. Improving ride quality involves tackling several challenges, such as noise reduction, which remains difficult to achieve at levels suitable for cities. Several studies have focused on quieter rotor designs and optimized flight paths to lessen noise pollution [10,11].

Aircraft response to external air disturbances, e.g., gust, and the control of vibration and trajectory of such aircraft is also critical for passenger comfort and aircraft performance and safety [12]. The development of autonomous flight systems adds to the complexity of ride quality, demanding robust algorithms to manage turbulence efficiently. In their comprehensive review, Kim et al. [13] noted that early quadrotor control developments relied on linear controllers like linear quadratic regulator (LQR) and proportional-integralderivative controllers. These controllers were effective for maintaining stability during level flight and hovering. However, they exhibited limitations in more challenging conditions, such as highspeed flights and environments with wind disturbances, as observed by Hoffmann et al. [14] in flight tests using a proportional-integralderivative controller. Zhang et al. [15] investigated the flight stabilization and gust control of the XV-15 tiltrotor aircraft using an optimal control method based on quadratic programing. Their approach employed a linear time-varying model to accurately capture the aircraft's dynamic characteristics through online linearization of the nonlinear model to update the model parameters at each sampling constant. The controller is designed based on the linear time-varying model and incorporated with the input constraints. The results indicated that the controller successfully achieved the desired tracking performance throughout the

¹Corresponding author.

Manuscript received December 11, 2024; final manuscript received April 7, 2025; published online April 28, 2025. Assoc. Editor: Stefanie Gutschmidt.

operational envelope, including the transition flights, and the ability to attenuate gust disturbance.

Alternatively, model predictive control (MPC) is a robust approach for controlling dynamic systems [16,17]. It has the potential for aircraft control, especially when the aircraft is subject to external disturbance. It utilizes a dynamic model to predict future responses and determine optimal inputs for achieving target trajectories [18,19]. Qin and Badgwell [20] conducted a comprehensive examination of the history and industrial applications of MPC algorithms. Notable reviews of MPC theory can also be found in several publications [21-23] as well as books [24-26]. He and Su [27] explored the use of MPC based on linear parameter-varying (LPV) models to suppress vibrations and alleviate gust loads for highly flexible aircraft. The dynamic equation was first linearized around a series of equilibria and model reduction was performed for each linearized model. A scheduling parameter was then chosen to parameterize and interpolate the linearized models to render a reduced-order LPV model. This work's main innovation was using the magnitude of the first symmetric bending mode as the LPV scheduling parameter, compared to using the gust-induced angle of attack at the wing root. Both parameter selections were evaluated for gust alleviation when the flexible aircraft faced a uniformly applied gust perturbation across the entire wing. The control input was the conventional trailing-edge flaps on the main wings and tails. The simulation results demonstrated that the controller designed using the modal magnitude as LPV parameter performed better in suppressing gusts when compared to using the gust-induced angle of attack.

Moreover, nonlinear model predictive controller (NMPC) has gained considerable attention in the aerospace research community, while the computational burden associated with this method usually limits its application. The work by Meradi et al. [28] investigated the stochastic gust control of a quadrotor VTOL with NMPC, sliding mode control (SMC), and integral backstepping control. While the NMPC was shown to have a higher computational cost than SMC and integral backstepping control, it showed minimum control effort. They proposed a new controller, predictive sliding mode control, combining SMC and NMPC. A recent study investigated NMPC's effectiveness for vibration suppression and lateral path tracking in a fixed-wing six-tiltrotor eVTOL [29]. In this study, the NMPC performance was compared to open-loop, LQR, and linear MPC. Results showed that both NMPC and LOR effectively suppressed vibrations, whereas the linear MPC was ineffective in mitigating rigid-body oscillations. For path tracking, NMPC outperformed LQR because the LQR control performance was limited by the linearized model of the tiltrotor dynamics. In contrast, NMPC's capacity to predict future aircraft states and account for system nonlinearity led to better path tracking. The authors expanded the study on UAM aircraft flight safety by evaluating the NMPC for flight control under control effectors failure [30]. The results indicate that the NMPC can effectively attenuate the perturbation caused by an asymmetric tiltrotor failure by utilizing the back rotors as push thrusters. Moreover, when employing the back rotors for pitch control, the NMPC significantly reduces the phugoid mode vibrations caused by the elevator failure.

The dynamic behavior of tiltrotor aircraft is inherently highly nonlinear, where NMPC is a promising technique for analyzing the control of such aircraft, especially when subjected to gust excitation. Thanks to the LiDAR/radar sensors, the gust ahead of the aircraft can be measured. Therefore, NMPC can incorporate the gust measurements into predicting the nonlinear system responses, and find finitehorizon optimal control inputs to attenuate the gust. The NMPC accounts for the full nonlinear dynamic model, which is more accurate than linearized or LPV models in capturing transient dynamics between equilibrium conditions. Therefore, this paper investigates the effects of NMPC for active gust attenuation of continuous stochastic and discrete gusts, which are applied symmetrically and asymmetrically on lifting surfaces of a tiltrotor aircraft. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the nonlinear flight dynamic formulation for tiltrotor aircraft, followed



Fig. 1 Global and body reference frames of a rigid-body tiltrotor aircraft (connections between rotors and aircraft are not shown)

by the control systems description in Sec. 3. Section 4 shows the numerical results. Finally, conclusions are summarized in Sec. 5.

2 Flight Dynamic Formulations

This study investigates a hybrid UAM aircraft that consists of a fixed-wing airplane with tiltrotors (see Fig. 1). This section presents a condensed summary of these equations. One can refer to Ref. [31] for more details on the formulation.

A body-fixed frame *B* is defined with respect to the inertial frame *G*, with B_x pointing to the right wing, B_y pointing forward, and B_z completing the right-hand rule. While the *B* frame can be arbitrarily placed, it is convenient to set the frame's origin O_B within the vehicle's symmetric plane. The inertial position of O_B is represented by \mathbf{p}_B , while $\mathbf{p}_{G/B}$ describes the position of the mass center of the fixed-wing aircraft (excluding the tiltrotors) with respect to the *B* frame. The aircraft's rigid-body velocity is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{v}_B\\ \boldsymbol{\omega}_B \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \dot{\mathbf{p}}_B + \boldsymbol{\omega}_B \times \mathbf{p}_B\\ \dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_B \end{array} \right\}$$
(1)

By following the Hamilton's principle, the governing equation of motion is obtained, given by

$$\mathbf{M}_{BB}(\boldsymbol{\Xi})\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbf{C}_{BB}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Xi})\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{R}_{B}$$
(2)

where the inertia matrix \mathbf{M}_{BB} is dependent on the tilt angles Ξ of the rotors, while the damping matrix \mathbf{C}_{BB} is dependent on both $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and Ξ . The load vector \mathbf{R}_B is the summation of the loads about the *B* frame origin, including the contributions of gravity load \mathbf{R}^{grav} , inertial load \mathbf{R}^{iner} , induced moment due to tiltrotors \mathbf{R}^{rate} , gyroscopic load \mathbf{R}^{gyro} , and external load \mathbf{R}^{ext} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{R}_{B} = \mathbf{R}^{\text{grav}} + \mathbf{R}^{\text{iner}} + \mathbf{R}^{\text{rate}} + \mathbf{R}^{\text{gyro}} + \mathbf{R}^{\text{ext}}$$
(3)

The external load includes propulsive and aerodynamic loads, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{R}^{\text{ext}} = \mathbf{R}^{\text{prop}} + \mathbf{R}^{\text{aero}} \tag{4}$$

The aerodynamic load is calculated for each airfoil section along the span of the lifting surfaces (see Fig. 2). The 2D quasi-steady aerodynamic loads l_{ac} , m_{ac} , and d_{ac} on each thin airfoil are determined as functions of trailing-edge flap deflection angle, lifting surface geometry, and acceleration components of Fig. 2 [31]. When gust disturbance is introduced, it is incorporated into the airfoil's local velocity V_{∞} , thereby modifying the aerodynamic load vector \mathbf{R}^{aero} to account for the gust effects.

The *B* frame's orientation is described by the quaternions ζ , governed by



Fig. 2 Aerodynamic frame and load components

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = -\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_1(\boldsymbol{\omega}_B) \boldsymbol{\zeta}$$
 (5)

where Ω_{ζ} is a function of the rigid-body angular velocities ω_B . Lastly, the inertial position of the *B* frame can be calculated by

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}}_{B}^{G} = \mathbf{C}^{GB} \mathbf{v}_{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{GB} & \mathbf{0}_{3} \end{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta}$$
(6)

where C^{GB} is the rotational transformation matrix from the body to the global frame. The combination of Eqs. (2), (5), and (6) completes the nonlinear flight dynamic model of the tiltrotor UAM aircraft. Those equations can be transformed to

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{M}_{BB}^{-1}(-\mathbf{C}_{BB}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Xi})\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{M}_{BB}^{-1}(\mathbf{R}_{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}, \delta_{e}, \delta_{a}, \delta_{r}, \boldsymbol{\Xi}, \dot{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}, \dot{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}, \ddot{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}})) \dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = -\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\boldsymbol{\zeta} \dot{\mathbf{p}}_{B}^{G} = [\mathbf{C}^{GB}\mathbf{0}_{3}]\boldsymbol{\beta}$$
(7)

where δ_e , δ_a , and δ_r are the elevator, aileron, and rudder deflections, Ξ is the vector containing the rotor's tilt angles, and Γ is the vector of spin kinematics of the rotors. Therefore, the nonlinear system state and control input vectors are defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad (\mathbf{p}_{B}^{G})^{\mathrm{T}} \quad (\mathbf{p}_{B}^{G})^{\mathrm{T}} \} \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \delta_{e} \quad \delta_{a} \quad \delta_{r} \quad \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \}$$

$$(8)$$

As a postprocessing, the Euler angles can be calculated from the quaternions. By keeping the convention of the Euler angles defined in the north-east-down frame for flight dynamics, the yaw angle ψ is defined as rotation about negative B_z -axis, the pitch angle θ is defined as rotation about B_x -axis, and the roll angle φ is defined as rotation about B_y -axis. Therefore, the Euler angles are given by

$$\varphi = \tan^{-1} \frac{2(\zeta_1 \zeta_2 - \zeta_0 \zeta_3)}{1 - 2(\zeta_0^2 + \zeta_1^2)}$$

$$\theta = \sin^{-1} [-2(\zeta_1 \zeta_3 + \zeta_0 \zeta_2)]$$

$$\psi = \tan^{-1} \frac{2(\zeta_0 \zeta_1 - \zeta_2 \zeta_3)}{1 - 2(\zeta_1^2 + \zeta_2^2)}$$

(9)

which can be simply noted as

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi} = \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \varphi & \theta & \psi \end{array} \right\}^{\mathrm{T}} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) \tag{10}$$

Additionally, the system output *y* can be selected as a combination of system states and Euler angles, with the full form given by

$$\mathbf{y}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad (\mathbf{p}_{B}^{G})^{\mathrm{T}} \}$$
(11)

3 Nonlinear Model Predictive Controller

The NMPC looks ahead by p steps to predict the system responses in the future (predicted output in Fig. 3). It calculates the best

Journal of Computational and Nonlinear Dynamics



Fig. 3 NMPC control and prediction horizon

sequence of control inputs **u** from the present to $t_n = t + n \times dt$ to achieve the closest match between the system output and the desired output reference (predicted control input in Fig. 3) [32]. Here, *p* is the prediction horizon, and *n* is the control horizon illustrated in Fig. 3. At each time-step, the controller predicts the future system output and solves an optimization problem to determine the control input, using only the initial input vector (i.e., the value between t_k and t_{k+1}). This procedure is repeated in the next time-step. This approach significantly enhances controller performance with the tradeoff of increased computational cost.

In this study, the NMPC is designed using the MATLAB® function *nlmpc*, where the function *nlmpcmove* solves the quadratic problem and find the optimal control input in each time-step. The cost function of the quadratic problem is

$$J(\mathbf{U}_k) = J_y(\mathbf{U}_k) + J_u(\mathbf{U}_k) + J_{\Delta u}(\mathbf{U}_k)$$
(12)

where \mathbf{U}_k is the quadratic problem decision defined by

$$\mathbf{U}_{k}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}(k|k) \quad \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}(k+1|k) \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}(k+p-1|k) \}$$
(13)

The $\mathbf{U}_{k}^{\mathrm{T}}$ vector contains the inputs vectors $\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}}(k+i-1|k)$ calculated in the current control interval k for the *i*th prediction horizon step, where *i* ranges from 1 to the prediction horizon p defined during the controller design. The output reference tracking term J_{y} given by

$$J_{y}(\mathbf{U}_{k}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{y}} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left\{ \frac{w_{i,j}^{y}}{s_{j}^{y}} \left[r_{j}(k+i|k) - y_{j}(k+i|k) \right] \right\}^{2}$$
(14)

Relates the *j*th output reference $r_j(k + i|k)$ to the *j*th output $y_j(k + i|k)$, both referent to the *i*th prediction horizon calculated at the current control interval *k*. The minimization of this term can be tuned by adjusting the weight for *j*th plant output at the *i*th prediction horizon step $w_{i,j}^y$ and the scale factor of the *j*th output s_j^y . The cost function term J_u allows for the input variable tracking and is given by

J

$$u(\mathbf{U}_{k}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{u}} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \left\{ \frac{w_{i,j}^{u}}{s_{j}^{u}} \left[u_{j}(k+i|k) - u_{j,\text{target}}(k+i|k) \right] \right\}^{2}$$
(15)

where $u_{j,\text{target}}$ is the target value for the *j*th input. $w_{i,j}^{u}$ and s_{j}^{u} are the weight and the scale factor of the *j*th input. The third term of the cost function is

$$J_{\Delta u}(\mathbf{U_k}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_u} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \left\{ \frac{w_{i,j}^{\Delta u}}{s_j^u} \left[u_j(k+i|k) - u_j(k+i-1|k) \right] \right\}^2$$
(16)

which allows for the consideration of input move smoothness during the optimization process.

In the function *nlmpcmove*, the measured disturbances can be inputted as an array of $N_{\rm md}$ (number of measured disturbances) columns and p + 1 rows to vary the disturbance values over the prediction horizon. When gust excitation is considered, it can be assumed as measured disturbance with known 3D wind speeds throughout the prediction horizon. The measurement of 3D flight speeds ahead in time, and consequently ahead of the aircraft in space, is possible with sensors such as LiDAR [33].

The NMPC is tuned for each case studied by adjusting the output and input weights. Those are considered constant throughout the prediction and control horizons and therefore have the new form w_j^y and w_j^u for the *j*th output and *j*th input weights. All the scale factors are chosen as 1, thus are omitted in Eq. (17). The input movement weights $w_{i,j}^{\Delta u}$ are also kept at their default values of 0.1. While the NMPC formulation allows for output constraints, only input and input rate hard constraints are used in this work, i.e.,

$$u_{j,\min}(i) \leqslant u_j(k+i-1|k) \leqslant u_{j,\max}(i)$$

$$\Delta u_{j,\min}(i) \leqslant \Delta u_j(k+i-1|k) \leqslant \Delta u_{j,\max}(i)$$
(17)

In addition, this work focuses on NMPC attenuating gust disturbance, thus neglects model uncertainty and other disturbances. In other words, the sensor data are assumed to be perfect reading without the noise on sensor readings.

4 Numerical Studies

This study focuses on the NMPC control of a UAM aircraft with six tiltrotors, as shown in Fig. 4. The aircraft's inertial and aerodynamic properties are listed in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. The rigid propeller pylon length is assumed to be 1 m. A comprehensive trim analysis at multiple flight conditions and the validation of the rotor tilt transition flight were investigated in a previous study (Ref. [31]) and will not be discussed here. The results showed that the aircraft model studied is stable and that the formulation can capture the essential characteristics of rotor kinematics, such as tilt angle and spin rate, regarding the overall vehicle response.



Fig. 4 Tiltrotor UAM aircraft geometry and rotor positions

Table 1 Inertial properties of UAM aircraft

Inertial property	Value	Unit
Body mass, m_B	2240.73	kg
Body moment of inertia, $I_{B,xx}$	12,000	kg m ²
Body moment of inertia, $I_{B,yy}$	9400	kg m ²
Body moment of inertia, $I_{B,zz}$	20,000	kg m ²
Rotor mass, <i>m_r</i>	4.55	kg
Rotor moment of inertia, $I_{r,yy}^e$	3.5	kg m ²
Rotor moment of inertia, $I_{r,w}^{e}$	7.0	kg m ²
Rotor moment of inertia, $I_{r,zz}^{e^{3y}}$	3.5	kg m ²

Table 2 Aerodynamic properties of UAM aircraft

Aerodynamic property	Wing	Tail
Airfoil	NACA 0012	NACA 0012
Ref. axis location ^a	25%	25%
Span, m	13.72	6.90
Sweep angle, deg	-2.306	0
Dihedral angle, deg	0	0
Chord (root/tip), m	2.075/0.970	1.080/1.080
Incidence angle, deg ^b	3.1598	1.0626

^aFrom leading-edge.

^bIncident angle with no twist.

The vehicle is first brought to a trimmed flight condition with a level flight speed of 68 m s^{-1} due north and an altitude of 304.8 m due north. This corresponds to a tip Mach number of 0.2 and a wing tip unit Reynolds number of $3.8 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^{-1}$. The chosen configuration has a lower flight speed and altitude than other similar aircraft in the literature [34,35]. In Ref. [34], a tiltrotor UAM aircraft operated at flight speeds of 168 m s^{-1} and a cruise altitude of 3000 m above sea level, resulting in a tip Mach of 0.48 and a tip unit Reynolds number of $8.99 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^{-1}$. The lower speed and altitude are selected in this work to consider the critical case of flying in a city setting closer to buildings and other obstacles.

For all cases, the NMPC input is the increment along a time-step $(\Delta \mathbf{u})$, as shown in

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}(k) = \mathbf{u}(k) - \mathbf{u}(k-1)$$

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}_{\text{target}}(k+1) = \mathbf{u}_{\text{target}}(k) - \mathbf{u}(k)$$
(18)

The input target for $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ is the difference between the desired input at the current time-step and the current input vector ($\Delta \mathbf{u}_{target}$). When the input is equal to the target, $\Delta \mathbf{u}_{target}$ equals zero. Minimizing the difference between $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ and $\Delta \mathbf{u}_{target}$ in the NMPC cost function consists of making the input equal to the target while leading to a constant condition ($\mathbf{u}(k) = \mathbf{u}(k-1)$). This approach eliminates the impact of input scale on the cost function minimization. For instance, when using $\Delta \mathbf{u}$, the difference in scale between elevator (0.01) and rotor spin rate inputs (3000) does not significantly affect the cost function minimization.

The states \mathbf{x} and output \mathbf{y} are given by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad (\mathbf{p}_{B}^{G})^{\mathrm{T}} \}$$

$$\mathbf{y}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \boldsymbol{\phi} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} \quad \boldsymbol{\psi} \quad \boldsymbol{p}_{B,x}^{G} \quad \boldsymbol{p}_{B,y}^{G} \quad \boldsymbol{p}_{B,z}^{G} \}$$
(19)

where ϕ , θ , and ψ are the roll, pitch, and yaw angles in degrees. $P_{B,x}^G$, $P_{B,y}^G$, and $P_{B,z}^G$ are the *B*'s frame inertial position measured in meters. The following gust excitation cases are investigated:

- Continuous stochastic gust (Sec. 4.1)
- Discrete gust (Sec. 4.2)

Figure 5 illustrates the gust excitation for the discrete gust case. This diagram also applies to the continuous gust but with a different



Fig. 5 Discrete gust excitation diagram

gust profile. The gust magnitude varies in the level flight path direction (north). Both continuous and discrete gusts are assessed with gust excitation applied symmetrically and asymmetrically to the lifting surfaces of the aircraft. In the symmetric case, the gust magnitude remains constant along the wing span. In the asymmetric case, the right wing and tail are subject to the gust with a 80% magnitude of the nominal one, as shown in Fig. 5.

In addition, the gust velocity profile along the prediction horizon can be fed to the NMPC, allowing it to predict a more accurate dynamic response and find a more robust control for the aircraft. In order to simplify the study, the gust magnitude at the wing root V_w (middle of the aircraft) is provided to the NMPC as the measured disturbance. This setup is feasible in practice as one can use a LiDAR sensor to measure the gust component down the path. In this study, the gust profile in the range of 68 m ahead of the aircraft is used in the NMPC, as shown in Fig. 6. This is equivalent to a prediction horizon of 1 s, as the nominal flight speed of the aircraft is 68 m s⁻¹.

The control input vector consists of

$$\mathbf{u}^{\mathrm{T}} = \{ \Delta \delta_{e} \quad \Delta \delta_{a} \quad \Delta \delta_{r} \quad \Delta \dot{\Gamma}_{3} \quad \Delta \dot{\Gamma}_{4} \}$$
(20)

where $\dot{\Gamma}_3$ and $\dot{\Gamma}_4$ are the spin rates of rotors 3 and 4, respectively. Note that rotors 3 and 4 are used as thrusters with no tilt commanded. The goal of the NMPC is to minimize the path deviation caused by gust excitation and regulate the aircraft to its trimmed flight condition. For this purpose, the input target \mathbf{u}_{target} in Eq. (18) is the trimmed flight input condition. Additionally, the reference output \mathbf{y}_{ref} is the initial output vector.

The case ID convention used here follows the format "1-23-4." "1" describes whether the simulation is open-loop (O) or NMPC (N). "2" indicates the type of gust excitation, with S for continuous



Fig. 6 Diagram of gust excitation observed by NMPC. Airplane representation approximated eVTOL aircraft length of 5.9 m.

Table 3 Case ID and descriptions

Case ID	Description
O-SS-41	OPEN—sym. turbulence σ_w of 4.1 m s ⁻¹
N-SS-41	NMPC—sym. turbulence σ_w of 4.1 m s ⁻¹
N-SS-46	NMPC—sym. turbulence σ_w of 4.6 m s ⁻¹
N-SS-51	NMPC—sym. turbulence σ_w of 5.1 m s ⁻¹
N-SS-56	NMPC—sym. turbulence σ_w of 5.6 m s ⁻¹
O-SA-41	OPEN—asym. turbulence σ_w of 4.1 m s ⁻¹
N-SA-41	NMPC—asym. turbulence σ_w of 4.1 m s ⁻¹
N-SA-46	NMPC—asym. turbulence σ_w of 4.6 m s ⁻¹
N-SA-51	NMPC—asym. turbulence σ_w of 5.1 m s ⁻¹
O-DS-17	OPEN—sym. discrete, V_{max} of 16.8 m s ⁻¹
N-DS-02	NMPC—sym. discrete, V_{max} of 1.52m s^{-1}
N-DS-07	NMPC—sym. discrete, V_{max} of 6.62 m s ⁻¹
N-DS-12	NMPC—sym. discrete, V_{max} of 11.73 m s ⁻¹
N-DS-17	NMPC—sym. discrete, V_{max} of 16.8 m s ⁻¹
O-DA-07	OPEN—asym. discrete, V_{max} of 6.62 m s ⁻¹
N-DA-02	NMPC—asym. discrete, V_{max} of 1.52 m s ⁻¹
N-DA-07	NMPC—asym. discrete, V_{max} of 6.62 m s ⁻¹
N-DA-12	NMPC—asym. discrete, V_{max} of 11.73 m s ⁻¹
N-DA-17	NMPC—asym. discrete, V_{max} of 16.8 m s ⁻¹

OPEN: open loop response, i.e., no controller.

 σ_w : vertical turbulence gust intensity.

V_{max}: maximum discrete gust velocity.

stochastic gust and D for discrete gust. "3" provides information on whether the gust was applied symmetrically (S) or asymmetrically (A) to the aircraft lifting surfaces. Lastly, "4" gives additional details such as gust turbulence intensity for continuous gust case and gust maximum vertical speed for discrete gust case. Table 3 shows the case IDs and descriptions for all simulations presented in this section. Detailed information on open loop and controller settings can be found in Table of Appendix. For all cases, the NMPC is simulated using a time-step of 0.1 s, and *fmincon* as the optimization problem solver from MATLAB's optimization toolbox.

4.1 Continuous Stochastic Gust. The gust model Dryden wind Turbulence Model of the Military Specification MIL-F-8785C is used, where the turbulence is formulated as a stochastic process defined by velocity spectra [36]. This study assumes a purely vertical gust with velocity spectra given by

$$\Phi_{w}(\omega) = \frac{\sigma_{w}^{2}L_{w}}{\pi V} \times \frac{1 + 3\left(L_{w}\frac{\omega}{V}\right)^{2}}{\left[1 + \left(L_{w}\frac{\omega}{V}\right)^{2}\right]^{2}}$$
(21)

where σ_w is the vertical turbulence intensity, L_w is the turbulence scale length, *V* is the aircraft flight speed through a frozen turbulence field, and ω is the frequency, with value inside a user-determined range. The gust velocity spectra with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m s⁻¹ is presented in Fig. 7. For altitudes below or equal to 304.8 m, which is the case assumed in this work, the turbulence scale length L_w is equal to the altitude and the vertical turbulence intensity σ_w is equal to 10% of the wind speed at 6 m altitude ($\sigma_{w,6}$). The settings used for the Dryden gusts are presented in Table 4. The four different intensity values σ_w presented are used, creating stochastic gusts of different intensities to evaluate the limits of the NMPC capabilities.

The gust time history is calculated using the inverse Fourier theory. The gust vertical component for each time-step is given by

$$V_{w,c}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\omega_{\max}} (\sqrt{\Phi_w(\omega_i)\Delta\omega} \cos(\omega_i t + \Psi))$$
(22)

where $\Delta \omega$ is the frequency step and Ψ is a random phase shift in rad. The frequencies evaluated are defined by the desired frequency range going from 0 to ω_{max} (see Table 4).

During the simulation, the system is subjected to continuous gust excitation from 2 to 30 s. The gust signals of the four vertical



Fig. 7 Stochastic gust velocity spectra with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m/s

Table 4 Dryden turbulent gust setting

Parameter	Value	Unit
Vertical turbulence intensity, σ_w	4.1, 4.6, 5.1, 5.6	$m s^{-1}$
Turbulence scale length, L_w	304.8	m
Flight speed, V	68	$m s^{-1}$
Frequency range $\{0, \omega_{\text{max}}\}$	$\{0, 10\}$	Hz
Frequency step, $\Delta \omega$	0.06	rad s ⁻¹

turbulence intensities mentioned in Table 4 are shown in Fig. 8. These gust profiles, given as vertical velocity in the global coordinate system *G*, are converted to the body-fixed frame *B* and added to local velocity calculated for the airfoil sections along the wing/tail span $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_w$ as follows:

$$V_{\infty} = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_{w} - \mathbf{C}^{BG} \begin{cases} 0\\0\\V_{w} \end{cases}$$
(23)

where C^{BG} is the rotational transformation matrix from the global to body frame and V_{∞} is the air speed in the airfoil section of Fig. 2.

As seen in Fig. 5, the tail is expected to encounter the gust after the wing. Therefore, the distance from the wing and tail is taken into consideration when determining the gust excitation on the tail nodes.



Fig. 8 Stochastic gust excitation for different turbulence intensities

First, the distance between tail and wing nodes in the north direction Δy_{tail} is determined to be 5.16 m in the wing root. This distance is then converted to time by the following operation:

$$t_{\text{tail}} = t - \frac{\Delta y_{\text{tail}}}{\dot{p}_{B,y}^G} \tag{24}$$

where *t* is the current simulation time used to determine the wing's gust excitation and $\dot{p}_{B,y}^{G}$ is the north-wise aircraft velocity. A linear interpolation is used to find the tail gust excitation corresponding to t_{tail} for the simulation time-step t_k

$$V_{\text{tail}}(t_k) = V_w(t_{k-1}) + \frac{V_w(t_k) - V_w(t_{k-1})}{t_k - t_{k-1}} \times (t_{\text{tail}} - t_{k-1})$$
(25)

whose value is subtracted from $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_w$ of the airfoil sections along the tail span according to Eq. (23).

4.1.1 Symmetric Stochastic Gust. The symmetric stochastic gust involves aircraft experiencing the gust excitations of Fig. 8 equally affecting both the right and left-hand sides of the aircraft lifting surfaces. This symmetric gust results in longitudinal aircraft motion, causing changes in altitude and pitch angle. Figures 9 and 10 display the results for aircraft flight with and without the designed NMPC controller for path correction when subjected to a gust intensity of $\sigma_w = 4.1 \text{ ms}^{-1}$. The NMPC's objective is to maintain the trimmed flight condition by keeping the system outputs constant at their initial values. The NMPC output weight for $p_{B,y}^G$ is set to zero (refer to Appendix) to exclude its values from the NMPC optimization process. The NMPC primarily controls the longitudinal flight using elevator deflection as input. The elevator input rate allowed is 50 deg/s, which is conservative when compared to the literature that reports deflection speeds of 70 deg/s or higher [37].

Figure 9 illustrates the pitch angle and flight path of the aircraft. The open loop results show a significant deviation from the intended path. However, with the assistance of the controller, the aircraft can maintain a near-constant altitude while deviating from the desired pitch angle only during gust excitation. While the NMPC achieves good path tracking, the results indicate that the optimal solution found by the NMPC differs from the initial condition. Before the gust encounter, the aircraft is trimmed with a zero pitch angle at the altitude of 304.8 m, achieved with an elevator deflection of -0.013 deg. After the aircraft hits the gust, the NMPC identifies a new optimal condition consisting of a near-constant pitch angle of 0.5 deg, resulting from an elevator deflection of -0.8 deg. This response highlights that the gust perturbation caused a shift in the trim condition, forcing the controller to prioritize either orientation or position tracking but not both simultaneously.

The NMPC's limitations are explored by analyzing the effects of increasingly intense gusts, with performance results shown in Figs. 11 and 12. These results demonstrate that the NMPC can maintain control of the flight path for gust intensities up to 5.1 m s^{-1} . In these cases, the NMPC handles the disturbances with only minor deviations in pitch angle and elevator input, which stabilize soon after the gust has passed. However, when gust intensity is raised to $5.6 \,\mathrm{m \, s^{-1}}$, the NMPC reaches the ceiling of its control capabilities. This loss of control is evidenced by an increase in pitching oscillation magnitude while the gust is active, along with a substantial decrease in altitude immediately following the gust disturbance. The elevator deflection angle also exhibits a progressive oscillation with growing amplitude, suggesting that while the NMPC attempts to control the flight path, it requires increasingly high control inputs to counteract the instability introduced by the gust. When the gust excitation is abruptly removed, the NMPC can no longer effectively correct the flight path.

The challenge of controlling an aircraft during intense turbulence is better illustrated by Fig. 13, which shows the pitch angle rate and vertical body velocity for different turbulence intensities. The



Fig. 9 Pitch angle and aircraft trajectory response during flight under symmetric stochastic gust excitation with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m/s



Fig. 10 Elevator input during flight under symmetric stochastic gust excitation with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m/s



Fig. 11 Elevator input during flight under symmetric stochastic gust excitation with different turbulence intensities

results indicate that the vertical velocity reaches higher magnitudes after the gust excitation, as a result of the loss of control by the NMPC at that moment. The main cause of this loss of control is the pitch angle rate, which shows an increase in magnitude prior to that instant, reaching its maximum at 25 s. Although the NMPC indirectly addresses these issues by maintaining the pitch angle and vertical position, it does not directly track the pitch angle rate or the vertical velocity as they are not part of the output vector. Adding the pitch angle rate as a system output could potentially help improve the control of the aircraft in challenging gust conditions. However, this addition would also increase the complexity of control, introducing another variable into the optimization problem and consequently increasing the computational cost.

4.1.2 Asymmetric Stochastic Gust. For the asymmetric gust study, a gust with the nominal magnitude is applied to the left wing and tail, while the right lifting surfaces are subjected to a gust with 80% of the nominal magnitude (see Fig. 5). As a result, the flight path is expected to deviate from the desired trimmed flight path in both the longitudinal and lateral directions. Therefore, the NMPC needs to utilize all available control inputs to control both motions and maintain the aircraft on its intended path. The control surface inputs, Euler angle system response and the flight path for both open loop and NMPC with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m s⁻¹ are presented in Figs. 14–16.

The open-loop response shows that the asymmetric stochastic gust excitation causes the aircraft to lose altitude while turning due east, caused by the higher gust excitation happening on the left side of the aircraft. Such a response is not observed in the case with a flight controller, where level flight is maintained, showing only small oscillations of pitch angle during gust excitation. These oscillations are completely suppressed after the gust ends. Since there is now a lateral motion component, both aileron and rudder inputs are used in addition to the elevator, all with reasonable input magnitudes. More specifically, the elevator is used by the NMPC for altitude and pitch control, and the aileron and rudder for roll angle, yaw angle, and lateral path control. Again, different trim conditions are observed before and after the gust disturbance, with the main deviation occurring in the pitch angle. When flying with calm air, the aircraft's Euler angle components are all zeros at the altitude of 304.8 m, achieved with an elevator deflection of -0.013 deg and no input from the aileron or rudder. After the gust disturbance, the roll and yaw angles remain near zero, but the pitch angle shifts to 0.42 deg at the same altitude, resulting from approximately zero aileron and rudder deflections and an elevator deflection of -0.67 deg.

The controller is further examined by simulating the cases with higher-intensity gusts. The results are compared in Figs. 17 and 18 for the system subjected to the control surface inputs of Fig. 19. The increase in path deviation observed is not linear with the increase in gust intensity because the turbulent time domain curves are not the same with only magnitude change. The profile of the gust velocities, particularly the values close to the end of gust excitation, directly



Fig. 12 Pitch angle and aircraft trajectory response during flight under symmetric stochastic gust excitation with different turbulence intensities



Fig. 13 Pitch angle rate and vertical body velocity during flight under symmetric stochastic gust excitation with different turbulence intensities



Fig. 14 Control surfaces inputs during flight under asymmetric stochastic gust excitation with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m/s

affects the aircraft's flight path after the gust disappears. The results indicate that the aircraft's lateral position is primarily affected by the different gust intensities. In addition, the aircraft drifts down after the gust excitation in all cases, with a greater deviation for the gust with higher intensities. However, even for the high gust intensity considered (5.1 m s^{-1}), the flight is still controllable.

4.2 Discrete "1-Cosine" Gust. The discrete gust used has a "1-cosine" shape in accordance to Ref. [36] and is given by

$$V_{w,d}\left(p_{B,y}^{G}\right) = \frac{V_{\max}}{2} \left[1 - \cos\left(\frac{\pi\left(p_{B,y}^{G} - p_{B,y}^{G}\right)}{H}\right)\right]$$
(26)

where $V_{w,d}$ is the gust vertical component for a specific northward position $p_{B,y}^G$, $p_{B,y0}^G$ is the initial y-coordinate when the aircraft encounters the gust indicated by the light dotted line in Fig. 5. The variable *H* denotes the gust gradient, which is equal to half the width of the gust wave (see Fig. 5). The literature recommends the investigation of gust gradients ranging from 9.14 to 106.7 m to determine the critical gust width [36]. Upon investigation, the case with the larger open-loop deviations is found to be the 106.7 m case, which will be used from now on. V_{max} represents the design gust velocity, which can be calculated based on a reference gust velocity associated with the flight airspeed, as well as the flight profile alleviation factor derived from flight altitude and aircraft weight information. However, in this study, V_{max} is used as a parameter to define the discrete gust intensity curve, as it is equal to the gust magnitude at the peak of the curve.



Fig. 15 Aircraft trajectory response during flight under asymmetric stochastic gust excitation with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m/s



Fig. 16 Euler angle response during flight under asymmetric stochastic gust excitation with turbulence intensity of 4.1 m/s

The discrete gust settings are detailed in Table 5. The gust is expected to first interact with the aircraft at 136 m north, which is anticipated to occur 2 s into the simulation, assuming a constant flight speed of 68 m s^{-1} . The resulting gust curves for the four maximum gust velocities mentioned in Table 5 are shown in Fig. 20. Table 3 summarizes the case IDs and descriptions discussed in this section with detailed NMPC settings presented in Table 6 of Appendix.

The discrete gust curves shown in Fig. 20 are subtracted from $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_w$ of the airfoil sections along the wing/tail span according to Eq. (23). Similar to before, the gust excitation at the tail nodes is calculated taking into account the distance of the tail nodes to the wing root, denoted as Δy_{tail} . The discrete gust excitation described in Eq. (26) depends on the north aircraft position $p_{B,y}^G$. Therefore, simplifying the determination of the tail gust can be achieved by substituting $p_{B,y}^G$ in Eq. (26) with the north position of the tail, given by

$$p_{B,y,\text{tail}}^G = p_{B,y}^G - \Delta y_{\text{tail}} \tag{27}$$

where the distance of the tail nodes to the wing root $\Delta y_{\text{tail}} = 5.16 \text{ m}$ and p_{By}^G is the northward position of the aircraft wing root in the global frame.

4.2.1 Symmetric Discrete Gust. The gust excites the lifting surfaces of the aircraft equally on both sides, resulting in a longitudinal aircraft motion that must be controlled by the NMPC, similar to the case discussed in Sec. 4.1.1.

The results for the open loop and NMPC simulations are compared in Figs. 21 and 22 for the case with a maximum gust



Fig. 17 Aircraft trajectory response during flight under asymmetric stochastic gust excitation with different turbulence intensities



Fig. 18 Euler angle response during flight under asymmetric stochastic gust excitation with different turbulence intensities



Fig. 19 Control surfaces inputs during flight under asymmetric stochastic gust excitation with different turbulence intensities

velocity of 16.8 m s⁻¹. The open loop response shows oscillation of both pitch angle and altitude caused by the gust excitation, which is not suppressed by the end of the simulation. On the other hand, the close loop simulation with NMPC can maintain a nearly constant altitude with a slight oscillation of altitude during gust excitation. However, Fig. 21 shows a gradual increase in the elevator input magnitude after gust excitation, reaching -1.86 deg by the end of

Table 5 Discrete 1-cos gust setting

Parameter	Value	Unit
Maximum gust velocity, V_{max} Gust gradient, H Location of gust start, $p_{B,y0}^G$	1.52, 6.62, 11.73, 16.8 106.7 136	m s ⁻¹ m m



Fig. 20 Discrete gust excitation for different 1-cos curve intensities



Fig. 21 Elevator input during flight with 16.8 m/s maximum magnitude symmetric discrete gust excitation

the simulation. This results in a steady increase in the pitch angle, reaching 1.18 deg at the end of the simulation. Additionally, the pitch angle deviation during gust excitation is higher than the open-loop response. The nonconstant elevator input and the resulting pitch angle response after excitation indicate that, while the controller successfully maintains a constant altitude, the aircraft does not return to the initial pitch angle or achieve a stable input/ output condition, meaning the trimmed flight is not re-established.

The gust intensity is reduced to determine if a less severe gust leads to less deviation in pitch angle and elevator input. That is what is observed in Figs. 23 and 24, which compares the controller results for the gust intensities mentioned in Table 5. However, even with a small gust magnitude of 1.52 m s^{-1} , some deviation is still observed. The results indicate that gust intensity has a more significant



Fig. 22 Pitch angle and aircraft trajectory response during flight with 16.8 m/s maximum magnitude symmetric discrete gust excitation



Fig. 23 Elevator input during flight with symmetric discrete gust excitation for different maximum magnitudes

influence on pitch angle control compared to altitude. This is because the altitude deviation from the path shows minimal changes for the different gust intensity cases.

4.2.2 Asymmetric Discrete Gust. In order to study the effects of uneven discrete gusts on NMPC effectiveness, the left wing and tail sides experience full gusts, while the right side experiences 80% of



Fig. 25 Control surfaces inputs during flight with 6.62 m/s maximum magnitude asymmetric discrete gust excitation



Fig. 24 Pitch angle and aircraft trajectory response during flight with symmetric discrete gust excitation for different maximum magnitudes

Downloaded from http://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/computationalnonlinear/article-pdf/doi/10.1115/1.4068426/7478715/cnd_020_07_071001.pdf by University Of Alabama Tuscaloosa, Weihua Su on 28 April 2025



Fig. 26 Euler angle response during flight with 6.62 m/s maximum magnitude asymmetric discrete gust excitation

the gust velocity, similar to the asymmetric stochastic gust discussed in Sec. 4.1.2. This is expected to cause the aircraft to deviate from its intended flight path in both longitudinal and lateral planes, which must be controlled by the NMPC. The NMPC takes advantage of all control surfaces to do so (Fig. 25). Once again, the elevator input does not return to its initial value. Instead, it exhibits a gradual increase in magnitude, ultimately reaching -0.45 deg. This behavior is not observed for the aileron and is only observed to a lesser extent for the rudder, which reaches -0.03 deg. Although the pitch angle deviates from its initial value after gust excitation (initially zero), reaching 0.28 deg (see Fig. 26), the aircraft maintains a nearly constant flight path, as illustrated in Fig. 27, with a minimal east position deviation of 1.23 m by the end of the flight.

When comparing the responses for different gust excitation magnitudes (Figs. 28-30), the results show that an increase in gust



Fig. 28 Control surfaces inputs during flight with asymmetric discrete gust excitation for different maximum magnitudes

excitation causes an increase in pitch and yaw angle deviations after gust excitation. Consequently, a deviation of lateral position and altitude is also observed, showing that a level flight was not achieved. Even with such deviation, the NMPC greatly improves the stability and path tracking for the aircraft compared to the open loop response.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper presented the implementation of a NMPC for an urban air mobility aircraft during level flight under gust excitation. The performance of the NMPC was assessed for continuous stochastic and discrete "1-cosine" gust control. In both cases, the gust was applied symmetrically to both sides of the aircraft's lifting surfaces (symmetric gust) and with a higher intensity on the left side (asymmetric gust). The findings showed that the NMPC effectively



Fig. 27 Aircraft trajectory response during flight with 6.62 m/s maximum magnitude asymmetric discrete gust excitation



Fig. 29 Euler angle response during flight with asymmetric discrete gust excitation for different maximum magnitudes

minimized flight path deviation caused by the stochastic gust for turbulence intensity levels up to 4.6 m s^{-1} . However, it was observed that while a trimmed flight was achieved following the gust excitation, the new trim condition differed from the initial one. After the gust, the elevator input adjusted to a new value, resulting in a different pitch angle, although the altitude was maintained. This suggests that the gust disturbance caused a shift in the trimmed condition. In this new condition, the NMPC prioritized maintaining the flight path, which could not be achieved simultaneously with meeting the orientation targets (Euler angles). For higher turbulence intensities of 5.1 m s^{-1} , the NMPC failed to maintain the desired flight path, indicating a limit at which it is no longer effective. The decrease in control effectiveness can be linked to an increased pitch rate. Including this parameter in the controller output vector can expand the range of gust intensities for which the control is still effective for path tracking. A similar pattern was observed in the case of discrete gusts, where the NMPC successfully maintained the flight path for both symmetric and asymmetric gusts with deviations in elevator input and pitch angle response. In this scenario, a trimmed flight after the gust disturbance was not achieved. The elevator input exhibited a gradual increase, leading to a corresponding rise in pitch angle magnitude. Similarly, the NMPC prioritized path tracking, achieving good performance at the expense of reduced accuracy in maintaining the desired aircraft orientation. Additionally, an increase in path deviation was observed with higher discrete gust intensities, resulting in larger pitch angles and eastward path deviations. However, in all gust control cases studied, the NMPC results showed significant improvement in path tracking compared to the open-loop response, which exhibited significant altitude drop and severe aircraft turning due east in the cases of asymmetric gust.

The high computational cost of NMPC continues to be a significant challenge for the proposed method. At present, a 60 s flight simulation requires 8 h of computation time, which hinders its use for real-time flight control. One potential solution is using a neural network-based NMPC, which can reduce the time required to obtain the optimal NMPC input by employing a neural network approximation of the aircraft model for future predictions instead of relying on the full system model. This approach is currently being explored for future research.

Data Availability Statement

The datasets generated and supporting the findings of this article are obtainable from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Nomenclature

B = body coordinate frame
C_{BB} = damping matrix
\mathbf{C}^{GB} = rotational matrix—body to global
G = global coordinate frame
H = discrete gust gradient
$I_B =$ body moment of inertia, kg m ²
I_r^e = rotor moment of inertia, kg m ²
J = cost function
L_w = turbulence scale length
$m_B = \text{body mass, kg}$
$m_r = $ rotor mass, kg
$\mathbf{M}_{BB} = $ inertia matrix
n = control horizon
p = prediction horizon
$\mathbf{p}_{G/B}$ = aircraft mass center in O_B , m
- /



Fig. 30 Aircraft trajectory response during flight with asymmetric discrete gust excitation for different maximum magnitudes

$\mathbf{p}_{B}^{G} = \text{inertial position vector of } O_{B}, \text{ m}$ $p_{B,y0}^{G} = y\text{-coord. at which aircraft enters discrete gust}$ $\mathbf{r} = \text{output reference vector}$ $\mathbf{R}_{B} = \text{aircraft load vector}$ $\mathbf{R}^{\text{ext}} = \text{external loads}$ $\mathbf{R}^{\text{grav}} = \text{gravity load}$		$\pm \Delta \mathbf{u}_{lim}$		l	I	1	{5,5,5,100,100}
$\mathbf{R}^{gyro} = gyroscopic loads$ $\mathbf{R}^{iner} = inertial loads$ $\mathbf{R}^{rate} = induced moment due to tiltrotors$ $s^{i} = variable i NMPC \text{ scale factor}$ $\mathbf{u} = system \text{ control inputs}$ $u_{j,target} = target of the jth input$ $U_{i} = quadratic problem decision vector.$		±u _{lim}	I	l	I	l	$\{5, 5, 5, 100, 100\}$
$\mathbf{v}_k = quadratic problem decision vector \mathbf{u}_{\min/max} = input limits vector V = aircraft flight speed through a frozen turbulence field \mathbf{v}_B = \text{translational velocity vector, m s}^{-1}V_w, V_t = \text{gust vertical velocity at the wing and tail}V_{\max} = \text{discrete gust velocity}w^i = \text{variable } i \text{ NMPC weight}\mathbf{x} = \text{system states}$		Input weight ω^u	I	I	I	I	{0.1,0.1,0.1,0.1,0.1}
$\mathbf{y} = \text{system outputs}$ $\mathbf{\beta} = \text{rigid-body velocity vector}$ $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \text{rotor spin angle, deg}$ $\delta_e, \delta_a, \delta_r = \text{elevator, aileron, and rudder angles, deg}$ $\Delta \mathbf{u}_{\min/\max} = \text{input rate limits vector}$ $\Delta y_{\text{tail}} = \text{northwise distance between tail and wing nodes}$ $\Delta \omega = \text{turbulent gust frequency step}$ $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \text{quaternions vector}$ $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \text{nitch angle, deg}$	lysis	Output weight ω^{y}	I	I	I	I	$\{0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5\}$
$\theta = \text{pich angle, deg}$ $\theta_B = \text{rigid-body rotation angles, rad}$	n ana	и	I				-1
$\Delta = 1000$ m angle, deg $\sigma_w = $ vertical turbulence intensity	itatio	d					} 10
$ \phi = \text{roll angle, deg} $ $ \Phi = \text{Euler angle vector} $ $ \Phi_w(\omega) = \text{gust with velocity spectra} $ $ \psi = \text{yaw angle, deg} $ $ \Psi = \text{random gust phase shift in rad} $ $ \omega = \text{turbulent gust frequency} $ $ \omega_R = \text{angular velocity vector, rad s}^{-1} $	tting for gust exc	Input vector u	Eq. (8)	Eq. (8)	Eq. (8)	Eq. (8)	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4,$
Ω_{ζ} = rigid-body angular velocities function Appendix: Nonlinear Model Predictive Controller	Table 6 Se	put vector y	$\left(,p_{B,x}^{G},p_{B,y}^{G},p_{B,z}^{G} ight) $	$\left(p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G \right)$	$\left(p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G\right)$	$\left(p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G\right)$	$\left(p_{B,x}^{G}, p_{B,y}^{G}, p_{B,z}^{G} \right)$
Table 6 below presents the summary of the NMPC settings for		Out	ϕ, θ, ψ	ϕ, θ, ψ	ϕ, θ, ψ	ϕ, θ, ψ	ϕ, θ, ψ
each simulation case presented herein.		s	<u> </u>	~~ _			<u> </u>
• Case ID—1-23-4		dt,	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
- 1: open-loop (O) or NMPC (N) simulations - 2: type of gust excitation. S for continuous stochastic gust and		t_f , s	45	45	45	45	45
D for discrete gust - 3: informs of symmetric (S) or asymmetric (A) gust excitation - 4: additional information		l angle, deg	0,0,0}	0, 0, 0, 0), 0, 0, 0}), 0, 0, 0}	0,0,0}
 Description Tiltrotor initial angle—90 deg for upward <i>t_f</i>—length of simulation in seconds <i>dt</i>—simulation time step in seconds 		Rotor initia	{90,90,0	{90,90,1	{90, 90, 1	{90,90,1	{90, 90, 1
 Input vector—applicable for NMPC. Open-loop uses all system inputs <i>p</i>—NMPC prediction horizon <i>n</i>—NMPC control horizon 		Description	1 loop results ymmetric tur- tce intensity	r 4.1 m s ⁻ 1 loop results symmetric llence inten- . of 4.1 m s ⁻¹	i loop results ymmetric dis- gust with velocity of	n s 1 loop results symmetric ete gust with velocity of	The second seco
• Output weight ω —weights for each y variable before and after control failure			Oper for sy buler	σ _w of Oper for as turbu	Oper Oper for s: crete max.	for a: discr max.	symr lence of 4.1

after control failure

• Output weight ω^u —weights for each u variable before and

 $\pm u_{lim}$ —upper and lower limits for NMPC inputs

 $\pm \Delta u_{lim}$ —upper and lower limits for NMPC input rate

•

•

Transactions of the ASME

N-SS-41

0-DA-07

0-DS-17

0-SA-41

0-SS-41

Case ID

						Table 6 (continued)						
Case ID	Description	Rotor initial angle, deg	t_f, \mathbf{s}	dt, s	Output vector y	Input vector u	d	и	Output weight ω^{y}	Input weight ω^{u}	±u _{lim}	$\pm \Delta u_{lim}$
N-SS-46	NMPC results for symmetric turbu- lence intensity σ_w of 4 cm s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G\right\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_{e},\delta_{a},\delta_{r},\dot{\Gamma}_{3},\dot{\Gamma}_{4}\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-SS-51	NMPC results for symmetric turbu- lence intensity σ_w of 5.1 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	$\{5, 5, 5, 100, 100\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-SS-56	NMPC results for symmetric turbu- lence intensity σ_w of 5.6 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-SA-41	NMPC results for asymmetric turbu- lence intensity σ_w of 4.1 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e, \delta_a, \delta_r, \dot{\Gamma}_3, \dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	$\{5, 5, 5, 100, 100\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-SA-46	NMPC results for asymmetric turbu- lence intensity σ_w of 4.6 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, heta,\psi,p_{B,x}^G,p_{B,y}^G,p_{B,z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e, \delta_a, \delta_r, \dot{\Gamma}_3, \dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	$\{5, 5, 5, 100, 100\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-SA-51	NMPC results for asymmetric turbu- lence intensity σ_w of 5 1 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e, \delta_a, \delta_r, \dot{\Gamma}_3, \dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	$\{5, 5, 5, 100, 100\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-DS-02	NMPC results for symmetric discrete gust with max. velocity of 1.52 m	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p^G_{B,\gamma}, p^G_{B,\gamma}, p^G_{B,\gamma}, P^G_{B,z} ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-DS-07	NMPC results for symmetric discrete gust with max. velocity of 6.62 m	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p^G_{B,\gamma}, p^G_{B,\gamma}, p^G_{B,\gamma}, P^G_{B,z} ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-DS-12	NMPC results for symmetric discrete gust with max. velocity of 11.73 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p^G_{B,\gamma}, p^G_{B,\gamma}, p^G_{B,z} ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-DS-17	NMPC results for symmetric discrete gust with max. velocity of 16.8 m	{90, 90, 0, 0, 0, 0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, heta,\psi,p_{B,x}^G,p_{B,y}^G,p_{B,z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1 {	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1}	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
N-DA-02	NMPC results for asymmetric dis- crete gust with max. velocity of 1.52 m s^{-1}	{90, 90, 0, 0, 0, 0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B, r}^G, p_{B, y}^G, p_{B, z}^G ight\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10	1	0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}

										;		
D	Description	Rotor initial angle, deg	t_f , s	dt, s	Output vector y	Input vector u	p r		Output weight ω^{y}	Input weight ω ^u	$\pm \mathbf{u}_{lim}$	$\pm \Delta u_{lim}$
-07 -07 -07	NMPC results for asymmetric dis- rete gust with max. velocity of 5.62 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi,\theta,\psi,p_{B,v}^G,p_{B,v}^G,p_{B,z}^G\right\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_e,\delta_a,\delta_r,\dot{\Gamma}_3,\dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10 1	0}	.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}
-12 1	NMPC results for asymmetric dis- crete gust with max. velocity of [1.73 m s ⁻¹	{90, 90, 0, 0, 0, 0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^G, p_{B,y}^G, p_{B,z}^G\right\}$	$\Delta \{\delta_e, \delta_a, \delta_r, \dot{\Gamma}_3, \dot{\Gamma}_4\}$	10 1	0}	.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	$\{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1\}$	$\{5, 5, 5, 100, 100\}$	{5,5,5,100,100}
-17 1 6 7 1 1	NMPC results for asymmetric dis- arete gust with nax. velocity of [6.8 m s ⁻¹	{90,90,0,0,0,0}	45	0.1	$\left\{\phi, \theta, \psi, p_{B,x}^{g}, p_{B,y}^{g}, p_{B,z}^{g}\right\}$	$\Delta\{\delta_{e},\delta_{a},\delta_{r},\dot{\Gamma}_{3},\dot{\Gamma}_{4}\}$	10 1	0}	.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0, 5}	{0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1}	{5,5,5,100,100}	{5,5,5,100,100}

References

- Tuncer, U. A., 2022, "Urban Air Mobility Industry Outlook," IGLUS Q., 8(1), pp. 18–26.
- [2] Goyal, R., Reiche, C., Fernando, C., Serrao, J., Kimmel, S., Cohen, A., and Shaheen, S., 2018, "Urban Air Mobility (UAM) Market Study," National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC, Technical Report No. HQ-E-DAA-TN65181.
- [3] Reiche, C., McGillen, C., Siegel, J., and Brody, F., 2019, "Are We Ready to Weather Urban Air Mobility UAM?," Integrated Communications, Navigation and Surveillance Conference (ICNS), Herndon, VA, Apr. 9–11, pp. 1–7.
- [4] Holden, J., and Goel, N., 2016, "Fast-Forwarding to a Future of On-Demand Urban Air Transportation," Uber Technologies, San Francisco, CA, accessed Apr. 21, 2025, https://evtol.news/__media/PDFs/UberElevateWhitePaperOct2016.pdf
- [5] Zhou, Y., Zhao, H., and Liu, Y., 2020, "An Evaluative Review of the VTOL Technologies for Unmanned and Manned Aerial Vehicles," Comput. Commun., 149, pp. 356–369.
- [6] Straubinger, A., Rothfeld, R., Shamiyeh, M., Büchter, K.-D., Kaiser, J., and Plötner, K. O., 2020, "An Overview of Current Research and Developments in Urban Air Mobility—Setting the Scene for UAM Introduction," J. Air Transp. Manage., 87, p. 101852.
- [7] Kim, H. D., Perry, A. T., and Ansell, P. J., 2018, "A Review of Distributed Electric Propulsion Concepts for Air Vehicle Technology," AIAA Paper No. 2018-4998.
- [8] Braman, G. D., 2018, "Aircraft Accidents: Investigating Human Error," Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium (RAMS), Reno, NV, Jan. 22–25, pp. 1–6.
- [9] Zhao, Y., Guo, J., Bai, C., and Zheng, H., 2021, "Reinforcement Learning-Based Collision Avoidance Guidance Algorithm for Fixed-Wing UAVs," Complexity, 2021(1), p. 8818013.
- [10] Zhang, T., Barakos, G. N., Filippone, A., and Furqan, M., 2024, "High-Fidelity Aero-Acoustic Evaluations of a Heavy-Lift eVTOL in Hover," J. Sound Vib., 584, p. 118453.
- [11] Farazi, N. P., and Zou, B., 2024, "Planning Electric Vertical Takeoff and Landing Aircraft eVTOL-Based Package Delivery With Community Noise Impact Considerations," Transp. Res. Part E: Logist. Transp. Rev., 189, p. 103661.
- [12] Kumar, S. N. T., Duba, P. K., Mannam, N. P. B., Mutnuri, V. S., and Rajalakshmi, P., 2024, "Aeroacoustics and Vibration Analysis of Multirotor eVTOL for Sustainable Urban Air Mobility (UAM)," IEEE Sens. Lett., 8(5), pp. 1–4.
- [13] Kim, J., Gadsden, S. A., and Wilkerson, S. A., 2020, "A Comprehensive Survey of Control Strategies for Autonomous Quadrotors," Can. J. Electr. Comput. Eng., 43(1), pp. 3–16.
- [14] Hoffmann, G., Huang, H., Waslander, S., and Tomlin, C., 2007, "Quadrotor Helicopter Flight Dynamics and Control: Theory and Experiment," AIAA Paper No. 2007–6461.
- [15] Zhang, J., Sun, L., Qu, X., and Wang, L., 2018, "Time-Varying Linear Control for Tiltrotor Aircraft," Chin. J. Aeronaut., 31(4), pp. 632–642.
- [16] Bao, X., Kirsch, N., Dodson, A., and Sharma, N., 2019, "Model Predictive Control of a Feedback-Linearized Hybrid Neuroprosthetic System With a Barrier Penalty," ASME J. Comput. Nonlinear Dyn., 14(10), p. 101009.
- [17] Boruah, N., and Roy, B. K., 2020, "A Novel Event-Triggered Active Model Predictive Control for Synchronization of Discrete-Time Chaotic Systems," ASME J. Comput. Nonlinear Dyn., 15(10), p. 101006.
- [18] Camacho, E. F., and Bordons, C., 2007, Model Predictive Control (Advanced Textbooks in Control and Signal Processing), 2nd ed., Springer, London, UK.
- [19] Kouvaritakis, B., and Cannon, M., 2016, Model Predictive Control: Classical, Robust and Stochastic (Advanced Textbooks in Control and Signal Processing), Springer, Cham, Switzerland.
- [20] Qin, S. J., and Badgwell, T. A., 2003, "A Survey of Industrial Model Predictive Control Technology," Control Eng. Pract., 11(7), pp. 733–764.
- [21] García, C. E., Prett, D. M., and Morari, M., 1989, "Model Predictive Control: Theory and Practice—A Survey," Automatica, 25(3), pp. 335–348.
 [22] Morari, M., and Lee, J. H., 1999, "Model Predictive Control: Past, Present and
- [22] Morari, M., and Lee, J. H., 1999, "Model Predictive Control: Past, Present and Future," Comput. Chem. Eng., 23(4–5), pp. 667–682.
 [23] Mayne, D. Q., Rawlings, J. B., Rao, C. V., and Scokaert, P. O. M., 2000,
- [23] Mayne, D. Q., Rawlings, J. B., Rao, C. V., and Scokaert, P. O. M., 2000, "Constrained Model Predictive Control: Stability and Optimality," Automatica, 36(6), pp. 789–814.
- [24] Allgöwer, F., and Zheng, A., eds., 2000, Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (Progress in Systems and Control Theory, Vol. 26), Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, Switzerland.
- [25] Kouvaritakis, B., and Cannon, M., 2001, Non-Linear Predictive Control: Theory and Practice, The Institution of Engineering and Technology, Stevenage, UK.
- [26] Bordons, C., Garcia-Torres, F., and Ridao, M. A., 2020, "Model Predictive Control Fundamentals," *Model Predictive Control of Microgrids (Progress in Systems and Control Theory)*, Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 25–44.
- [27] He, T., and Su, W., 2023, "Robust Control of Gust-Induced Vibration of Highly Flexible Aircraft," Aerosp. Sci. Technol., 143, p. 108703.
- [28] Meradi, D., Benselama, Z. A., and Hedjar, R., 2022, "A Predictive Sliding Mode Control for Quadrotor's Tracking Trajectory Subject to Wind Gusts and Uncertainties," Int. J. Electr. Comput. Eng. (IJECE), 12(5), pp. 4861–4875.
 [29] Nunes, J. S. M., Su, W., and He, T., 2025, "Vibration Suppression and Trajectory
- [29] Nunes, J. S. M., Su, W., and He, T., 2025, "Vibration Suppression and Trajectory Tracking With Nonlinear Model Predictive Control for Urban Air Mobility Aircraft," ASME J. Dyn. Syst., Meas., Control, 147(4), p. 041010.
- [30] Nunes, J. S. M., Su, W., and He, T., 2024, "Nonlinear Model Predictive Control for Stabilizing Tiltrotor Urban Air Mobility Aircraft Under Control Effector Failures," Aerosp. Sci. Technol., (submitted).
- [31] Su, W., Qu, S., Zhu, G., Swei, S. S.-M., Hashimoto, M., and Zeng, T., 2022, "Modeling and Control of a Class of Urban Air Mobility Tiltrotor Aircraft," Aerosp. Sci. Technol., 124, p. 107561.

- [32] Takács, G., and Rohal'-Ilkiv, B., 2012, Model Predictive Vibration Control: Efficient Constrained MPC Vibration Control for Lightly Damped Mechanical
- Structures, Springer, London, UK.
 [33] Giesseler, H. G., Kopf, M., Varuti, P., Faulwasser, T., and Findeisen, R., 2012, "Model Predictive Control for Gust Load Alleviation," IFAC Proc. Vol., 45(17), pp. 27–32.
 [34] Liu, Y., Druyor, C. T., and Wang, L., 2023, "High-Fidelity Analysis of Lift+Cruise VTOL Urban Air Mobility Concept Aircraft," AIAA Paper No. 2023–3671.

- [35] Johnson, W., and Silva, C., 2022, "NASA Concept Vehicles and the Engineering of Advanced Air Mobility Aircraft," Aeronaut. J., 126(1295), pp. 59–91.
 [36] U.S. Department of Defense, 1980, "Flying Qualities of Piloted Airplanes," US Military Specification, Washington DC, Report No. MIL-F-8785C.
 [37] Grauer, J. A., Morelli, E. A., and Murri, D. G., 2017, "Flight-Test Techniques for Quantifying Pitch Rate and Angle-of-Attack Rate Dependencies," J. Aircr., 54(6), pp. 2367–2377.