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HIGHLIGHTS

\begin{itemize}
  \item A sliding surface extending from integer-order to fractional-order is introduced.
  \item The stability of FONNs is analyzed by means of the Lyapunov function.
  \item A composite learning law is designed for FONNs under the IE condition.
\end{itemize}
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Parameter estimations for SMC and CLSMC.
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ABSTRACT

In this work, a sliding mode control (SMC) method and a composite learning SMC (CLSMC) method are proposed to solve the synchronization problem of chaotic fractional-order neural networks (FONNs). A sliding mode surface and an adaptive law are constructed to update parameter estimation. The SMC ensures that the synchronization error asymptotically tends to zero under a strict permanent excitation (PE) condition. To reduce its rigor, online recording data together with instantaneous data is used to define a prediction error about the uncertain parameter. Both synchronization error and prediction error are used to construct a composite learning law. The proposed CLSMC method can ensure that the synchronization error asymptotically approaches zero, and it can accurately estimate the uncertain parameter. The above results obtained in the CLSMC method only requires an interval-excitation (IE) condition which can be easily satisfied. Finally, comparative results reveal the control effects of the two proposed methods.
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Introduction

Fractional calculus has a history of more than 300 years. Recently, fractional calculus as an important part of mathematics, has been studied by more and more scientists [1,2]. Fractional-order systems that are described by fractional-order differential formulas have applications in different fields, such as bioengineering, thermal diffusion, electronics, robotics, and physics [3–7]. The fractional calculus has some unique properties including memory and inheritance, which are useful to model nonlinear systems. Therefore, many scientists apply fractional-order calculus to neural networks (NNs) to construct fractional-order NNs (FONNs), with the goal of showing more clearly the dynamic behavior of neurons in NNs. In [8], Arena et al. gave a fractional-order cellular NNs. In [9], Petráš introduced a fractional-order 3-cell network to show the limit cycle and stable orbit under various parameters. In addition, FONNs have important applications in parameter estimation domain [10,11]. It has been shown bifurcations and chaos exist in FONNs [8,12]. A fractional-order Hopfield neural model was analyzed in [13], and the stability of this model was studied by using energy-like functions. The synchronization problem of fractional-order chaotic NNs was analyzed by means of Mittag-Leffler function and linear feedback control in [14], fractional-order chaotic systems was investigated by means of adaptive fuzzy synchronization control based on backstepping in [15,16] and the adaptive synchronization problem of uncertain FONNs was studied by using the Lyapunov approach in [17]. Some interesting control methods are proposed for FONN in above literature, however, the mismatched unknown parameters are not considered. If mismatched parameters appear in a FONN, these methods may not have good control performance. Therefore, it is worthwhile to find a good method to solve this problem.

Among many usually used control methods, sliding mode control (SMC) has been studied by more and more scholars in recent years [18–21]. The SMC method is an effective robust nonlinear control strategy, one of its main characteristics is the switch of control law. The composite learning method is crucial to ensure that accurate parameter estimation are obtained under an interval-

excitation (IE) condition which is lower than the PE condition. However, the composite learning control methods previously seen are extensively used in integer-order nonlinear systems. With respect to fractional-order systems, some preliminary works have been done, for example, in [18,37]. A composite learning adaptive dynamic surface was used to study fractional-order nonlinear systems (FONNs) in [37] and composite learning adaptive SMC was used to study FONNs in [18]. The above two works provide a clear idea to use composite learning method to analyze the control of FONNs in the future. Whereas, in [18,37], only SISO systems are considered. Therefore, it is necessary and challenging to apply composite learning to synchronize MIMO FONNs.

Based on above analysis, this work considers the synchronization control for a class of FONNs through SMC and CLSMC. First, a sliding surface is introduced, and then a traditional SMC is shown to ensure that the synchronization error asymptotically approaches zero. In order to get exact errors of the uncertain parameters, a CLSMC method is proposed. The stability studies for the SMC and the CLSMC methods are proved by the integral-order Lyapunov stability criteria. Last but not least, the control capability of the two methods is compared through theoretical analysis and simulation results. Compared to some previous works, such as [18,37], the contributions of this study contain: (1) A sliding surface extending from integer-order to fractional-order is introduced; (2) The stability of FONNs is analyzed by means of the Lyapunov function; (3) A composite learning law is defined to design the CLSMC for FONNs. The convergence of synchronization errors and the accuracy of parameter estimation in FONNs are sufficient to ensured under the IE condition is lower than the PE condition. Compared with the traditional SMC, the CLSMC method has better control ability and can estimate parameter more accurately.

The article is divided into the following parts. Some of the fractional-order calculus preliminaries are given in Section “Preliminaries”. Section “Adaptive sliding mode control design” gives the description of the problem, fractional sliding surface design, the concepts of IE and PE, and the construction of the SMC and CLSMC. Section “Simulation example” shows the simulation example to compare the effects of the SMC method and the CLSMC method. Finally, Section “Conclusions” concludes this work.

Preliminaries

Fractional-order calculus is an extension of integer-order calculus, and the definition of Caputo’s fractional-order integral is

\[ \int_0^t f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \int_0^t (t - \tau)^{a-1} f(t) \, d\tau. \]

where \( \Gamma(s) = \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt \).

The Caputo’s fractional-order differential is

\[ D_0^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n - \alpha)} \int_0^t (t - \tau)^{n-\alpha-1} f^{(n)}(\tau) \, d\tau, \]

where \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( n - 1 < \alpha < n \). For ease of use, we will assume that \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) hereafter. Therefore, (2) is expressed as

\[ D_0^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)} \int_0^t (t - \tau)^{-\alpha} f'(\tau) \, d\tau. \]

Lemma 1. If \( x(t) \in C^1[0,T] \) for some \( T > 0 \), then it holds:
\[ I^\alpha D^\beta x(t) = x(t) - x(0), \quad \text{and} \]
\[ D^\gamma I^\delta x(t) = x(t). \]

Lemma 2. Caputo’s fractional calculus satisfies
\[ D^\gamma (\lambda v_1(t) + \mu v_2(t)) = \lambda D^\gamma v_1(t) + \mu D^\gamma v_2(t), \]
where \( \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R} \).

Problem statement
The dynamics of fractional-order cellular NNs are written as the following differential equations:
\[ D^\gamma z_i(t) = -a z_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij}(t)f_j (\zeta_j(t)) + H_i + \psi^T_i(\zeta(t)) \theta, \quad \text{where} \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \ z \text{ is the fractional order,} \ n \text{ is the number of} \]
units in the NN, \( \zeta(t) \) represents the state of the \( i \)-th unit at time \( t \), \( b_{ij}(t) \) is the connection weight of the \( j \)-th neuron on the \( i \)-th neuron which is assumed to be disturbed, \( f_j(\zeta) \) is a nonlinear function, \( a_i \) corresponds to the rate with which the neuron will reset its potential to the resting state when disconnected from the network, \( H_i \) represents the external input, \( \psi : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^u \) with \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) is a known vector function, and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^u \) is an unknown constant vector to be estimated.

According to the concept of driver-response, we set the system (7) as the drive FENN, and consider the response FENN as:
\[ D^\gamma \eta_i(t) = -a \eta_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij}(t)f_j (\eta_j(t)) + H_i + u_i(t), \quad \text{where} \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \]

Definition 1. A signal \( \psi(t) \) is of IE on \( [T - \zeta_0, T] \) for \( \zeta_0 > 0 \) and \( T > \zeta_0 \) if
\[ \int_{T - \zeta_0}^{T} \psi^T(\zeta) \psi(\zeta) d\zeta \geq \forall \epsilon < \epsilon \text{ for } \psi \in \mathbb{R}^l, \zeta_0 > 0 \text{ and all } t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \]

Definition 2. A signal \( \psi(t) \) is of PE if
\[ \int_{T - \zeta_0}^{T} \psi^T(\zeta) \psi(\zeta) d\zeta \geq \forall \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_2 \text{ for } \psi \in \mathbb{R}^l, \zeta_0 > 0 \text{ and all } t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \]

There are two indices that are usually used to describe the control performance, i.e., the integral squared error (ISE) and the mean squared error (MSE), which can be defined as follows.

The ISE:
\[ ISE = \int_{0}^{\infty} e^2(t) dt, \quad \text{where} \ e(t) \text{ is the error between the actual output and the expected output.} \]

The MSE:
\[ MSE = \int_{0}^{\infty} t e^2(t) dt, \quad \text{where} \ e(t) \text{ is the error between the actual output and the expected output.} \]

Adaptive sliding mode control and stability analysis

The synchronization error is defined as:
\[ e(t) = \eta(t) - \zeta(t). \]

The parameter estimation error is expressed by
\[ \hat{\theta}(t) = \theta(t) - \theta, \quad \text{with} \ \theta(t) \text{ being the evaluation of} \ \theta. \]

With the error dynamics between the response system (8) and the drive system (7) can be written as:
\[ D^\gamma e_i(t) = -a_i e_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij}(t) [f_j(\eta_j(t)) - f_j(\zeta_j(t))] + u_i(t) - \psi^T_i(\zeta(t)) \theta. \]

In this part, a sliding mode control method with adaptive law of \( \hat{\theta}(t) \) is proposed to ensure the convergence of synchronization error \( e(t) \) and parameter estimation error \( \hat{\theta}(t) \). Here we will introduced the following fractional sliding surface:
\[ S_i(t) = \delta t^{\gamma - 2} e_i(t), \]
where \( \delta \) is chosen such that \( S_i(t) \) converges quickly. As an extension of the integral sliding surface, the fractional sliding surface (14) is the same as integral SMC, so the control action can be realized through two steps: the system state variables goes into the sliding surface and then stays on it.

It follows from (14) that
\[ \dot{S}_i(t) = \delta t^{\gamma - 2} \dot{e}_i(t) \]
where \( \dot{\theta} \) is the fractional order, \( \psi \) is the connection weight of the \( j \)-th neuron on the \( i \)-th neuron which is assumed to be disturbed, \( f_j(\zeta) \) is a nonlinear function, \( a_i \) corresponds to the rate with which the neuron will reset its potential to the resting state when disconnected from the network, \( H_i \) represents the external input, \( \psi : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^u \) with \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) is a known vector function, and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^u \) is an unknown constant vector to be estimated.

According to the concept of driver-response, we set the system (7) as the drive FENN, and consider the response FENN as:
\[ D^\gamma \eta_i(t) = -a \eta_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij}(t)f_j (\eta_j(t)) + H_i + u_i(t), \]
where \( \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R} \).

Theorem 1. With regard to the drive FENN (7) and the response FENN (8). The sliding mode controller (16) and the adaptive law (17) can not only make all signals keep bounded but also make the synchronization error \( e(t) \) asymptotically tend to the origin.

Proof. Substituting the control input (16) into (15) yields
\[ \dot{S}_i(t) = \delta t^{\gamma - 2} [\psi^T_i(\zeta(t)) \dot{\theta}(t) - \psi^T_i(\eta(t)) \theta - \psi^T_i(\zeta(t)) \theta]. \]

The Lyapunov function is set to be:
\[ V(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} \dot{\theta}^T(\theta(t)). \]
Differerentiating the Lyapunov function (20) gives
\( \dot{V}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i(t) \dot{S}_i(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ddot{\theta}(t) \dot{\theta}(t). \)  

(21)

Substituting (19) into (21) yields

\[
\dot{V}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i(t)[-\lambda S_i(t) + \dot{\delta}_i(t) \dot{\theta}(t)] + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ddot{\theta}(t) \dot{\theta}(t),
\]

\[
= -\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i^2(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \dot{\delta}_i(t) \dot{\theta}(t) S_i(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ddot{\theta}(t) \dot{\theta}(t).
\]

(22)

Using [38, Th.4.6.1], and substituting (17) into (22) yields

\[
\dot{V}(t) \leq -\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i^2(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \ddot{\theta}(t) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \dot{\delta}_i(t) \dot{\theta}(t) S_i(t).
\]

(23)

Thus, asymptotic stability of the controlled system is achieved, and this ends the proof of Theorem 1. □

**Composite learning sliding mode control and stability analysis**

From the above SMC design, we known that the adaptation law (17) consists of instantaneous data related to \( S_i(t) \), and its value is used to update \( \dot{\theta}(t) \) online. In (19), \( \lambda, S_i(t), \delta_i \) and \( \dot{\delta}_i(t) \) are available. When \( \dot{S}_i(t) \) is also available, the \( \dot{\theta}(t) \) can be calculated, which gives an accurate estimation of \( \dot{\theta}(t) \). Later in this article, a CLSMC method will be provided to guarantee not only that \( \dot{\theta}(t) \) asymptotically approaches zero without the PE condition but also obtain the accurate estimation of \( \dot{\theta} \). To meet above objectives, we set the prediction error as

\[
e_i(t) = h_1(\zeta(t)) \dot{\theta}(t),
\]

with \( h_1(\zeta(t)) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \) being expressed as

\[
h_1(\zeta(t)) = \begin{cases} 
0_m \times m, & \text{for } t \leq \zeta_0, \\
\int_{t-\zeta_0}^{t} \Psi(t'\zeta(t')) \Psi(t'\zeta(t')) d\zeta', & \text{for } t > \zeta_0.
\end{cases}
\]

(25)

with \( \Psi(t'\zeta(t)) = \dot{\delta}_i(t) \). Then, we will use the following equation to update \( \dot{\theta} \):

\[
\dot{\theta}(t) = \Lambda(\dot{\theta}(t), F(t)),
\]

where \( \omega > 0 \) is a learning parameter, and \( \Lambda(\dot{\theta}(t), F(t)) \) has the same concept as (18). According to (25), the definition of IE condition is rewritten as \( h_1(\zeta(t)) \geq \beta \) with \( \beta \) being an exciting term. Let \( T_1 \) \( (T_1 > \zeta_0) \) be the first point that satisfies Definition 1, exciting term that varies over time is

\[
v_d(t) = \sup_{\zeta(t) \in [T_1,t]} \{ v(t) \}.
\]

A graph of \( v(t) \) and \( v_d(t) \) can be indicated as Fig. 1, in which \( v_d(t) \) is defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi(t), & \quad t \in [0,T_1), \\
\psi(t), & \quad t \in [T_1,T_2), \\
\psi(t), & \quad t \in [T_2,T_3), \\
\psi(t), & \quad t \in [T_3,T_4), \\
\psi(t), & \quad t \in [T_4, \infty).
\end{align*}
\]

Next, we will calculate the value of \( e_i(t) \). Let

\[
e_i(t) = \int_{t-\zeta}^{t} \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t')) \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t')) d\zeta.
\]

(27)

Since \( \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t)) = \dot{\delta}_i(t) \), Eq. (19) is equivalent to

\[
\dot{S}_i(t) = -\lambda S_i(t) + \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t)) \dot{\theta}(t).
\]

(28)

Multiply both ends of (28) by \( \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t)) \)

\[
\Psi_i(t) \dot{S}_i(t) = -\lambda \Psi_i(t) S_i(t) + \Psi_i(t) \Psi_i(t') \dot{\theta}(t).
\]

(29)

According to (12), Eq. (29) is written as

\[
\Psi_i(t) \dot{S}_i(t) = -\lambda \Psi_i(t) S_i(t) + \Psi_i(t) \Psi_i(t') \dot{\theta}(t) - \Psi_i(t) \psi(t).
\]

(30)

From the above formula, we can get

\[
\Psi_i(t) \Psi_i(t') \dot{\theta}(t) = -\lambda \Psi_i(t) \dot{S}_i(t) + \lambda \Psi_i(t) \Psi_i(t') \dot{\theta}(t).
\]

(31)

Consequently, (27) and (31) imply

\[
e_i(t) = \int_{t-\zeta}^{t} \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t)) \left[ \dot{S}_i(t) - \lambda S_i(t) + \Psi_i(t'\zeta(t)) \dot{\theta}(t) \right] d\zeta.
\]

(32)
Fig. 2. Dynamical behavior of system (38) with initial value $[\begin{array}{c} -0.3 \\ 0 \\ 4.0 \\ 3 \end{array}]^T$.

Fig. 3. Control inputs and sliding surfaces under SMC and CLSMC.
So $\epsilon_i(t)$ is calculated as
\[
\epsilon_i(t) = h_i(\zeta(t))\dot{\theta}(t) - \int_{t_{\alpha_0}}^{t} \Psi_i(\zeta(\zeta)) \left[ -\dot{S}_i(\zeta) - 2\dot{S}_i(\zeta) + \Psi'_i(\zeta(\zeta))\dot{\theta}(\zeta) \right] d\zeta. \tag{33}
\]

**Remark 1.** In the SMC method, only instantaneous data is applied to update the parameter estimator (see, the adaptation law (17)). However, in the CLSMC method, the combination of online recording data and instantaneous data is used to update the parameter estimator.
Remark 2. The composite learning law (26) is constructed under the IE condition by using prediction error (24). In this law all recorded data on the interval \( t \in [0, +\infty) \) is used to get an accurate estimate of unknown parameter \( \theta \). In (25), \( \bar{c}_0 \) can be selected according to the control target, but if \( \bar{c}_0 \) is too large, it puts a great quantity of memory pressure on the system. The control rate of CLSMC will vary with the change of quantity of memory pressure on the system. The control rate of SMC will also vary with the change of memory pressure on the system.

Remark 3. In the CLSMC design, a main problem need to be solved is how to obtain the prediction error. Here, we will give a procedure to elaborate how to calculate \( e_i(t) \). In Definition 1, if \( h_i(\zeta(t)) \leq \alpha \), \( h_i(\zeta(t)) \) is 0. At this point, \( e_i(t) = 0 \). On the other hand, if \( h_i(\zeta(t)) > \alpha \), and all the data in the interval \([T - \bar{c}_0, T]\) is used to calculate the prediction error \( e_i(t) \) by

\[
e_i(t) = h_i(\zeta(t)) \hat{\theta}(t) - e_i(t).\tag{34}
\]

Noting that the exact value of \( \hat{S}_i(t) \) is not available, to obtain \( e_i(t) \) in (32), we can use the data of \( S_i(t) \). For example, it can be computed as

\[
\hat{S}_i(t) \approx \frac{S_i(t + \Delta t) - S_i(t)}{\Delta t},
\]

where the estimation error \( o(\Delta t) \). On the other hand, in the CLSMC design, the integral is used in (27), which can further reduce the calculation error of \( e_i(t) \).

Theorem 2. With regard to the drive FONN (7) and the response FONN (8). The sliding mode controller (16) and the composite learning law (26) guarantee that both the synchronization error \( e(t) \) and the parameter estimation error \( \hat{\theta}(t) \) converge to zero asymptotically.

Proof. Let the Lyapunov function be (20), and its derivative be (21). Putting (26) into (22), then (22) becomes

\[
\dot{V}(t) \leq -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{n}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i \psi_i(\zeta(t)) \| \hat{\theta}(t) - \theta_i(t) \| \| \hat{\theta}(t) - \theta_i(t) \| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i \| e_i(t) \|.
\]

Substituting (34) into (36) yields

\[
\dot{V}(t) \leq -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{n}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i \psi_i(\zeta(t)) \| \hat{\theta}(t) - \theta_i(t) \| \| \hat{\theta}(t) - \theta_i(t) \| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i \| e_i(t) \|.
\]

Therefore, both the synchronization error \( e(t) \) and the parameter estimation error \( \hat{\theta}(t) \) tend to zero asymptotically. This ends the proof of Theorem 2. \( \square \)

Fig. 7. Synchronization between \( \zeta(t) \) and \( \eta_i(t) \) for SMC and CLSMC.

Fig. 8. ISE of parameters for SMC and CLSMC.
Remark 4. The SMC and CLSMC introduced in this article use the same controller (16). In terms of the advantages and disadvantages, the CLSMC which uses composite learning law (26) has the following merits. (1) In the adaptive SMC, only instantaneous data is applied to update $\dot{h}(t)$. However, in the CLSMC, all data recorded on interval $[t-\tau, t]$ is utilized. That is, the CLSMC method has better control performance than the SMC method, although these two methods use similar control energy.

Remark 5. The advantage of the proposed CLSMC method over the traditional SMC method is obvious. Although both methods use the same control input (16) and they both ensure that the synchronization error $e(t)$ tends to zero, the PE condition must be satisfied to drive the synchronization error converges to zero in the SMC, while in the CLSMC, the PE condition should be fulfilled. The CLSMC method uses the composite learning law (26) to update the estimation of $\theta$. Compared with the SMC method using the adaptive law (17), the CLSMC method can be seen as a special case of the CLSMC (i.e., $\tau_0 = 0$). (2) In the CLSMC approach, the synchronization error $e(t)$ and the parameter estimation error $\dot{h}(t)$ asymptotically approaching zero can be guaranteed under the PE condition in the adaptive SMC method. (3) Noting that the two methods, i.e., SMC and CLSMC, use the same controller (16), they will consume similar control energy in the same circumstance. However, in terms of control ability, the CLSMC approach has better control performance than the SMC method.

Simulation example

The drive FONN is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{\xi}_1(t) &= -\xi_1(t) + 2 \tanh \xi_1 - 1.2 \tanh \xi_2 + \psi_1^T(\xi(t)) \theta, \\
\dot{\xi}_2(t) &= -\xi_2(t) + 2 \tanh \xi_1 + 1.71 \tanh \xi_2 + 1.5 \tanh \xi_3 + \psi_1^T(\xi(t)) \theta, \\
\dot{\xi}_3(t) &= -\xi_3(t) - 4.75 \tanh \xi_1 + 1.1 \tanh \xi_3 + \psi_1^T(\xi(t)) \theta,
\end{align*}
$$

(38)

and the response FONN is

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{\eta}_1(t) &= -\eta_1(t) + 2 \tanh \eta_1 - 1.2 \tanh \eta_2 + u_1(t), \\
\dot{\eta}_2(t) &= -\eta_2(t) + 2 \tanh \eta_1 + 1.71 \tanh \eta_2 + 1.5 \tanh \eta_3 + u_2(t), \\
\dot{\eta}_3(t) &= -\eta_3(t) - 4.75 \tanh \eta_1 + 1.1 \tanh \eta_3 + u_3(t).
\end{align*}
$$

(39)

In the drive FONN system (38), when $\theta = [0.0, 0.0, 0.0]^T$ and $H_1 = 0$, it becomes a chaotic system. The dynamical behavior of (38) with $\theta = [0.0, 0.0, 0.0]^T$ and $\alpha = 0.95$ is shown in Fig. 2.

The initial value of the drive FONN is $\xi_0 = [-0.3, 0.4, 0.3]^T$ and the initial value of the response FONN is $\eta_0 = [0.3, -0.4, -0.3]^T$. The basis functions are set to be $\psi_1(\xi(t)) = [0.25, 0.5 \tanh \xi_1, 0.5 \sin(\xi_1 + \xi_2), 0.5 \tanh(\xi_1 + \xi_2)]^T, \psi_2(\xi(t)) = [0.5 \sin(\xi_1 + \xi_2), 0.5 \tanh(\xi_1 + \xi_2)]^T, \psi_3(\xi(t))$.
by comparing the ISE and MSE of the two control methods in rately estimate parameters. (3) In terms of control performance, represent that the SMC method does not have the ability to accu-
the contrary, in Fig. 8 (a) and Fig. 9 (a), we can see that ISE and MSE at 
Fig. 4. The synchronization performance of 
ISE and MSE of the two control methods when using the CLSMC are less than by using the SMC. In Table 1, the 
from which similar conclusions can be obtained. (2) From Fig. 8(b) and Fig. 9(b), it can be verified that the two control methods are indicated in Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, respectively. The ISE and MSE of parameters and state variables are given in Fig. 3 (d), (e), (f). The estimation of \( \theta \) is presented in Fig. 4. The synchronization performance of \( \zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t), \zeta_3(t) \) by using the two control methods are indicated in Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, respectively. The ISE and MSE for SMC and CLSMC are shown in Figs. 8–11. Finally, the values of ISE and MSE of state variables for SMC and CLSMC are shown in Figs. 8–11. The values of ISE and MSE at \( t = 40 \) s under the SMC method and the CLSMC method are given in Table 1. From these simulation results, we have the following conclusions. (1) It can be seen from dynamics of sliding surfaces and the synchronization between the drive FONN and the response FONN under SMC and CLSMC, the convergence speed of synchronization error \( e_1(t) \) and \( e_2(t) \) is faster under CLSMC than under SMC (although the rate at which \( e_3(t) \) approaches zero is similar in both methods). It is commonly recognized that the smaller of the ISE and MSE, the higher the accuracy of the estimation, therefore, the convergence rate of \( e_1(t) \) and \( e_2(t) \) under CLSMC is faster than that under the SMC. It can be verified that in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11 the ISE and MSE of \( \theta \) and \( \zeta(t) \) by using the CLSMC are less than by using the SMC. In Table 1, the ISE and MSE of the two control methods when \( t = 40 \) s are given, from which similar conclusions can be obtained. (2) From Fig. 8 (b) and Fig. 9 (b), it can be seen that ISE and MSE in the CLSMC method finally approach a certain value, and the value of ISE and MSE at \( t = 40 \) s obtained from Table 1 is very small, which indicates that the parameters in the CLSMC have been accurately estimated. On the contrary, in Fig. 8 (a) and Fig. 9 (a), we can see that ISE and MSE under the SMC are always on the rise and the values of ISE and MSE at \( t = 40 \) s obtained from Table 1 are very large, which represent that the SMC method does not have the ability to accurately estimate parameters. (3) In terms of control performance, by comparing the ISE and MSE of the two control methods in Figs. 8–11 and Table 1. We can see that the CLSMC are less than by using the SMC, which is the CLSMC technique that has a better control performance than the SMC and can stabilize the system in a short time. (4) It should be emphasized that the two control methods use the same control signal, then they consume similar control energy (which can be seen in Fig. 3(a), (b), (c)). However, the CLSMC technique obtain better synchronization performance than the SMC method.

### Conclusions

This paper presents a composite learning sliding mode synchronization method for chaotic FONNs with unmatched unknown parameter. By using the traditional SMC method, the convergence of the synchronization error can be guaranteed under the PE condition. Then, a CLSMC method is proposed, and it is proved that the proposed CLSMC method can achieve the accurate estimation of unknown parameter and ensures that the parameters converges to zero asymptotically under an IE condition that is lower than the PE condition. In addition, by comparing the ISE and MSE under the two methods, it is concluded that the CLSMC method can not only achieve accurate parameter estimation without the PE condition, but also has better control performance than the SMC approach. One of the future work will focus on how to design composite learning adaptive sliding mode synchronization of uncertain FONNs.
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