Review of: "Backstepping Control Design in Conjunction with an EKF-based Sensorless Field-Oriented Control of an IPMSM"

Daniel Legrand Mon-Nzongo¹

1 Concordia University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1 where the f matrix should state that it can be voltage, current, flux, etc., instead of just saying that it can be divided into fa, fb, fc 3D matrices

2 VABCs and IABCs should state that they are the stator voltage and current of the ABC three-phase, and it may not be enough to say that they are the stator voltage and current. Does it repeat the description here? Only need to introduce the same physical quantity once.

4 It is not introduced that e1 is the rotor speed error and x2 is the q-axis reference.

6 Why does a formula derivation transition change the case of a letter?

7 All formulas should add "where" to describe the physical quantity.

8 Step 6 describes that the conversion of U $\alpha\beta$ to UABC for PWM is incompatible with the direct use of U $\alpha\beta$ for SVPWM in Figure 2. Figure 2. Is idref grounded? I think it's good to just write idref=0.

9 The third part is the current controller based on FOC, so I think we should introduce the FOC first and then the controller.

10 This only introduces the meaning that this symbol is the optimal estimate, and the horizontal symbol should be the average.

11 IPMSM Ld is different from Lq.

12 In the simulation, there are only velocity estimate graphs, iαβ estimate graphs, and we, IdIq, motor torque load torque graphs under the experimental condition of we=400, T=20 Nm, t=3 s. The change in the speed of parameter change stated in the introduction is not reflected. Figure 6 should not be 0-400. Suppose it is 0-200-400. The important thing is 200-400. Parameter change should be stability analysis under parameter mismatch. The high efficiency of EFK is not reflected only in the accuracy. The number of simulation experiments is too small.