# **ECE 171A: Linear Control System Theory Lecture 24: Uncertainty and robustness**

Yang Zheng

#### Assistant Professor, ECE, UCSD

May 25, 2022

Reading materials: Ch 13.1, 13.2

## **HW8**

- $\blacktriangleright$  HW8 will be out this afternoon; due by 11:59 pm on June 2 (next Thursday)
- $\blacktriangleright$  From the survey feedback: HW8 is now optional.
- $\triangleright$  We will drop the lowest score from your HW1 HW8 for the final grade.
- $\triangleright$  So you can choose to skip this homework, and then your HW1-HW7 will account for 40% of the final grade.
- $\blacktriangleright$  However, we suggest you try this final HW since
	- 1) it will only increase your HW performance,
	- 2) the material here is within the scope of the final exam.

[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0)

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0)

[Summary](#page-21-0)

<span id="page-3-0"></span>[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0)

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0)

[Summary](#page-21-0)

[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0) 4/23

### **Lead and Lag Compensation**

Simple compensators with transfer function

$$
C(s) = k\frac{s+a}{s+b}, \qquad a > 0, \ b > 0
$$

- **Lag compensator** (Phase) if  $a > b$ ; a PI controller is a special case with  $b=0.$
- **In Lead compensator** (Phase) if  $a < b$ ; a PD controller with filtering.



## **Example 2**

# Example (Example 12.5)

The transfer function for the system dynamics is

$$
P(s) = \frac{r}{Js^2}, \qquad r = 0.25, \ \ J = 0.0475
$$

I less than 1 % error in steady state;  $\leq 10\%$  tracking error up to 10 rad/s



[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0) 6/23

#### **Example 2 - Lead compensation**





Figure: Margins for  $L(s) = P(s)C(s)$ 

$$
C(s) = k \frac{s+a}{s+b},
$$
  

$$
a = 2, b = 50, k = 200;
$$

#### **Example 2 - time domain simulations**



[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0) 8/23

## **Loop-shaping: Summary**

#### **The loop transfer function** should have roughly the shape below



(a) Gain plot of loop transfer function



(b) Gain plot of sensitivity functions

#### **In General purpose of Lag compenstation**

- increases the gain at low frequencies
- improve tracking performance at low frequencies
- improve disturbance attenuation at low frequencies
- I General purpose of **Lead compenstation**
	- Add phase lead in the frequency range between the pole and zero pair
	- By appropriately choosing the location of this phase lead, we can provide **additional phase margin** at the gain crossover frequency.

[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0) 9/23

<span id="page-9-0"></span>[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0)

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0)

[Summary](#page-21-0)

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0) 10/23

### **Robustness to uncertainty**

**Robustness to uncertainty** is one of the most useful properties of feedback

 $\triangleright$  what makes it possible to design feedback systems based on strongly simplified models.

We discuss two types of uncertainties in this lecture.

- **Parametric uncertainty** in which the parameters describing the system are not precisely known, e.g.,
	- The variation of the mass of a car, which changes with the number of passengers and the weight of baggage
	- When linearizing a nonlinear system, the parameters of the linearized model also depend on the operating conditions.
- **Informational Dimerger 1 Unmodeled dynamics** are neglected during the modeling, e.g.,
	- In Cruise Control, we did not include a detailed model of the engine dynamics

### **Parametric Uncertainty**

- In principle, it is easy to investigate the effects of parametric uncertainty by evaluating the performance criteria for a range of parameters.
- $\triangleright$  Such a calculation reveals the consequences of parameter variations.
- ▶ However, this can be intractable (**computationally demanding**) for large parameter space. Formal guarantees can be challenging too!.



**Figure 13.1:** Responses of the cruise control system to a slope increase of  $4^{\circ}$  (a) and the eigenvalues of the closed loop system (b). Model parameters are swept over a wide range. The closed loop system is of second order.

## **Unmodeled dynamics**

How to handle unmodeled dynamics?

- ▶ **Method 1:** develop a more complex model that includes additional details.
	- Such models are commonly used for controller development, but substantial effort is required to generate them.
	- These models are themselves likely to be uncertain, since the parameter values may vary over time.
- **I** Method 2: investigate whether the closed loop system can be made **insensitive** to generic forms of unmodeled dynamics.
	- The basic idea is to augment the nominal model with a bounded input/output transfer function that captures the gross features of the unmodeled dynamics.
	- Describing unmodeled dynamics with transfer functions permits us to handle infinite-dimensional systems like time delays.

### **Unmodeled dynamics**



(a) Additive uncertainty (b) Multiplicative uncertainty (c) Feedback uncertainty

Figure 13.2: Unmodeled dynamics in linear systems. Uncertainty can be represented using additive perturbations (a), multiplicative perturbations (b), or feedback perturbations (c). The nominal system is P, and  $\Delta$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\Delta_{\text{fb}}$  represent unmodeled dynamics.

**Additive uncertainty**: the true plant dynamics are in the range of

$$
\tilde{P}(s) = P(s) + \Delta(s), \qquad |\Delta(i\omega)| < \epsilon, \forall \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}.
$$

**Multiplicative uncertainty:** 

$$
\tilde{P}(s) = P(s)(1 + \delta(s)), \qquad |\delta(i\omega)| < \epsilon, \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}.
$$

- **Feedback uncertainty**:  $\tilde{P}(s) = \frac{P}{1 + P\Delta_{\text{fb}}}, \qquad |\Delta_{\text{fb}}(i\omega)| < \epsilon, \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\blacktriangleright$  The specific form that is used depends on what provides the best representation of the unmodeled dynamics.

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0) 14/23

## **When Are Two Systems Similar?**

 $\blacktriangleright$  A naive approach is to say that two systems are close

- if their open loop responses are close.
- or if their open loop frequency responses are similar.
- I Unfortunately, both are **inappropriate**!
- $\triangleright$  This seemingly innocent problem is not as simple as it may appear
- I Proper measures are relatively recent (1990s) **Vinnicombe metric** (details are not required in this class)

## Example

Systems similar in open loop but different in closed loop

$$
P_1(s) = \frac{k}{s+1},
$$
  

$$
P_2(s) = \frac{k}{(s+1)(sT+1)^2},
$$

have very similar open loop step responses for small values of *T*.

 $\blacktriangleright$  Closed loop step responses are different.



[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0) 15/23

## **When Are Two Systems Similar?**

#### Example

Systems different in open loop but similar in closed loop

$$
P_1(s) = \frac{k}{s+1},
$$
  

$$
P_2(s) = \frac{k}{s-1},
$$

have very different open loop step responses.

 $\blacktriangleright$  Closed loop step responses are very similar.



- ▶ Two systems can have very close frequency responses (i.e., Bode plots and Nyquist plots are similar)
- $\triangleright$  But their closed-loop response are very different! (see Example 13.4)
- **Proper measures are relatively recent (in the early 90s) Vinnicombe metric** (details are not required in this class)

#### [Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0) and the state of th

<span id="page-16-0"></span>[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0)

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0)

[Summary](#page-21-0)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0) 17/23

## **Robust stability**

**Robust stability**: when can we formally show that the stability of a system is robust with respect to process variations?

- I **Nyquist criterion**: a powerful and elegant way to study the effects of uncertainty.
- $\blacktriangleright$  The stability margin  $s_m$  is a good robustness measure.



**Figure 13.7:** Illustrations of robust stability in Nyquist plots. The plot (a) shows the stability margin  $s_m = 1/M_s$ . The plot (b) shows the Nyquist curve and the circle shows uncertainty due to stable additive process variations  $\Delta$ .

#### [Robust stability](#page-16-0) 18/23

#### **Robust stability - explicit conditions**



**Figure 13.7:** Illustrations of robust stability in Nyquist plots. The plot (a) shows the stability margin  $s_m = 1/M_s$ . The plot (b) shows the Nyquist curve and the circle shows uncertainty due to stable additive process variations  $\Delta$ .

If the process is changed from  $P(s)$  to  $P(s) + \Delta(s)$ , the loop transfer function changes from  $P(s)C(s)$  to

$$
(P(s) + \Delta(s))C(s).
$$

 $\triangleright$  Assume that  $\Delta(s)$  is stable, the closed-loop system remains stable as long as the perturbed loop transfer function

$$
(P+\Delta)C
$$

never reaches the critical point  $-1$ .

#### [Robust stability](#page-16-0) 19/23

#### **Robust stability - explicit conditions**



Figure 13.7: Illustrations of robust stability in Nyquist plots. The plot (a) shows the stability margin  $s_m = 1/M_s$ . The plot (b) shows the Nyquist curve and the circle shows uncertainty due to stable additive process variations  $\Delta$ .

- **►** The distance from  $-1$  to  $L = PC$  is  $|1 + L|$ .
- $\triangleright$  The perturbed Nyquist curve will not reach  $-1$  provided that

<span id="page-19-0"></span>
$$
|C\Delta| < |1 + L| \tag{1}
$$

<span id="page-19-1"></span>▶ (1) holds if  

$$
|\Delta| < \left|\frac{1+L}{C}\right|
$$
, or  $|\delta| < \left|\frac{1+L}{L}\right| = \frac{1}{|T|}$ , where  $\delta = \frac{\Delta}{P}$  (2)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0) 20/23

#### **Robust stability - explicit conditions**

The condition [\(2\)](#page-19-1) must be valid all all points on the Nyquist curve  $$ point-wise for all frequencies

<span id="page-20-0"></span>
$$
|\delta(i\omega)| < \left|\frac{1 + L(i\omega)}{L(i\omega)}\right| = \frac{1}{|T(i\omega)|}, \quad \forall \omega \ge 0.
$$
 (3)

- ▶ Condition [\(3\)](#page-20-0) is one of the reasons why feedback systems work so **well in practice.**
	- The models used to design control systems are often simplified, and the properties of a process may change during operation.
	- Condition [\(3\)](#page-20-0) implies that the closed loop system will at least be stable for substantial variations in the process dynamics

The peak value of the complimentary sensitivity:

$$
M_t = \max_{\omega} |T(i\omega)| := \left\| \frac{PC}{1 + PC} \right\|_{\infty}
$$

- $\triangleright$  Condition [\(3\)](#page-20-0) becomes  $|\delta(iω)| < 1/M_t$ , ∀ω > 0.
- Reasonable values of  $M_t$  are from 1.2 to 2.

[Robust stability](#page-16-0) 21/23

<span id="page-21-0"></span>[Loop-shaping \(continue from Lecture 23\)](#page-3-0)

[Modeling uncertainty](#page-9-0)

[Robust stability](#page-16-0)

[Summary](#page-21-0)

[Summary](#page-21-0) 22/23

## **Summary**

- **Robustness to uncertainty** is one of the most useful properties of feedback - design feedback systems based on strongly simplified models.
	- **Parametric uncertainty** in which the parameters describing the system are not precisely known
	- **Unmodeled dynamics**, in which some dynamics are neglected during the modeling.
- **ID An explicit sufficient robustness condition** based on Nyquist criterion

$$
|C\Delta| < |1 + L|, \quad \text{or} \quad |\delta(i\omega)| < \left|\frac{1 + L(i\omega)}{L(i\omega)}\right| = \frac{1}{|T(i\omega)|}, \quad \forall \omega \ge 0.
$$



**Figure 13.7:** Illustrations of robust stability in Nyquist plots. The plot (a) shows the stability margin  $s_m = 1/M_s$ . The plot (b) shows the Nyquist curve and the circle shows uncertainty due to stable additive process variations  $\Delta$ .