Goals:

• Review:
  - canonical control design problem
  - performance measures
• Loop Transfer Functions (Gang of Four, Seven)
• Show how to use “loop shaping” to achieve a performance specification
• Work through example(s)

Reading:

• Åström and Murray, Feedback Systems 2-e, Section 12.1, 12.2-12.4
Design Patterns for Control Systems

“Classical” control (1950s...)

- **Goal:** output $y(t)$ should track reference trajectory $r(t)$
- Design typically done in “frequency domain” (second half of CDS 101/110)

Modern” (state space) control (1970s...)

- **Goal unchanged:** output $y(t)$ should track reference trajectory $r(t)$ [often constant]

---

```
• Reference input shaping
• Feedback on output error
• Compensator dynamics shape closed loop response
• Uncertainty in process dynamics $P(s) +$ external disturbances ($d$) & noise ($n$)

• Assume dynamics are given by linear system, with known $A$, $B$, $C$, $D$ matrices
• Measure the state of the system and use this to modify the input
  • $u = -K x + k_r r$
```
Input/Output Control Design Specifications

Common Sense Goals:
- Keep error small for reference signals $r$
- Attenuate effect of sensor noise $n$ and load disturbances $d$
- Avoid large input commands $u$

Designs represent tradeoffs, e.g.:
- Keep $L = PC$ large for good performance ($G_{er} << 1$)
- Keep $L = PC$ small for good noise rejection ($G_{nn} < 1$)

• Load disturbances ($d$) typically low frequency, while noise ($v$) is high frequency
• Stability always determined by $1/(1+PC)$ assuming stable process & controller
• Numerator determined by forward path between input and output

More generally: 7 primary transfer functions; simultaneous design of each
- Controller $C(s)$ enters in multiple places ⇒ possibly hard to understand tradeoffs
General Loop Transfer Functions

$r = \text{reference input}$
$e = \text{error}$
$u = \text{control}$
$v = \text{control + disturbance}$
$\eta = \text{true output (what we want to control!)}$
$y = \text{measured output}$

System "inputs" 

$\begin{pmatrix} y \\ \eta \\ v \\ u \\ e \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{PCF}{1+PC} & \frac{P}{1+PC} & \frac{1}{1+PC} \\ \frac{PCF}{1+PC} & \frac{P}{1+PC} & \frac{1}{1+PC} \\ \frac{CF}{1+PC} & \frac{1}{1+PC} & \frac{-C}{1+PC} \\ \frac{CF}{1+PC} & \frac{1}{1+PC} & \frac{-C}{1+PC} \\ \frac{F}{1+PC} & \frac{-P}{1+PC} & \frac{-1}{1+PC} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r \\ d \\ n \end{pmatrix}$

System "outputs"

$\begin{pmatrix} y \\ \eta \\ v \end{pmatrix}$

"Gang of Six"

$\text{TF} = \frac{PCF}{1+PC}$
$\text{T} = \frac{PC}{1+PC}$
$\text{PS} = \frac{P}{1+PC}$

$\text{CFS} = \frac{CF}{1+PC}$
$\text{CS} = \frac{C}{1+PC}$
$\text{S} = \frac{1}{1+PC}$

Response of $(y, u)$ to $r$
Response of $u$ to $(d, n)$
Response of $y$ to $(d, n)$
Key Loop Transfer Functions

$F(s) = 1$: Four unique transfer functions define performance ("Gang of Four")

**Sensitivity Function:**  $G_{er} = S(s) = \frac{1}{1+L(s)}$

**Complementary Sensitivity Function:**  $G_{yr} = T(s) = \frac{L(s)}{1+L(s)}$

**Load Sensitivity Function:**  $G_{yd} = PS(s) = \frac{P(s)}{1+L(s)}$

**Noise Sensitivity Function:**  $G_{yn} = CS(s) = \frac{C(s)}{1+L(s)}$

$L(s) = P(s)C(s)$

"Gang of Four" (the "sensitivity" functions)

Characterize most performance criteria of interest
Culture, not Control

Gang of Four at trial, 1981.
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Sensitivity

Note:

\[ H_{yd} = \frac{P(s)}{1 + L(s)} = P(s) \frac{1}{1 + L(s)} = P(s)S(s) \]

- I.e., Closed Loop Response to Disturbance = Open Loop Response x Sensitivity
- I.e., \( S(s) \) tells us how variations in output are influenced by feedback
  - Disturbances with \( |S(i\omega)|<1 \) attenuated by feedback
  - Disturbances with \( |S(i\omega)|>1 \) amplified

- Max Sensitivity = \( \max |S(i\omega)| := M_s \)
  - \( M_s = 1/s_m \),
  - \( s_m \) is stability margin (from Nyquist)
  - Related to robustness

\[ L(s) = \frac{20}{(s + 1)(s/10 + 1)(s/100 + 1)} \]
Sensitivity (continued)

Example plotted is:

\[ L(s) = \frac{20}{(s + 1)(s/10 + 1)(s/100 + 1)} \]  

\[ S(s) = \frac{1}{1 + L(s)} \]

- \(|S(i\omega)| > 1\) Inside unit circle centered at -1  
  (disturbances amplified)
- \(|S(i\omega)| < 1\) outside unit circle centered at -1  
  (disturbances attenuated)

---

Fig. 4 Nyquist plot of the loop gain \(G(s) = P(s)C(s)\) for the system (29). For frequencies for which \(G(i\omega)\) enters the unit circle centered about the \(-1\) point, disturbances are amplified and, for frequencies for which \(G(s)\) lies outside this circle, disturbances are attenuated relative to open-loop.  

(*) From Rowley & Battin, *Fundamentals & Applications of Modern Flow Control*, Ch 5
Frequency Domain Specifications (review)

Specifications on the open loop transfer function ($L$)

- **Gain crossover frequency**, $\omega_{gc}$: the lowest frequency at which loop gain = 1
- **Gain margin**, $g_m$: amount the loop gain can be increased before instability
- **Phase margin**, $\phi_m$: amount of phase lag required to generate instability

Specifications on closed loop frequency response (eg $G_{yr}$, $G_{yd}$, etc)

- Resonant peak, $M_r$, is the largest value of the frequency response
- Peak frequency, $\omega_p$, is the frequency where the maximum occurs
- Bandwidth, $\omega_b$, is the frequency where the gain has decreased to $1/\sqrt{2}$

Basic idea: *convert specs on closed loop to specs on open loop*

- Bandwidth $\approx$ value for which $|L| = 1$
- Resonant peak set by phase margin
- Keep $L(s)$ large to set $H_{yr} \approx 1$

\[
H_{yr} = \frac{L}{1+L} \quad H_{er} = \frac{1}{1+L}
\]
Time domain specifications

Map to frequency domain for second order system

\[ r \rightarrow + \rightarrow k \rightarrow \frac{1}{s^2 + bs} \rightarrow y \]

\[ L(s) = \frac{k}{s^2 + bs} \quad H_{yr} = \frac{k}{s^2 + bs + k} \]

- Use properties of second order systems (Ch 7)
“Loop Shaping”: Design Loop Transfer Function

Translate specs to “loop shape”

\[ L(s) = P(s)C(s) \]

Naïve Idea: let \( L(s) \) have desired properties, then
\[ C(s) = \frac{L(s)}{P(s)} \]

Design \( C(s) \) to obey constraints

- High gain at low frequency
  - Good tracking, disturbance rejection at low freqs
- Low gain at high frequency
  - Avoid amplifying noise
- Sufficiently high bandwidth
  - Good rise/settling time
- Shallow slope at crossover
  - Sufficient phase margin for robustness, low overshoot

Loop shaping is \textit{trial and error}
Aside: Relation of Gain to Phase in Bode Plot

If no poles/zeros in RHP (a minimum phase system), then (see A&M FBS-2e, 10.4) phase curve uniquely related to gain curve

\[
\arg G(i\omega_0) = \frac{\pi}{2} \int_0^\infty f(\omega) \frac{d \log|G(i\omega)|}{d \log \omega} d \log \omega
\]

\[
\approx \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{d \log|G(i\omega_0)|}{d \log \omega_0}
\]

Where

\[
f(\omega) = \frac{2}{\pi} \log \left| \frac{\omega + \omega_0}{\omega - \omega_0} \right|
\]

Consequence:

- Shape of phase curve is dictated by shape of gain curve
- Phase curve is weighted average of derivative of the gain curve
- Where gain curve is \(\sim\) constant slope, phase curve is constant
Loop Shaping: Basic Approach

Disturbance rejection \[ H_{ed} = \frac{-P}{1 + L} \]

• Would like \( H_{ed} \) to be small make \( \Rightarrow \) large \( L(s) \)
• Typically require this in low frequency range

High frequency measurement noise \[ H_{un} = \frac{-L}{P(1 + L)} \]

• Want to make sure that \( H_{un} \) is small (avoid amplifying noise) \( \Rightarrow \) small \( L(s) \)
• Typically generates constraints in high frequency range

Robustness: gain and phase margin
• Focus on gain crossover region: make sure the slope is “gentle” at gain crossover
• Fundamental tradeoff: transition from high gain to low gain through crossover
Design Method #1: Process Inversion

Simple trick: invert out process

- Write performance specs in terms of desired loop transfer function
- Choose \( L(s) \) to satisfy specifications
- Choose controller by *inverting* \( P(s) \)

\[
C(s) = \frac{L(s)}{P(s)}
\]

Pros

- Simple design process
- \( L(s) = k/s \) often works very well
- Can be used as a first cut, with additional tuning

Cons

- High order controllers (at least same order as plant)
- Requires “perfect” process model (due to inversion)
- Can generate non-proper controllers (order(num) > order(den))
  - Difficult to implement, plus amplifies noise at high frequency \( (C(\infty) = \infty) \)
  - Fix by adding high frequency poles to roll off control response at high frequency
- Does not work if right half plane poles or zeros (*internal instability*)
**Lead & Lag Compensators**

**Lead:** $K > 0$, $a < b$
- Add phase near crossover
- Improve gain & phase margins, increase bandwidth (better transient response).

**Lag:** $K > 0$, $a > b$
- Add gain in low frequencies
- Improves steady state error

**Lead/Lag:**
- Better transient and steady state response

---

![Graphs showing Bode plots for lead and lag compensation](image)
Design Method #2: Add Lead, Lag, Lead/Lag compensation

Lead: increases phase in frequency band

- Effect: lifts phase by increasing gain at high frequency
- Increases PM
- Bode: add phase between zero and pole
- Nyquist: increase phase margin

\[
\begin{array}{c}
r \\ e \\ K \frac{s + a}{s + b} \\ u \\ P(s) \\ y
\end{array}
\]

\[a < b \quad K > 0\]
Example: Lead Compensation for Second Order System

System description

\[ P(s) = \frac{p_1 p_2}{(s + p_1)(s + p_2)} \]

- Poles: \( p_1 = 1, \ p_2 = 5 \)

Control specs

- Track constant reference with error < 1%
- Good tracking up to 100 rad/s (less than 10% error)
- Overshoot less than 10%
  - Gives PM of \( \sim 60 \text{ deg} \)

Try a lead compensator

\[ C(s) = K \frac{s + a}{s + b} \]

- Want gain cross over at approximately 100 rad/sec => center phase gain there
- Set zero frequency gain of controller to give small error \( \Rightarrow |L(0)| > 100 \)
- \( a = 20, \ b = 500, \ K = 10,000 \) (gives \( |C(0)| = |L(0)| = 400 \))
Better Loop Shaping Design Process

*A Process*: sequence of (nonunique) steps

1. Start with plant and performance specifications
2. If plant not stable, first stabilize it (e.g., PID)
3. Adjust/increase simple gains
   - Increase proportional gain for tracking error
   - Introduce integral term for steady-state error
   - Will derivative term improve overshoot?
4. Analyze/adjust for stability and/or phase margin
   - Adjust gains for margin
   - Introduce *Lead or Lag Compensators* to adjust phase margin at crossover and other critical frequencies
   - Consider PID if you haven’t already
Summary: Loop Shaping

Loop Shaping for Stability & Performance

- Steady state error, bandwidth, tracking response
- Specs can be on any input/output response pair

Main ideas

- Performance specs give bounds on loop transfer function
- Use controller to shape response
- Gain/phase relationships constrain design approach
- Standard compensators: proportional, lead, PI

Things to remember (for homework and exams)

- Always plot Nyquist to verify stability/robustness
- Check gang of 4 to make sure that noise and disturbance responses also look OK