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Previously on Digital Controls...

• We discussed discretised state-space systems.

• Which few people understood or cared about!

• (oh, and a while lot of other stuff related to practical digital control)
State-space lolwut?

• A ‘clean’ way of representing systems

• Easy implementation in matrix algebra

• Simplifies understanding Multi-Input-Multi-Output (MIMO) systems
Affairs of state

- Introductory brain-teaser:
  - If you have a dynamic system model with history (ie. integration) how do you represent the instantaneous state of the plant?

Eg. how would you setup a simulation of a step response, mid-step?
Introduction to state-space

- Linear systems can be written as networks of simple dynamic elements:

\[ H = \frac{s + 2}{s^2 + 7s + 12} = \frac{2}{s + 4} + \frac{-1}{s + 3} \]
Introduction to state-space

- We can identify the nodes in the system
  - These nodes contain the integrated time-history values of the system response
  - We call them “states”
Linear system equations

• We can represent the dynamic relationship between the states with a linear system:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= -7x_1 - 12x_2 + u \\
\dot{x}_2 &= x_1 + 0x_2 + 0u \\
y &= x_1 + 2x_2 + 0u
\end{align*}
\]
State-space representation

• We can write linear systems in matrix form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= \begin{bmatrix} -7 & 12 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u \\
y &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} x + 0u
\end{align*}
\]

Or, more generally:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax + Bu \\
y &= Cx + Du
\end{align*}
\]

“State-space equations”
State-space representation

• State-space matrices are not necessarily a unique representation of a system
  – There are two common forms

• Control canonical form
  – Each node – each entry in $\mathbf{x}$ – represents a state of the system (each order of $s$ maps to a state)

• Modal form
  – Diagonals of the state matrix $\mathbf{A}$ are the poles (“modes”) of the transfer function
Control canonical form

- CCF matrix representations have the following structure:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-a_1 & -a_1 & \cdots & -a_{n-2} & -a_{n-1} & -a_n \\
1 & 0 & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & & & & \\
\vdots & & & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Pretty diagonal!
State variable transformation

• Important note!
  – The states of a control canonical form system are not the same as the modal states
  – They represent the same dynamics, and give the same output, but the vector values are different!

• However we can convert between them:
  – Consider state representations, $x$ and $q$ where
    \[ x = Tq \]
    
    $T$ is a “transformation matrix”
State variable transformation

- Two homologous representations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax + Bu \\
y &= Cx + Du
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{q} &= Fq + Gu \\
y &= Hq + Ju
\end{align*}
\]

We can write:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= \mathbf{T} \dot{q} = ATz + Bu \\
\dot{q} &= \mathbf{T}^{-1} ATz + \mathbf{T}^{-1} Bu
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, \( \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{T} \) and \( \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \)

Similarly, \( \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{T} \) and \( \mathbf{D} = \mathbf{J} \)
Controllability matrix

• To convert an arbitrary state representation in $F$, $G$, $H$ and $J$ to control canonical form $A$, $B$, $C$ and $D$, the "controllability matrix"

$$\mathbf{C} = [G \quad FG \quad F^2G \quad \cdots \quad F^{n-1}G]$$

must be nonsingular.

> deep think <

Why is it called the “controllability” matrix?
Controllability matrix

• If you can write it in CCF, then the system equations must be linearly independent.

• Transformation by any nonsingular matrix preserves the controllability of the system.

• Thus, a nonsingular controllability matrix means $x$ can be driven to any value.
Kind of awesome

- The controllability of a system depends on the particular set of states you chose

- You can’t tell just from a transfer function whether all the states of $x$ are controllable

- The poles of the system are the Eigenvalues of $F$, $(p_i)$. 
State evolution

• Consider the system matrix relation:
  \[ \dot{x} = Fx + Gu \]
  \[ y = Hx + Ju \]

The time solution of this system is:
  \[ x(t) = e^{F(t-t_0)}x(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} e^{F(t-\tau)}Gu(\tau)d\tau \]

If you didn’t know, the matrix exponential is:
  \[ e^{Kt} = I + \frac{1}{2!}K^2t^2 + \frac{1}{3!}K^3t^3 + \cdots \]
Stability

• We can solve for the natural response to initial conditions $x_0$:

$$x(t) = e^{pit} x_0$$

$$\therefore \dot{x}(t) = p_i e^{pit} x_0 = F e^{pit} x_0$$

Clearly, a system will be stable provided $\text{eig}(F) < 0$
Characteristic polynomial

• From this, we can see \( Fx_0 = p_i x_0 \)
  
or, \( (p_i I - F)x_0 = 0 \)
  
which is true only when \( \det(p_i I - F)x_0 = 0 \)

  Aka. the characteristic equation!

• We can reconstruct the CP in \( s \) by writing:
  
\[ \det(sI - F)x_0 = 0 \]
Great, so how about control?

- Given $\dot{x} = Fx + Gu$, if we know $F$ and $G$, we can design a controller $u = -Kx$ such that $\text{eig}(F - GK) < 0$

- In fact, if we have full measurement and control of the states of $x$, we can position the poles of the system in arbitrary locations!

Of course, that never happens in reality.
Example: PID control

• Consider a system parameterised by three states: $x_1, x_2, x_3$ where $x_2 = \dot{x}_1$ and $x_3 = \dot{x}_2$

\[
\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -2 & -2 \end{bmatrix} x - Ku
\]

\[
y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + 0u
\]

$x_2$ is the output state of the system; $x_1$ is the value of the integral; $x_3$ is the velocity.
We can choose $K$ to move the eigenvalues of the system as desired:

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} 1 - K_1 & \ \ \ \ & 1 - K_2 \\ & 1 - K_2 & -2 - K_3 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

All of these eigenvalues must be positive.

It’s straightforward to see how adding derivative gain $K_3$ can stabilise the system.
Just scratching the surface

• There is a lot of stuff to state-space control

• One lecture (or even two) can’t possibly cover it all in depth

Go play with Matlab and check it out!
And now for...

Estimation and Kalman Filtering
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Fun Fact: In Soviet Russia, State controls you!
Discretisation FTW!

- We can use the time-domain representation to produce difference equations!

\[ x(kT + T) = e^{FT} x(kT) + \int_{kT}^{kT+T} e^{F(kT+T-\tau)} Gu(\tau) d\tau \]

Notice \( u(\tau) \) is not based on a discrete ZOH input, but rather an integrated time-series.

We can structure this by using the form:

\[ u(\tau) = u(kT), \quad kT \leq \tau \leq kT + T \]
Discretisation FTW!

• Put this in the form of a new variable:
  \[ \eta = kT + T - \tau \]

Then:
\[ x(kT + T) = e^{FT} x(kT) + \left( \int_{kT}^{kT+T} e^{F\eta} d\eta \right) Gu(kT) \]

Let’s rename \( \Phi = e^{FT} \) and \( \Gamma = \left( \int_{kT}^{kT+T} e^{F\eta} d\eta \right) G \)
Discrete state matrices

So,

\[ x(k + 1) = \Phi x(k) + \Gamma u(k) \]
\[ y(k) = H x(k) + J u(k) \]

Again, \( x(k + 1) \) is shorthand for \( x(kT + T) \)

Note that we can also write \( \Phi \) as:

\[ \Phi = I + FT \Psi \]

where

\[ \Psi = I + \frac{FT}{2!} + \frac{F^2T^2}{3!} + \cdots \]
Simplifying calculation

• We can also use $\Psi$ to calculate $\Gamma$
  
  – Note that:
  
  $$\Gamma = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{F^k T^k}{(k + 1)!} T G$$
  
  $$= \Psi T G$$

$\Psi$ itself can be evaluated with the series:

$$\Psi \approx I + \frac{FT}{2} \left( I + \frac{FT}{3} \left[ I + \cdots \frac{FT}{n-1} \left( I + \frac{FT}{n} \right) \right] \right)$$
State-space z-transform

We can apply the z-transform to our system:

\[(zI - \Phi)X(z) = \Gamma U(k)\]

\[Y(z) = HX(z)\]

which yields the transfer function:

\[\frac{Y(z)}{X(z)} = G(z) = H(zI - \Phi)^{-1}\Gamma\]
State-space control design

- Design for discrete state-space systems is just like the continuous case.
  - Apply linear state-variable feedback:
    \[ u = -Kx \]
  such that \( \det(zI - \Phi + \Gamma K) = \alpha_c(z) \)
  where \( \alpha_c(z) \) is the desired control characteristic equation

Predictably, this requires the system controllability matrix

\[ C = [\Gamma \ \Phi \Gamma \ \Phi^2 \Gamma \ \ldots \ \Phi^{n-1} \Gamma] \] to be full-rank.