CDS 101/110: Lecture 10-1
Limits on Performance

Richard M. Murray
30 November 2015

Goals:
- Describe limits of performance on feedback systems
- Introduce Bode's integral formula and the "waterbed" effect
- Show some of the limitations of feedback due to RHP poles and zeros

Reading:
- Åström and Murray, Feedback Systems, Section 12.6

Algebraic Constraints on Performance



$$H_{er} = \frac{1}{1+PC} =: S$$ Sensitivity function

$$H_{yn} = \frac{PC}{1+PC} =: T$$ Complementary sensitivity function

Goal: keep S & T small
- S small ⇒ low tracking error
- T small ⇒ good noise rejection (and robustness [CDS 112/212])

Problem: S + T = 1
- Can't make both S & T small at the same frequency
- Solution: keep S small at low frequency and T small at high frequency
- Loop gain interpretation: keep L large at low frequency, and small at high frequency



- Transition between large gain and small gain complicated by stability (phase margin)

Bode's Integral Formula and the Waterbed Effect

Bode's integral formula for S = 1/(1+PC) = 1/(1+L):

- Let pk be the unstable poles of L(s) and assume relative degree of L(s) ≥ 2
- Theorem: the area under the sensitivity function is a conserved quantity:

$$\int_0^\infty \log_e |S(j\omega)| d\omega = \int_0^\infty \log_e \frac{1}{|1+L(j\omega)|} d\omega = \pi \sum \mathrm{Re}\, p_k$$



Waterbed effect:

- Making sensitivity smaller over some frequency range requires *increase* in sensitivity someplace else
- Presence of RHP poles makes this effect worse
- Actuator bandwidth further limits what you can do
- Note: area formula is linear in ω; Bode plots are logarithmic

Example: Magnetic Levitation



System description

- Ball levitated by electromagnet
- Inputs: current thru electromagnet
- Outputs: position of ball (from IR sensor)
- States: z, $\dot{z}$
- Dynamics: F = ma, F = magnetic force generated by wire coil
- See MATLAB handout for details



Controller circuit

- Active R/C filter network
- Inputs: set point, disturbance, ball position
- States: currents and voltages
- Outputs: electromagnet current

Equations of Motion



Process: actuation, sensing, dynamics

$$m\ddot{z} = mg - k_m(k_A u)^2/z^2$$
$$v_{ir} = k_T z + v_0$$

- u = current to electromagnet
- v_{ir} = voltage from IR sensor

Linearization:

$$P(s) = \frac{-k}{s^2 - r^2} \qquad k, r > 0$$

- Poles at $s = \pm r \Rightarrow$ open loop unstable





Control Design

Need to create encirclement

- Loop shaping is not useful here
- Flip gain to bring Nyquist plot over -1 point
- Insert phase to create CCW encirclement

Can accomplish using a lead compensator

- Produce phase lead at crossover
- Generates loop in Nyquist plot

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





Performance Limits

Nominal design gives low perf

- Not enough gain at low frequency
- Try to adjust overall gain to improve low frequency response
- Works well at moderate gain, but notice waterbed effect

Bode integral limits improvement

$$\int_0^\infty \log|S(j\omega)|d\omega = \pi r$$

- Must increase sensitivity at some point





Right Half Plane Zeros

Right half plane zeros produce "non-minimum phase" behavior

- Phase of frequency response has additional phase lag for given magnitude
- Can cause output to move opposite from input for a short period of time

Example: $H_1(s) = \dfrac{s+a}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}$ **vs** $H_2(s) = \dfrac{s-a}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}$





Example: Lateral Control of the Ducted Fan





$$H_{xf_1}(s) = \frac{(s^2 - mgl)}{s^2(Js^2 + ds + mgl)}$$

- Poles: 0, 0, $-\sigma$ § $j\,\omega_d$
- Zeros: $\pm\sqrt{mgl}$

Source of non-minimum phase behavior

- To move left, need to make θ > 0
- To generate positive θ, need f1 > 0
- Positive f1 causes fan to move right initially
- Fan starts to move left after short time (as fan rotates)



Stability in the Presence of Zeros

Loop gain limitations

- Poles of closed loop = poles of 1 + L. Suppose C = k nc/dc, where k is the gain of the controller

$$1 + L = 1 + k\frac{n_c n_p}{d_c d_p} = \frac{d_c d_p + k n_c n_p}{d_c d_p}$$

- For large k, closed loop poles approach open loop zeros
- RHP zeros limit maximum gain ⇒ serious design constraint!

Root locus interpretation

- Plot location of eigenvalues as a function of the loop gain k
- Can show that closed loop poles go from open loop poles (k = 0) to open loop zeros (k = \infty)



Additional performance limits due to RHP zeros

Another waterbed-like effect: look at maximum of Her over frequency range:

$$M_1 = \max_{\omega_1 \le \omega \le \omega_2} |H_{er}(j\omega)| \qquad M_2 = \max_{0 \le \omega \le \infty} |H_{er}(j\omega)|$$

Thm: Suppose that P has a RHP zero at z. Then there exist constants c1 and c2 (depending on ω1, ω2, z) such that $c_1 \log M_1 + c_2 \log M_2 \ge 0$

- M_1 typically << 1 ⇒ M_2 must be larger than 1 (since sum is positive)
- If we increase performance in active range (make M_1 and H_{er} smaller), we must lose performance (H_{er} increases) some place else
- Note that this affects peaks not integrals (different from RHP poles)



$$H(s) = \frac{(s^2 - mgl)}{s^2(Js^2 + ds + mgl)}$$

- Poles: 0, 0, $-\sigma \pm j\,\omega_d$
- Zeros: $\pm\sqrt{mgl}$



Summary: Limits of Performance

Many limits to performance

- Algebraic: S + T = 1
- RHP poles: Bode integral formula
- RHP zeros: Waterbed effect on peak of S

Main message: try to avoid RHP poles and zeros when-ever possible (eg, re-design)

$$\int_0^\infty \log_e |S(j\omega)| d\omega = \int_0^\infty \log_e \frac{1}{|1 + L(j\omega)|} d\omega = \pi \sum \mathrm{Re}\, p_k$$





Announcements

Homework #8 is due on Friday, 2 pm

- In class or HW slot (102 STL)

Office hours this week

- Wed, 3-4 pm, 243 ANB
- Thu, 7-9 pm, 106 ANB

Final exam

- Out on 4 Dec (Fri)
- Due on 11 Dec by 5 pm: turn in to Nikki (109 Steele) or HW slot (102 STL)
- Final exam review: 4 Dec from 2-3 pm, 105 Annenberg
- Office hours during study period
  - 7 Dec (Mon), 3-5 pm
  - 8 Dec (Tue), 3-5 pm
- Piazza will be "read only" starting at ~8 pm on 8 Dec