Individualized Training of Back Muscles using Iterative Learning Control of a Compliant Balance Board – Stability analysis for the iterative learning controller

Elisabeth Jensen[1,2], Fan Wu[1,2], Reihaneh Mirjalili[1,2], Kim Peper[1,2], Dennis Ossadnik[1,2], Jan Lang[1,3,4], Matthias Martin[5], Florian Hetfleisch[5], Rainer Burgkart[*1,3], Sami Haddadin[*1,2]

I. Stability

Consider the following time-discrete dynamics from Section III.B of the main paper

$$K_{d,i+1} = K_{d,i} + \Delta k \left(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1\right)^3 , \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{a}{\sigma_\theta^*}$. In this work we set $\Delta k = 400\,\mathrm{Nm}$ and $\sigma_\theta^* = 4°$. Additionally, we found that $\alpha \in [1.125, 1.375]$ and $b \in [0.0010, 0.0015]$ (95% confidence interval) for one test subject using the nonlinear least squares method.

Proposition 1 *Let $K_d^* = \frac{\ln(\alpha)}{b}$ be the equilibrium position of the time-discrete dynamics (1), where $\alpha > 1$, $b > 0$, and $0 < \Delta k < \Delta k_{max}$. If there exists a Lyapunov function that satisfies*

i) $V(K_{d,i}) \geq 0$,
ii) $V(K_{d,i}) = 0$, *iff* $K_{d,i} = K_d^*$, *and*
iii) $\Delta V(K_{d,i}) = V(K_{d,i+1}) - V(K_{d,i}) < 0$

for all $K_{d,i} > 0$, then the equilibrium position of (1) is asymptotically stable.

Proof: To prove that $K_d^* = \frac{\ln(\alpha)}{b}$ is the equilibrium position, we set $K_d^* = K_{d,i} = K_{d,i+1}$ and substitute in (1)

$$\begin{aligned} K_d^* &= K_d^* + \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_d^*} - 1)^3 \\ 0 &= \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_d^*} - 1)^3 \\ 0 &= \alpha e^{-bK_d^*} - 1 \\ e^{-bK_d^*} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \\ -bK_d^* &= \ln(\frac{1}{\alpha}) \\ K_d^* &= \frac{\ln(\alpha)}{b} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Next, we select

$$V(K_{d,i}) = \frac{1}{2}(K_{d,i} - K_d^*)^2 \tag{3}$$

as a candidate Lyapunov function. Condition i) is always fulfilled because (3) is an upward opening parabola with vertex at $V = 0$. By substituting $K_{d,i} = K_d^*$ into (3), it is evident that condition ii) is fulfilled. This leaves us with condition iii), which we will prove next.

[1]Munich Institute of Robotics and Machine Intelligence, Technical University of Munich (TUM), Munich, Germany
[2]Chair of Robotics and Systems Intelligence, TUM, Munich, Germany
[3]Department of Orthopaedics and Sports Orthopaedics, University Hospital Rechts der Isar, TUM School of Medicine, Munich, Germany
[4]Chair of Non-destructive Testing, TUM School of Engineering and Design, Munich, Germany
[5]B&W Engineering und Datensysteme GmbH, Stuttgart, Germany
* These authors share senior authorship.
Corresponding author: elisabeth.jensen@tum.de

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
V(K_{d,i+1}) &= \frac{1}{2}(K_{d,i+1} - K_d^*)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(K_{d,i} + \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 - K_d^*)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(K_{d,i} - K_d^*)^2 + (K_{d,i} - K_d^*)\Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 + \frac{1}{2}\Delta k^2(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^6 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(K_{d,i} - K_d^*)^2 + \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 \left((K_{d,i} - K_d^*) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta V(K_{d,i}) &= V(K_{d,i+1}) - V(K_{d,i}) \\
&= \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 \left((K_{d,i} - K_d^*) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

For the subsequent analysis, we define

$$g(K_{d,i}) \coloneqq \alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1 \tag{6}$$

and

$$f(K_{d,i}) \coloneqq K_{d,i} - K_d^* + \frac{1}{2}\Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3; \tag{7}$$

thus,

$$\Delta V(K_{d,i}) = g(K_{d,i})f(K_{d,i}). \tag{8}$$

To prove that condition iii) holds, we consider both the case that $g(K_{d,i}) < 0$ and that $g(K_{d,i}) > 0$, wherein $g(K_{d,i}) = 0$ corresponds to $K_{d,i} = K_d^*$.

Case 1: First, let us consider when $g(K_{d,i}) < 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1 &< 0 \\
\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} &< 1 \\
-bK_{d,i} &< -\ln\alpha \\
K_{d,i} &> K_d^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Following (8), $\Delta V(K_{d,i}) > 0$ only holds for this case if $f(K_{d,i}) > 0$, i.e.

$$K_{d,i} - K_d^* + \frac{1}{2}\Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 > 0. \tag{9}$$

Given that $f(K_d^*) = 0$, we need to show that $f(K_{d,i})$ is monotonously increasing for $K_{d,i} > K_d^*$, i.e.

$$f'(K_{d,i}) = 1 - \frac{3}{2}\Delta k\alpha b e^{-bK_{d,i}}(ae^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^2 > 0. \tag{10}$$

This is most easily demonstrated by showing that all extrema of $f'(K_{d,i})$ are greater than zero for $K_{d,i} > K_d^*$. For this, we have to compute the derivative and set it to zero:

$$\begin{aligned}
f''(K_{d,i}) = \frac{3}{2}\Delta k\alpha b^2 e^{-bK_{d,i}}(ae^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^2 + 3\Delta k\alpha^2 b^2 e^{-2bK_{d,i}}(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1) &= 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad (\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^2 + 2\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}}(ae^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1) = 0 &= 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad (ae^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)\left((\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1) + 2e^{-bK_{d,i}}\right) &= 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad (\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)\left(3\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1\right) &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

If $(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1) = 0$, $K_{d,i} = K_d^*$, and $f'(K_d^*) = 1 > 0$. If $\left(3\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1\right) = 0$, we have

$$K_{d,i} = K_{ex} \coloneqq \frac{\ln 3\alpha}{b} \tag{12}$$

Substituting K_{ex} back into Eq. (10) yields the following condition

$$\Delta k < \Delta k_{max} \coloneqq \frac{9}{8b}. \tag{13}$$

There are no other extrema in the domain of interest; therefore, it only remains to verify that (10) holds as $K_{d,i}$ approaches infinity. Since

$$\lim_{K_{d,i}\to\infty} f'(K_{d,i}) = 1 \tag{14}$$

holds, (10) is fulfilled in this case, as well.

Case 2: Now we consider when $g(K_{d,i}) > 0$ and thus $K_{d,i} < K_d^*$. We need to show that

$$f(K_{d,i}) < 0. \tag{15}$$

We know that $f(0) = -K_d^* < 0$ and $f(K_d^*) = 0$. From our previous analysis, we know that for $K_d \in (0, K_d^*)$, there are no extrema of $f'(K_d^*)$ and that $f'(K_d^*) > 0$. This evidence suffices to prove that $f(K_{d,i}) < 0$ for all $K_{d,i} < K_d^*$. Therefore, if Δk is selected according to (13), (15) holds, and we have proven asymptotic stability for all $K_{d,i} > 0$. ■

II. Transient behavior

We want to ensure that the controller does not generate a physically infeasible negative stiffness value $K_{d,i} < 0$.

Proposition 2 *For all $K_{d,i} > K_d^*$, no overshooting occurs, i.e. $K_{d,i+1} > K_d^*$.*

Proof: To prove that

$$K_{d,i+1} = K_{d,i} + \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 > K_d^* \tag{16}$$

we must show that

$$(K_{d,i} - K_d^*) + \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3 > 0. \tag{17}$$

Let us define $h(K_{d,i}) := (K_{d,i} - K_d^*) + \Delta k(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^3$. We know that $h(K_d^*) = 0$. Therefore, we need to show that $h(K_{d,i})$ is monotonically increasing, i.e., $h'(K_{d,i}) > 0$. Taking the first derivative yields

$$h'(K_{d,i}) = 1 - 3\Delta k\alpha b e^{-bK_{d,i}}(\alpha e^{-bK_{d,i}} - 1)^2 \tag{18}$$

Similar to our proof for Proposition 1, we check for extrema in the domain $K_{d,i} > K_d^*$ by setting $h''(K_{d,i}) = 0$, which yields

$$K_{d,i} = K_{ex} := \frac{\ln 3\alpha}{b}. \tag{19}$$

Substituting this value in $h'(K_{d,i}) > 0$ yields

$$\Delta k < \frac{9}{4b}, \tag{20}$$

which is similar to the requirement outlined in (13). Furthermore, since

$$\lim_{K_{d,i}\to\infty} h'(K_{d,i}) = 1, \tag{21}$$

we have shown that $h'(K_{d,i}) > 0$ for all $K_{d,i} > K_d^*$ and thus proven Proposition 2. ■