

## Lecturer

### Set up MATLAB

In [1]:

```
cd matlab  
pwd  
clear all  
format compact
```

ans =

```
'/Users/eechris/dev/eglm03-textbook/content/02/matlab'
```

## Steady-state and Transient Response

This chapter is concerned with steady-state and transient analysis of control systems.

The second-order system response and its relationship to the closed-loop poles and zeros is revised. The effect of an additional zero or an additional pole on the 2<sup>nd</sup> order response is examined and pole-zero cancellation is discussed.


System type-number and its relationship to steady-state error response is revised.

## Reading

You should read sections 4.2 **Time Domain Criteria** and 4.1 **Steady-State Criteria** of the [Handout](#) ([./eglm03-textbook/handouts/csd](#)) **Control System Design Methods, Compensation Strategies and Design Criteria**.

## Transient Performance

### A Second-Order System



Processing math: 22%

Where are the system poles and what does the model 2nd Order response look like for each of these cases?

$\omega_n$	$\zeta$
3	3
3	1
3	0.8
3	0.5
3	0

## Effect of Damping on 2nd Order Response

In [2]:

```
wn = 3;
z = [3, 2.5, 2, 1.5, 1, 0.9, 0.8, 1/sqrt(2), 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1, 0];
```


In [3]:

```
zeta = z(2);  
G = tf(wn^2, [1, 2*zeta*wn, wn^2])  
subplot(211),pzmap( G),axis([-20, 1, -4, 4])  
subplot(212),step( G),axis([0,10,0,2])
```

G =


$$\frac{9}{s^2 + 15s + 9}$$

Continuous-time transfer function.



Or download and run this script `second_resp.m` (second\_resp.m) in MATLAB.


Processing math: 22%



**How do the natural frequency and damping ratio relate to pole locations?**

$$T(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + \zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1,2} &= -\zeta \pm \omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2} \\ &= -\sigma_d \pm j\omega_d \end{aligned}$$




## How do the transient performance criteria map to the closed loop poles?

### Settling time $T_s$

Settling time is related to relative stability and speed of response.

1% settling time:


$$T_s \approx \frac{4.6}{\sigma_d}$$



### Rise Time $T_r$

Rise time is related to speed of response

$$T_r \approx \frac{1.8}{\omega_n}$$



### Percentage overshoot (%OS or $M_p$ )


Percentage overshoot is related to damping

$$M_p = \exp\left(\frac{-\pi\zeta}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}\right) \times 100$$

Processing math: 22%




$$M_p \approx \left(1 - \frac{\zeta}{0.6}\right) \times 100 \quad 0 \leq \zeta < 0.6$$



### Combined constraints

- If system has inadequate rise time (too slow) we must raise the natural frequency
- If system has too much overshoot we need to increase damping
- If transient persists too long, move the poles further to the left in the s-plane



Processing math: 22%

## What if the system is not second order?

- What is the effect of an extra zero?
- What is the effect of an extra pole?
- What if there are many poles and zeros?

### Effect of an Extra Zero

First normalize transfer function:

$$G(s) = \frac{C(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{2}{\omega_n}\right)^2 + 2\zeta\left(\frac{s}{\omega_n}\right) + 1}$$

Then add a zero

$$G(s) = \frac{C(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{\left(\frac{s}{\alpha\zeta\omega_n}\right) + 1}{\left(\frac{2}{\omega_n}\right)^2 + 2\zeta\left(\frac{s}{\omega_n}\right) + 1}$$

Note that  $\alpha$  is a multiplier of the real part of the complex poles  $\zeta\omega_n$ .

### 2nd order system with extra zero

Matlab demo (run zero2nd.m (zero2nd.m)):

In [4]:

```
zero2nd
```

Processing math: 22%

```

clf
wn = 10;
zeta = 0.7;
t = 0:0.01:2;
s = tf('s');
Tc = tf(1/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1))

```

```
Tc =
```

$$\frac{1000}{10 s^2 + 140 s + 1000}$$

Continuous-time transfer function.

```

[c]=step(Tc,t);
plot(t,c,'r-')
title('Effect of an additional zero on model 2nd order response')
ylabel('Controlled variable C(t)')
xlabel('Normalised time wn t')
hold on
for alpha = [100,50,10,8,6,4,3,2,1.5,1,0.5]

```

```

    T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```

```

    T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```

```

    T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```

```

    T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```

```

    T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```

```

    T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'g*')
    end
    plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```

```
end
```

Processing math: 22%

```


T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
[c,t]=step(T2,t);
if (alpha == 4)
plot(t,c,'b-')
end


T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
[c,t]=step(T2,t);
if (alpha == 4)
plot(t,c,'b-')
end

T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
[c,t]=step(T2,t);
if (alpha == 4)
plot(t,c,'b-')
end

T2 = tf((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1));
[c,t]=step(T2,t);
if (alpha == 4)
plot(t,c,'b-')
end

```





Design curves (see handout):




Figure 20 Effect of an extra zero at  $s = -z_r$  on a second order system

- a). % overshoot  $M_p$  vs  $z_r / \zeta \omega_n$   
 b). normalized rise time  $\omega_n t_r$  vs  $z_r / \zeta \omega_n$



### .. how about adding an extra pole?

$$G(s) = \frac{C(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{1}{\left( \left( \frac{s}{\alpha \omega_n} \right) + 1 \right) \left( \left( \frac{s}{\omega_n} \right)^2 + 2\zeta \left( \frac{s}{\omega_n} \right) + 1 \right)}$$

Note that  $\alpha$  is a multiplier of the real part of the complex poles.

### 2nd order system with extra pole

Matlab demo (run [pole2nd.m](#) (`pole2nd.m`)):

In [ ]:

```
pole2nd
```

Processing math: 22%

```
clf
wn = 10;
zeta = 0.7;
t = 0:0.01:2;
s = tf('s');
Tc = tf(1/((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) + 1))
```

```
Tc =
```

```

      1000
-----
10 s^2 + 140 s + 1000
```


Continuous-time transfer function.

```
[c]=step(Tc,t);
plot(t,c,'r-')
title('Effect of an additional pole on model 2nd order response')
ylabel('Controlled variable C(t)')
xlabel('Normalised time wn t')
hold on
```


```
for alpha = [100,50,10,8,6,4,3,2,1.5,1,0.5]
    T2 = tf(1/((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)*((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) +
1)));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
    end
    T2 = tf(1/((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)*((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) +
1)));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
    end
    T2 = tf(1/((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)*((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) +
1)));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
    end
    T2 = tf(1/((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)*((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) +
1)));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'b-')
    end
    T2 = tf(1/((s/(alpha*zeta*wn)+1)*((s/wn)^2 + 2*zeta*(s/wn) +
1)));
    [c,t]=step(T2,t);
    if (alpha == 4)
        plot(t,c,'g*')
    end
    plot(t,c,'b-')
end
```

Processing math: 22%

end



Processing math: 22%



Design curves (see handout):




Figure 19 Effect of an extra pole at  $s = -p_r$  on a second order system

- a). % overshoot  $M_p$  vs  $p_r / \zeta \omega_n$
- b). normalized rise time  $\omega_n t_r$  vs  $p_r / \zeta \omega_n$

## Dominant poles and order reduction

Because the time response of many real systems will be dominated by two or three low frequency poles, a complex high order system can often be simplified by ignoring the effects of high-frequency poles and zeros or a pole that is effectively cancelled by a zero. This MATLAB script file demonstrates this.

Matlab demo (Run [reduction.m](#) (reduction.m))

In this example we ignore any poles or zeros that are located 4 or more times the real part of the dominant poles  $s = -1 \pm j$  or poles that are cancelled by a closed-loop zero and see that the seventh order system is effectively only a third-order system.

In [ ]:


```
sigma = 1;
wd = 1;
disp('Full order system')
zeros = [-6*sigma; -3.2*sigma]
poles = [-9*sigma
        -7*sigma+j*2*wd
        -7*sigma-j*2*wd
        -3*sigma
        -2*sigma
        -sigma+j*wd
        -sigma-j*wd]
g = zpk(zeros,poles,prod(abs(poles))/prod(abs(zeros)));
```

Full order system

```
zeros =
    -6.0000
    -3.2000
poles =
    -9.0000 + 0.0000i
    -7.0000 + 2.0000i
    -7.0000 - 2.0000i
    -3.0000 + 0.0000i
    -2.0000 + 0.0000i
    -1.0000 + 1.0000i
    -1.0000 - 1.0000i
```

In [ ]:

```
subplot(121)
pzmap(poles,zeros)
subplot(122)
step(g)
```



Now remove redundant terms

Step 1: remove high frequency pole at  $-9 \times \sigma$

In [ ]:

```
z1 = zeros
p1 = poles(2:7)
g1 = zpke(z1,p1,prod(abs(p1))/prod(abs(z1)));
```


```
z1 =
    -6.0000
    -3.2000
p1 =
    -7.0000 + 2.0000i
    -7.0000 - 2.0000i
    -3.0000 + 0.0000i
    -2.0000 + 0.0000i
    -1.0000 + 1.0000i
    -1.0000 - 1.0000i
```

Processing math: 22%



In [ ]:

```
subplot(121)
pzmap(p1,z1)
subplot(122)
step(g,g1)
```



Step 2: remove complex hf pole pair


In [ ]:

```
z2 = z1
p2 = p1(3:6)
g2 = zpka(z2,p2,prod(abs(p2))/prod(abs(z2)));
```

```
z2 =
    -6.0000
    -3.2000
p2 =
    -3.0000 + 0.0000i
    -2.0000 + 0.0000i
    -1.0000 + 1.0000i
    -1.0000 - 1.0000i
```

In [ ]:

```
subplot(121)
pzmap(p2,z2)
subplot(122)
step(g,g1,g2)
```



Step 3: remove hf zero


In [ ]:

```
z3= z2(2)
p3 = p2
g3 = zpk(z3,p3,prod(abs(p3))/prod(abs(z3)));
```

```
z3 =
-3.2000
p3 =
-3.0000 + 0.0000i
-2.0000 + 0.0000i
-1.0000 + 1.0000i
-1.0000 - 1.0000i
```

In [ ]:

```
subplot(121)
pzmap(p3,z3)
subplot(122)
step(g,g1,g2,g3)
```



Step 4: remove pole-zero cancellation terms


In [ ]:

```
z4= []
p4 = p3(2:4)
g4 = zpk(z4,p4,prod(abs(p4))/prod(abs(z4)));
```

```
z4 =
[]
p4 =
-2.0000 + 0.0000i
-1.0000 + 1.0000i
-1.0000 - 1.0000i
```

In [ ]:

```
subplot(121)
pzmap(p4,z4)
subplot(122)
step(g,g1,g2,g3,g4)
```



Step 5: remove last non-dominant pole')


In [ ]:

```
z5 = z4
p5 = p4(2:3)
g5 = zpkm(z5,p5,prod(abs(p5))/prod(abs(z5)));

z5 =
[]
p5 =
-1.0000 + 1.0000i
-1.0000 - 1.0000i
```

In [ ]:

```
subplot(121)
pzmap(p5,z5)
subplot(122)
step(g,g1,g2,g3,g4,g5)
```



Original system

In [ ]:

```
g
g =
      298.12 (s+6) (s+3.2)
-----
(s+9) (s+3) (s+2) (s^2 + 2s + 2) (s^2 + 14s + 53)
```

Continuous-time zero/pole/gain model.

Reduced order system

In [ ]:

g4


g4 =

$$\frac{4}{(s+2)(s^2 + 2s + 2)}$$

Continuous-time zero/pole/gain model.

In [ ]:

```
subplot(221)
pzmap(poles,zeros)
subplot(222)
step(g)
subplot(223)
pzmap(p4,z4)
subplot(224)
step(g,g4)
```



What are the steady-state performance criteria?


## Steady-state response

- Canonical system
- Disturbance rejection
- System type for non-unity gain feedback

Processing math: 22%

Canonical System

(unity-gain feedback)



$E(s) = R(s) - C(s)$

$E(s) = \frac{G_o(s)}{1 + G_o(s)}R(s)$

Steady-state Performance

For a unity-gain negative feedback system with open-loop transfer function  $G_o(s)$  the steady-state error (SSE) response of the closed-loop system is related to system type number according to the table shown below.

		System Type Number		
		Type 0	Type 1	Type 2
Type of input	SSE	Step	Velocity	Acceleration
Step	$\frac{1}{1+K_p}$	$\frac{1}{1+K_p}$	$\infty$	$\infty$
Ramp	$\frac{1}{K_v}$	0	$\frac{1}{K_v}$	$\infty$
Parabola	$\frac{1}{K_a}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{K_a}$

Where

**Position error constant for step input:**  $R(s) = 1/s$ :

$K_p = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s G_o(s)$

**Velocity error constant for ramp input:**  $R(s) = 1/s^2$ :

$K_v = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s G_o(s)$

**Acceleration error constant for parabolic input:**  $R(s) = 1/s^3$ :

$K_a = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s^2 G_o(s)$

## Special Cases


For these models calculate the error response ( $E(s) = G_o(s)N_d(s)$  for the "disturbance rejection" case and  $E(s) = R(s) - C(s)$  for the "non-unity-gain-feedback") case and use the final value theorem to calculate the steady state step error.

Compare your result with the result of the simulation.

You should note that in both cases the plant transfer function has type number 1. Do the rules of system type number as you understand them carry over to these special cases?

### Disturbance rejection? (Compliance)

Assuming that the system is originally at steady-state ( $E(s) = R(s) - C(s) = 0$ ) what is the steady-state error to a step change in the disturbance in  $n_d(t)$ ? ( $N_d(s) = 1/s$ )




[Model file [disturbance\\_rejection.mdl](#) ([disturbance\\_rejection.mdl](#))]

In [ ]:

```
disturbance_rejection
```

### Non-unity gain feedback



[Model file [non\\_unity\\_gain\\_feedback.mdl](#) ([non\\_unity\\_gain\\_feedback.mdl](#))]

In [ ]:

```
non_unity_gain_feedback
Processing math: 22%
```



## Further Reading

The System Metrics ([https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Control\\_Systems/System\\_Metrics](https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Control_Systems/System_Metrics)) section of the Control Systems Wikibook ([https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Control\\_Systems](https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Control_Systems)) amplifies some of the topics covered in this chapter.

The topics covered in this chapter are also amplified in

- Nise. Chapter 4: Time Response.
- Dorf and Bishop. Chapter 5: The Performance of Feedback Control Systems.