

Actuator Fault Diagnosis and Accommodation in Interconnected Nonlinear Dynamical Systems

Hamed Tirandaz

Supervisor: **Prof. Marios Polycarpou**

Co-supervisor: **Dr. Christodoulos Keliris**

Ph.D. Thesis Committee:

Prof. Christos Panayiotou

Prof. Panayiotis Kolios

Prof. Stelios Timotheou

Prof. Marios Polycarpou

Prof. Pedro Zufiria

Dr. Christodoulos Keliris

Electrical and Computer Engineering Department,
KIOS Research Center,
University of Cyprus

November 22, 2024

Outline

Preface

- Motivation
- Objectives/Challenges
- Challenges

Actuator Fault Detection and Isolation

- Problem Formulation
- Actuator Fault Detection
- Actuator Fault Propagation
- Actuator Fault Isolation

Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation

- Problem Formulation
- Sensor Fault Isolation
- Actuator Fault Isolation


Actuator Fault Accommodation

- Problem formulation
- System Normalization
- Adaptive approximation
- Nominal Controller Design
- Control Reconfiguration

Future Works

Dynamical Systems

System Structure



Dynamical Systems

System Structure

A class of nonlinear dynamical systems: (state-space representation)

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \underbrace{Ax(t) + B(u_H(t) + u_F(t))}_{\text{Linear term}} + \underbrace{g(x(t))}_{\text{Nonlinearity}} + \underbrace{\eta(x(t), t)}_{\text{Modelling uncertainty and disturbance}} + f_p(x(t), t) \\ y(t) = h(x(t)) + \underbrace{\varepsilon_y(t)}_{\text{Measurement noise}} + f_y(x(t), u(t), t) \end{cases}$$

Dynamical Systems

System Structure

A class of nonlinear dynamical systems: (state-space representation)


Fault types

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + B(u_H(t) + \underbrace{u_F(t)}_{\text{Actuator fault(s)}}) + g(x(t)) + \eta(x(t), t) + \underbrace{f_p(x(t), t)}_{\text{Process fault(s)}} \\ y(t) = h(x(t)) + \varepsilon_y(t) + \underbrace{f_y(x(t), u(t), t)}_{\text{Sensor fault(s)}} \end{cases}$$

Motivation

Dynamical Systems


Centralized vs. Interconnected



Motivation

Dynamical Systems

Centralized vs. Interconnected



The interconnected representation:

- ▶ Provides Simplicity in Monitoring & Control
- ▶ Improves fault isolability by addressing fault propagation

► Objectives

- Actuator Fault Detection and Isolation
- Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation
- Actuator Fault Accommodation

Actuator Fault Detection and Isolation in a Class of Nonlinear Interconnected Systems

Objectives:

- ▶ **Actuator Fault Detection**
- ▶ **Actuator Fault Isolation**

Literature Review: Actuator Fault Detection

Existing Research:

[1]. Keliris et al., 2013,

A distributed fault detection **filtering** approach for a class of interconnected continuous-time nonlinear systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*.

[2]. Reppa et al., 2014,

Adaptive approximation for multiple sensor fault detection and isolation of nonlinear uncertain systems, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*

[3]. Keliris et al., 2015,

A robust nonlinear observer-based approach for distributed fault detection of input–output interconnected systems, *Automatica*.

[4]. Keliris et al., 2017,

An **integrated learning and filtering approach** for fault diagnosis of a class of nonlinear dynamical systems, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*

New Contribution:

We propose a **new filtering** scheme to improve fault detection in nonlinear interconnected systems.

[5]. Reppa V, et al., 2014,

Decentralized isolation of multiple sensor faults in large-scale interconnected nonlinear systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*.

- ▶ Reasoning-based decision scheme
- ▶ Fault signature matrix
- ▶ Detection decision
- ▶ Consistency test

Dynamical system

$$\Sigma^{(I)} : \quad \dot{x}^{(I)}(t) = A^{(I)}x^{(I)}(t) + \gamma^{(I)} \left(x^{(I)}(t), u^{(I)}(t) \right) \\ + h^{(I)} \left(x^{(I)}(t), u^{(I)}(t), z^{(I)}(t) \right) \\ + \eta^{(I)} \left(x^{(I)}(t), u^{(I)}(t), z^{(I)}(t), t \right)$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{(I)} : \quad y^{(I)}(t) = C^{(I)}x^{(I)}(t) + d^{(I)}(t) + f^{(I)}(t)$$

Literature Review: Actuator Fault Isolation

[6]. Kościelny JM, Bartyś M., 2023,

A new method of diagnostic row reasoning based on trivalent residuals, *Expert Syst. Appl.*

► Reasoning-based decision scheme




Table 1
FIS for a set of two tanks (instrument faults are excluded).

f/s	f_1	f_2	f_3	f_4
s_1	+1	0	-1	0
s_2	0	+1	+1	-1
s_3	+1	+1	0	-1

Table 2

Conflict sets $C(s_j = v_p)$ in the case of bi-valued diagnostic signals.

S	V	$C(s_j = v_p)$
s_1	1	$\{f_1, f_3\}$
s_2	1	$\{f_2, f_3, f_4\}$
s_3	1	$\{f_1, f_2, f_4\}$

Table 3

Conflict sets $C(s_j = v_p)$ in the case of three-valued diagnostic signals.

S	V	$C(s_j = v_p)$
s_1	-1	$\{f_3\}$
	+1	$\{f_1\}$
s_2	-1	$\{f_4\}$
	+1	$\{f_2, f_3\}$

Problem Formulation

System Description

The I -th subsystem considered in our study

$$\Sigma^{(I)} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^{(I)} = A^{(I)}x^{(I)} + g^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, u^{(I)}) + h^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, z^{(I)}, u^{(I)}) + \eta^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, z^{(I)}, t) \\ y^{(I)} = x^{(I)} + \xi_y^{(I)}, \end{cases} \quad I = 1, \dots, N$$

Variables:

$$x^{(I)}, y^{(I)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_I}, \quad z^{(I)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}_I}, \quad u^{(I)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_I}, \quad y^{(I)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_I}$$

(Multiple Input Multiple Output per Subsystem)

Functions:

$$A^{(I)}x^{(I)}$$

(Known linear term)

$$g^{(I)} : \mathbb{R}^{n_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_I}$$

(Known nonlinear term)

$$h^{(I)} : \mathbb{R}^{n_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_I}$$

(Known interconnection term)

$$\eta^{(I)} : \mathbb{R}^{n_I} \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}_I} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_I}$$

(Unknown uncertainty term)

$$\xi_y^{(I)}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_I}$$

(Sensor noise)

Problem Formulation

System Description

The I -th subsystem considered in our study


$$\Sigma^{(I)} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^{(I)} = A^{(I)}x^{(I)} + g^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, u^{(I)}) + h^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, z^{(I)}, u^{(I)}) + \eta^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, z^{(I)}, t) \\ y^{(I)} = x^{(I)} + \xi_y^{(I)}, \end{cases} \quad I = 1, \dots, N$$

Assumptions:

- ▶ The state $x^{(I)}$ remains bounded before and after the occurrence of any actuator fault,
- ▶ $g^{(I)}$ Lipschitz in $x^{(I)}$,
- ▶ $h^{(I)}$ Lipschitz in both $x^{(I)}$ and $z^{(I)}$,
- ▶ $\eta^{(I)}$ Bounded, i.e., $|\eta^{(I)}| \leq \bar{\eta}^{(I)}$ where $\bar{\eta}^{(I)}$ is a Lipschitz in $x^{(I)}$,
- ▶ $\xi_y^{(I)}$ Bounded, i.e., $|\xi_y^{(I)}| \leq \bar{\xi}_y^{(I)}$.


Problem formulation

The architecture of the proposed actuator FDI scheme:



Actuator Fault Detection


Actuator fault detection agent of the I -th subsystem:



Actuator Fault Detection

Adaptive Threshold

– Generated through a new filtering technique.



Actuator Fault Propagation

It is guaranteed that the occurrence of an actuator fault can only be detected by the local detection agent of the faulty subsystem;

$$\Sigma^{(I)} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^{(I)} = f^{(I)}(x^{(I)}, z^{(I)}, \underbrace{u_f^{(I)}}_{\text{Faulty}}) \\ y^{(I)} = x^{(I)} + \xi_{y_i}^{(I)} \end{cases}$$

$$\Sigma^{(J)} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^{(J)} = f^{(J)}(x^{(J)}, z^{(J)}, \underbrace{u_H^{(J)}}_{\text{Healthy}}) \\ y^{(J)} = x^{(I)} + \xi_{y_i}^{(I)} \end{cases} \Rightarrow |\tilde{y}_j^{(J)}| < \bar{y}_j^{(J)} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n_j$$

Actuator Fault Isolation

Actuator Fault Isolation

- **Signature Matrix:** $F = [F_{ij}]_{n_I \times |\mathcal{F}|}$,

$$F_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{Fault } \mathcal{F}_{c_j} \text{ has not any affect on residual } \tilde{y}_i^{(I)} \\ -1 & \text{Fault } \mathcal{F}_{c_j} \text{ has negative affect on residual } \tilde{y}_i^{(I)} \\ +1 & \text{Fault } \mathcal{F}_{c_j} \text{ has positive affect on residual } \tilde{y}_i^{(I)} \\ * & \text{Fault } \mathcal{F}_{c_j} \text{ has unknown affect on residual } \tilde{y}_i^{(I)}, \end{cases}$$

- **Detection Decision:** $\mathcal{E}^{(I)}(t) = [\epsilon_1^{(I)}, \dots, \epsilon_{n_I}^{(I)}]$

$$\epsilon_i^{(I)}(t) = \begin{cases} +1 & \tilde{y}_i^{(I)}(t) > \bar{y}_i^{(I)}(t) \\ -1 & \tilde{y}_i^{(I)}(t) < -\bar{y}_i^{(I)}(t) \\ 0 & |\tilde{y}_i^{(I)}(t)| < \bar{y}_i^{(I)}(t) \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, n_I.$$

Actuator Fault Isolation

Consistent set: (Can result in false alarms in AFI)

$$\mathcal{D}_s(t) = \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{c_k}^{(I)} \middle| \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i(t) = F_{ik} \text{ or } F_{ik} = * & \forall i \in \mathcal{J} \\ F_{ik} = 0 & \forall i \notin \mathcal{J}. \end{cases} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{J} = \left\{ j \middle| |\tilde{y}_j^{(I)}| > \bar{y}_j^{(I)} \right\}$$
$$k \in \{1, \dots, 2^{m_I} - 1\}$$

Weakly consistent set: (Contain the accurate faulty actuator set)


$$\mathcal{D}_w^{(I)}(t) = \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{c_k}^{(I)} \middle| \varepsilon_j^{(I)}(t) = F_{jk}^{(I)} \text{ or } F_{jk}^{(I)} = *, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}^{(I)}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, 2^{m_I} - 1\} \right\}$$

Diagnosed fault set(s): (Accurate isolated faulty actuator set)

$$\mathcal{F}_w^{(I)} \triangleq \bigcap_{i=1}^{2^{m_I}-1} \left\{ \mathcal{F}_{c_i}^{(I)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{c_i}^{(I)} \in \mathcal{D}_w^{(I)}(t) \right\}.$$

Simulation results

Five-Tank System



Time interval	$[0, T_0^{(1)}) = [0, 5] \text{ sec}$	$[T_0^{(1)}, T_{d,1}^{(1)}] = [5, 5.3] \text{ sec}$	$[T_{d,1}^{(1)}, 35.1] = [5.3, 35.1] \text{ sec}$	$[35.1, 60] \text{ sec}$
Actual faulty actuators	—	$\mathcal{F}_{c_1}^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}\}$	$\mathcal{F}_{c_1}^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}\}$	—
Observed pattern $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}(t)$		$[0, 0, 0]^T$	$[-1, 0, 0]^T$	$[0, 0, 0]^T$
Diagnosis sets $\mathcal{D}_s^{(1)}(t)$ (consistency)		—	$\{\mathcal{F}_{c_1}^{(1)}\}$	—
Diagnosis sets $\mathcal{D}_w^{(1)}(t)$ (weak consistency)		—	$\{\mathcal{F}_{c_1}^{(1)}, \mathcal{F}_{c_4}^{(1)}, \mathcal{F}_{c_5}^{(1)}, \mathcal{F}_{c_7}^{(1)}\}$	—
Faulty identified set $\mathcal{F}_w^{(1)}(t)$		—	$\mathcal{F}_{c_1}^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}\}$	—

Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation in a Class of Nonlinear Dynamical Systems

Objectives:

- ▶ Identification of Fault Type: Sensor(s) or Actuator(s)
- ▶ Isolation of Faulty Component(s)

Literature Review

[1]. Trunov A.B., Polycarpou M. M., 2000,

Automated fault diagnosis in nonlinear multivariable systems using a learning methodology, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*

Dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z} &= Az + \alpha(y, u) + \eta_z(z, u, t) + \underline{\mathcal{B}_z(t - T_z)} f_z(y, u) \\ y &= Cz + \eta_y(z, u, t) + \underline{\mathcal{B}_y(t - T_y)} f_y(u)\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

A. Nonlinear Estimation Model

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{z}} &= A\hat{z} + \alpha(y, u) + K(y - \hat{y}) + \underline{\hat{f}_z(y, u; \hat{\theta}_z)} \\ &\quad + \Omega_z \dot{\hat{\theta}}_z + \Omega_y \dot{\hat{\theta}}_y, \quad \hat{z}(0) = z_0\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

$$\dot{\Omega}_z = A_0 \Omega_z + Z_z(y, u; \hat{\theta}_z), \quad \Omega_z(0) = 0 \quad (4)$$

$$\dot{\Omega}_y = A_0 \Omega_y - K Z_y(u; \hat{\theta}_y), \quad \Omega_y(0) = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{y} = C\hat{z} + \underline{\hat{f}_y(u; \hat{\theta}_y)} \quad (6)$$

[2]. Talebi HA, et al., 2008,

A recurrent neural-network-based sensor and actuator fault detection and isolation for nonlinear systems with application to the satellite's attitude control subsystem, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*

– Neural-Network-Based Scheme

Dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= Ax + g(x, u) + \eta_x(x, u, t) + T_A(x, u) \\ y &= Cx + \eta_y(x, u, t) + T_S(x, u)\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Estimation model:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{x}} &= A\hat{x} + g(\hat{x}, u) + \hat{T}_A(\hat{x}, u, W_1) \\ \hat{y} &= C\hat{x} + \hat{T}_S(\hat{x}, u, W_2)\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

Literature Review

[3]. Zhang X, et al.,2008,

Design and analysis of a fault isolation scheme for a class of uncertain nonlinear systems, *Annual Reviews in Control*.

– Generalized observer scheme (FIEs are sensitive to all but one fault)

Dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= Ax + \gamma(y, u) + \eta(x, u, t) + \beta_x(t - T_x)\phi(y, u) \\ y &= Cx + d(x, u, t) + \beta_y(t - T_y)F\theta(t)\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Fault set:

(2)

$$\mathcal{F}_P \triangleq \{\phi^1(y, u), \dots, \phi^N(y, u)\}.$$

Fault Isolation Decision Scheme: If, for each $r \in \{1, \dots, N+l\} \setminus \{s\}$, there exist some finite time $t^r > T_d$ and some $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, such that $|\epsilon_{y_j}^r(t^r)| > \mu_j^r(t^r)$, then the occurrence of fault s is concluded.

$p = 1, \dots, N$, the p th process fault,

$q = N+1, \dots, N+l$, the q th sensor fault,

Literature Review

[4]. Keliris C, et al., 2016,

An integrated learning and filtering approach for fault diagnosis of a class of nonlinear dynamical systems, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*

– Dedicated observer scheme (FIEs are sensitive to single fault)

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + f(x(t), u(t)) + \eta(x(t), u(t)) \\ \quad + \beta^x(t - T_0^x)\phi(x(t), u(t)) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$
$$y(t) = x(t) + \xi(t) + \beta^y(t - T_0^y)\sigma(t) \quad (2)$$

V. FAULT TYPE IDENTIFICATION

A. Process Fault

$$\dot{\hat{x}}_p(t) = g(y(t), u(t)) + \hat{\eta}(y(t), u(t), \hat{\theta}(t)) \quad (28)$$

$$\epsilon_p(t) \triangleq H_1(s)[y(t) - \hat{x}_p(t)] \quad (29)$$

$$r_p(t) \triangleq H_2(s)[\epsilon_p(t)] \quad (30)$$

B. Sensor Faults

$$\dot{\hat{x}}_s(t) = A\hat{x}_s(t) + f(\hat{x}_s(t), u(t)) + \hat{\eta}_L(y(t), u(t)) + \Lambda\epsilon_s^y(t) \quad (33)$$

$$\hat{y}_s(t) = \hat{x}_s(t) + \hat{\sigma}(t) \quad (34)$$

$$\dot{\hat{\sigma}}(t) = \mathcal{P}_\sigma(\Gamma^y\epsilon_s^y(t)) \quad (35)$$

Fault Identification Logic:

$$|r_p^{(k)}(t)| \leq \bar{r}_p^{(k)}(t) \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, n$$

for all $t > T_d + T_{L,2}$.

Fault Identification Logic:

$$|\epsilon_s^y(t)| \leq \bar{\epsilon}_s^y(t) \text{ and } |r_s^{(k)}(t)| \leq \bar{r}_s^{(k)}(t) \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, n$$

for all $t > T_d$.

[5]. Reppa V, et al., 2014,

Decentralized isolation of multiple sensor faults in large-scale interconnected nonlinear systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*.

– Reasoning-based decision scheme

Dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{(I)} : \quad \dot{x}^{(I)}(t) = & A^{(I)}x^{(I)}(t) + \gamma^{(I)}\left(x^{(I)}(t), u^{(I)}(t)\right) \\ & + h^{(I)}\left(x^{(I)}(t), u^{(I)}(t), z^{(I)}(t)\right) \\ & + \eta^{(I)}\left(x^{(I)}(t), u^{(I)}(t), z^{(I)}(t), t\right) \quad (1)\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{(I)} : \quad y^{(I)}(t) = C^{(I)}x^{(I)}(t) + d^{(I)}(t) + f^{(I)}(t) \quad (4)$$

Assumption 1:

the corresponding reference signals of the interconnection variables $z^{(I)}(t)$, denoted by $\bar{z}_r^{(I)}(t)$, are known.

$$|z^{(I)}(t) - \bar{z}_r^{(I)}(t)| \leq \bar{\epsilon}^{(I)}, \forall t \geq 0.$$

[1] Keliris C, et al., 2015,

Distributed fault diagnosis for process and sensor faults in a class of interconnected input–output nonlinear discrete-time systems, *Int. J. Control.*

Literature Review

[6]. Reppa V, et al., 2017,

Optimization of observer design for sensor fault detection of nonlinear systems, *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control.*

- Bias (and abrupt) faults
- Sensor fault detection
- Single sensor fault
- Detectability

Dynamical system:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \gamma(x(t), u(t)) + \eta(t) \quad (1)$$

$$y(t) = x(t) + d(t) + f(t), \quad (2)$$

Abrupt & Bias Faults:

$$f(t) = f_0 + \tilde{f}(t), \quad (34)$$

$f_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the (unknown) non-zero offset

Corollary 3.4: Every single sensor fault $f_i = f_{0i} + \tilde{f}_i$ with $|f_{0i}| \geq f_{0i}^{\min}$ and $|\tilde{f}_i| \leq \tilde{f}_i^*$ is strongly detectable, if $|V_j^{-1}A_i| > |V_j^{-1}|\Gamma$.

$$f_{0i}^{\min} = \min\{f_i : (|\lambda_j^{-1}V_j^{-1}A_i| - |\lambda_j^{-1}V_j^{-1}|\Gamma)|f_i| > c\} \quad (53)$$

$$c = |\lambda_j^{-1}V_j^{-1}|(2\bar{\eta} + \Gamma(2\|\bar{d}\| + \tilde{f}_i^*)) + (|V_j^{-1} - \lambda_j^{-1}V_j^{-1}A_i| + |V_j^{-1}|)(2\bar{d} + [0, \dots, \tilde{f}_i^*, \dots, 0]^\top) \quad (54)$$

[7]. Chen W, Saif M., 2007,

Adaptive actuator fault detection, isolation and accommodation in uncertain systems, *Int. J. Control.*

- Actuator fault detection and isolation
- Known and distinguishable fault functions

$$\dot{x} = Ax - ay + b_1 u_1 + \cdots + b_m u_m$$
$$y = x_1,$$

$$u_1(t) = u(t), u_2(t) = f_2(t) + u(t), \dots, u_m(t) = f_m(t) + u(t),$$
$$u_j(t) = \bar{u}_j, \quad t \geq t_j, \quad j \in 1, 2, \dots, m \quad (29)$$

$$f_j(t) = d f_j \sin(\omega_j t), \quad 2 \leq j \leq m$$

$C_m^1 + \cdots + C_m^{m-1}$ adaptive estimates need to isolate the faults.

Literature Review

[8]. Talebi HA, Khorasani K., 2012,

A neural network-based multiplicative actuator fault detection and isolation of nonlinear systems, *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*

- Actuator fault detection and isolation
- Neural Network-Based Scheme

Dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t), u(t)) + \eta_x(x, u, t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + \eta_y(x, u, t)\end{aligned}$$


Estimation model:

$$\hat{x} = A\hat{x} + g(\hat{x}, \hat{u}_f)$$

$$\hat{y} = C\hat{x}$$

$$\hat{u}_f = \hat{T}_A(\hat{x}, u, W)u,$$

$$\hat{T}_A(\hat{x}, \hat{W}) = \hat{W}\sigma(\hat{V}\hat{x})$$



- ▶ **Address Sensor Fault Propagation**

Key Contribution

- ▶ Address Sensor Fault Propagation
- ▶ Identification of Fault Type (Sensor/Actuator)

Key Contribution

- ▶ Address Sensor Fault Propagation
- ▶ Identification of Fault Type (Sensor/Actuator)
 - No Need for Persistency of Excitation

Definition (Persistence of excitation):

A signal $y(t)$ is persistently exciting if there are positive scalars $\eta_1, \eta_2, \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\eta_1 I \leq \int_t^{t+\mathcal{T}} y(\tau) y^T(\tau) d\tau \leq \eta_2 I \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

Persistently of exciting \iff sufficient variability over time

Key Contribution

- ▶ Address Sensor Fault Propagation
- ▶ Identification of Fault Type (Sensor/Actuator)
- ▶ **Accurate Isolation of Multiple Faulty Sensors: a Decentralized scheme**

Key Contribution


- ▶ Address Sensor Fault Propagation
- ▶ Identification of Fault Type (Sensor/Actuator)
- ▶ Accurate Isolation of Multiple Faulty Sensors: a Decentralized scheme

$$\text{Sensor fault isolability} \iff |f_{y,i}| > 4\bar{\xi}_{y,i}$$

Key Contribution

- ▶ Address Sensor Fault Propagation
- ▶ Identification of Fault Type (Sensor/Actuator)
- ▶ Accurate Isolation of Multiple Faulty Sensors: a Decentralized scheme

KIOS Testbed simulation results



WaterSafe state vector
 $[\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{Q}_2, \mathcal{L}_3, \mathcal{Q}_3, \mathcal{L}_4, \mathcal{Q}_4]$

It can easily show that drift faults greater than $3(t - T_0)$ for all $T_0 = 5$ can be detectable for states (tank levels):
 $[\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{L}_3, \mathcal{L}_4]$

$$\tilde{y}_{si}^{F_y}(T_d) - \tilde{y}_{si}^{f_y}(T_d) = F_{y_i}(T_d) - f_{y_i}(T_d) - \int_{T_0}^{T_d} e^{A_{k_i}(T_d - \tau)} \left[g(\hat{x}_{si}^{F_y}, \underline{y}_i) - g(\hat{x}_{si}^{f_y}, \underline{y}_i) + K_i(F_{y_i}(\tau) - f_{y_i}(\tau)) \right] d\tau$$

Key Contribution

- ▶ Address Sensor Fault Propagation
- ▶ Identification of Fault Type (Sensor/Actuator)
- ▶ Accurate Isolation of Multiple Faulty Sensors: a Decentralized scheme
- ▶ **Isolation of Multiple Faulty Actuators: an Adaptive Approximation Scheme**

Problem Formulation

System Description

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu_H(t) + Bu_F(t) + g(x(t)) + \eta(x, t) \\ y(t) = x(t) + \xi_y(t) + \beta(t - \mathcal{T}_0)f_y(x, t), \end{cases}$$

Variables:

$x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, u \in \mathbb{R}^m$. (Actuators and sensors can be faulty)

Functions:

Ax

(known linear term)

$g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$

(known nonlinear term)

$\eta : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}_I} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$

(unknown uncertainty term)

$\xi_y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$

(sensor noise)

$f_y(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$

(sensor fault)

Problem Formulation

System Description

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu_H(t) + Bu_F(t) + g(x(t)) + \eta(x, t) \\ y(t) = x(t) + \xi_y(t) + \beta(t - \mathcal{T}_0)f_y(x, t), \end{cases}$$

Assumptions:

- ▶ g Differentiable and hence Lipschitz in x
- ▶ Modeling uncertainty and measurement noise boundedness:
 - $|\eta_i(x, t)| \leq \bar{\eta}_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \bar{\eta}_i$ known constant!
 - $|\xi_{y,i}(t)| \leq \bar{\xi}_{y,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \bar{\xi}_{y,i}$ known constant!
- ▶ Sensor and actuator fault boundedness:
 - $|f_{y,i}| < \bar{f}_{y,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad \bar{f}_{y,i}$ known constant!
 - $|u_{F,i}(t)| < \bar{u}_{F,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad \bar{u}_{F,i}$ known constant!
- ▶ Sensor fault isolability: Sensor fault $f_{y,i}$ will be isolated if we have
 - $|f_{y,i}| > 4\bar{\xi}_{y,i} \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$

Problem Formulation

System Description

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu_H(t) + Bu_F(t) + g(x(t)) + \eta(x, t) \\ y(t) = x(t) + \xi_y(t) + \beta(t - \mathcal{T}_0)f_y(x, t), \end{cases}$$

► Actuator fault structure:

$$u_F(t) \triangleq -\Upsilon(t - T_0)\Lambda u_H(t),$$


$$\Upsilon_i(t - T_{0,i}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for all } t < T_{0,i} \\ 1 - \exp(-\delta_i(t - T_{0,i})) & \text{for all } t \geq T_{0,i}, \end{cases}$$

► Sensor fault structure (abrupt & bias faults)

$$\beta_i(t - \mathcal{T}_{0,i}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < \mathcal{T}_{0,i} \\ 1 & \text{if } t \geq \mathcal{T}_{0,i} \end{cases}$$

Actuator/Sensor Fault Isolation Modules

The architecture of actuator and sensor fault isolation modules



Sensor Fault Isolation Module:

- ▶ SFI Decomposition Procedure
- ▶ A Modified Luenberger estimator design
- ▶ Reasoning-based sensor fault isolation

Actuator Fault Isolation Module:

- ▶ AFI Decomposition Procedure
- ▶ Fault Detection Procedure (designed in our first work)
- ▶ Adaptive Approximation-Based Actuator Fault Estimation and Isolation

Sensor Fault Isolation

SFI Decomposition Procedure

Decompose the main system into n subsystems:

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu_H(t) + Bu_F(t) + g(x(t)) + \eta(x, t) \\ y(t) = x(t) + \xi_y(t) + \beta(t - \mathcal{T}_0)f_y(x, t), \end{cases} \quad \Downarrow$$

$$\Sigma_{s_i} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}_i = a_{ii}x_i + A_i\underline{x}_i + B_iu_H + B_iu_F + g_i(x) + \eta_i(x, t) \\ y_i = x_i + \xi_{y,i} + \beta_i(t - \mathcal{T}_{0,i})f_{y,i}(x, t), \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

where variables:

$x_i \in lR$ (*i-th state signal*)

$y_i \in lR$ (*i-th output signal*)

$\underline{x}_i \triangleq [x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 0, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n]^T$

$A_i = [a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in}]$ (*i-th row of A*)

$B_i = [b_{i1}, \dots, b_{im}]$ (*i-th row of B*)

A Modified Luenberger Estimator Design

By utilizing the Hurwitz stability in [2], we have

$$A - \bar{\mathcal{K}} = \Pi \triangleq [\pi_{ij}]_{n \times n} = \begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\pi_{11}} & \pi_{12} & \cdots & \pi_{1i} & \cdots & \pi_{1n} \\ \pi_{21} & \boxed{\pi_{22}} & \cdots & \pi_{2i} & \cdots & \pi_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \pi_{i1} & \pi_{i2} & \cdots & \boxed{\pi_{ii}} & \cdots & \pi_{in} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \pi_{n1} & \pi_{n2} & \cdots & \pi_{ni} & \cdots & \boxed{\pi_{nn}} \end{bmatrix}$$

[2] W. Zhang, et al. Sufficient conditions for Hurwitz stability of matrices. *Lat. Am. Appl. Res.*, 2008.

Sensor Fault Isolation

A Modified Luenberger estimator design

$$\Sigma_{s_i} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}_i = a_{ii}x_i + A_i\underline{x}_i + B_iu_H + B_iu_F + g_i(x) + \eta_i(x,t) \\ y_i = x_i + \xi_{y,i} + \beta_i(t - \mathcal{T}_{0,i})f_{y,i}(x, t), \end{cases}$$



$$\hat{\Sigma}_{s_i} : \begin{cases} \dot{\hat{x}}_{s_i} = a_{ii}\hat{x}_{s_i} + A_i\underline{y}_i + B_iu_H + g_i(\hat{x}_{s_i}, \underline{y}_i) + \mathcal{K}_{ii}(y_i - \hat{y}_{s_i}) \\ \hat{y}_{s_i} = \hat{x}_{s_i}, \end{cases}$$

where the estimator gain \mathcal{K}_{ii} has to be selected such that:

$$\mathcal{K}_{ii} > a_{ii} + L_{g_i},$$

$$|a_{ii} - \mathcal{K}_{ii}| > \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n |a_{ij}|.$$

Sensor Fault Isolation

Reasoning-based sensor fault isolation

Theorem 3.1 (SFI Threshold for the i -th Sensor)

If the i -th sensor is healthy, then we have

$$|\tilde{y}_{s_i}(t)| \leq \bar{y}_{s_i}(t) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where

$$\bar{y}_{s_i}(t) \triangleq \bar{x}_{s_i}(t) + \bar{\xi}_{y,i}(t),$$

$$\bar{x}_{s_i}(t) \triangleq \mathcal{C}_i(t) + \int_0^t e^{(L_{g_i} + \mathcal{A}_{ii})(t-\tau)} \mathcal{C}_i(\tau) d\tau,$$

$$\mathcal{C}_i(t) \triangleq e^{\mathcal{A}_{ii}t} \bar{x}_{i,0} + \int_0^t e^{\mathcal{A}_{ii}(t-\tau)} [\gamma_i - \mathcal{A}_{ii} \bar{\xi}_{y,i}] d\tau,$$

$$\gamma_i \triangleq |B_i| \bar{u}_F + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n |a_{ij}| (\bar{\xi}_{y,j} + \bar{f}_{y,j}) + L_{g_i} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_i} (\bar{\xi}_{y,j} + \bar{f}_{y,j}) + \bar{\eta}_i + a_{ii} \bar{\xi}_{y,i},$$

Sensor Fault Isolation

Reasoning-based sensor fault isolation

Theorem 3.1 (SFI Threshold for the i -th Sensor)

If the i -th sensor is healthy, then we have

$$|\tilde{y}_{s_i}(t)| \leq \bar{y}_{s_i}(t) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where

$$\bar{y}_{s_i}(t) \triangleq \bar{x}_{s_i}(t) + \bar{\xi}_{y,i}(t),$$

$$\bar{x}_{s_i}(t) \triangleq \mathcal{C}_i(t) + \int_0^t e^{(L_{g_i} + \mathcal{A}_{ii})(t-\tau)} \mathcal{C}_i(\tau) d\tau,$$

$$\mathcal{C}_i(t) \triangleq e^{\mathcal{A}_{ii}t} \bar{x}_{i,0} + \int_0^t e^{\mathcal{A}_{ii}(t-\tau)} [\gamma_i - \mathcal{A}_{ii}\bar{\xi}_{y,i}] d\tau,$$

$$\gamma_i \triangleq |B_i| \bar{u}_F + \sum_{i=1, i \neq i}^n |a_{ij}| (\bar{\xi}_{y,j} + \bar{f}_{y,j}) + L_{g_i} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{F}_i} (\bar{\xi}_{y,j} + \bar{f}_{y,j}) + \bar{\eta}_i + a_{ii}\bar{\xi}_{y,i},$$

If the i -th sensor is healthy, then

$\forall t_{0,i} > 0$, & $\forall \epsilon_i > 0$ $\exists \mathcal{M}_{ii} > 0$, such that:

$$\forall \mathcal{K}_{ii} > \mathcal{M}_{ii}, \Rightarrow |\tilde{y}_{s_i}(t)| < 2\bar{\xi}_{y,i} + \epsilon_i \quad \forall t > t_{0,i}$$

Assumption

Sensor fault isolability:

$$|f_{y,i}| > 4\bar{\xi}_{y,i}$$

AFI decomposition procedure

Actuator faults can only be detected in their corresponding subsystems.



Each actuator has to appear only in one subsystem:

$$u_i \in \mathcal{U}^{(I)} \text{ iff } u_i \notin \mathcal{U}^{(J)}, \text{ for all } I, J \in \{1, \dots, N\}, I \neq J.$$

Fault detection procedure

The fault detection scheme in our previous work is utilized for actuator fault detection.

Actuator Fault Isolation

Adaptive Approximation-Based Actuator Fault Estimation and Isolation

The r_I -th adaptive estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}$, $r_I = 1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_I$ are given by:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} : \begin{cases} \dot{\hat{x}}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} = A^{(I)}\hat{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} + B^{(I)}(\hat{u}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} + \hat{u}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}) + p(\hat{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}) \\ \quad + q^{(I)}(\hat{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}, y_z^{(I)}) + K^{(I)}(y^{(I)} - \hat{y}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}) + \Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}\dot{\hat{u}}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} \\ \hat{y}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}(t) = \hat{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}(t) \\ \dot{\Omega}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} = A_k^{(I)}\Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} + B_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} \\ \dot{\hat{u}}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} = \mathcal{P}\{\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)})^T D^{(I)}[\tilde{y}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}]\}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\dot{\hat{u}}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)})^T D[\tilde{y}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}] - \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} \frac{\hat{u}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} \hat{u}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)T}}{\hat{u}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)} \hat{u}_{\mathcal{F}_{r_I}}^{(I)}} \mathcal{P}^{(I)},$$

Adaptive Approximation-Based Actuator Fault Estimation and Isolation

AFI Threshold Design: Considering the accurate faulty actuator set is $\mathcal{F}_{k_I}^{(I)}$, and the fault is detected at time $T_d^{(I)}$, then, we have

$$|\tilde{y}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t)| \leq \bar{\bar{y}}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n_I \quad \forall t \geq T_d^{(I)} + t_D^{(I)},$$

where


$$\bar{\bar{y}}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t) \triangleq \bar{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t) + \bar{\xi}_y^{(I)}(t) \quad \forall t \geq T_d^{(I)} + t_D^{(I)},$$

$$\bar{x}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t) + L_i^{(I)} \int_{T_d^{(I)}}^t e^{(a_{k,i}^{(I)} + L_i^{(I)})(t-\tau)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(\tau) d\tau,$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)}(t) \triangleq \left| \Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)} \right| \kappa_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I}}^{(I)} + \int_{T_d^{(I)}}^t e^{a_{k,i}^{(I)}(t-\tau)} \mu_{\mathcal{F}_{k_I},i}^{(I)} d\tau + e^{a_{k,i}^{(I)}(t-T_d^{(I)})} \bar{x}_{d,i}^{(I)},$$

Simulation results

The KIOS Water Systems Testbed



$$\Sigma_I: \begin{cases} \dot{\mathcal{L}}_I(t) = \frac{1}{S_I} [\mathcal{Q}_I(t) - \mathcal{Q}_{I+1}(t) - d_I(t)] \\ \dot{\mathcal{Q}}_I(t) = \Psi_A(\mathcal{Q}_I(t), u_I(t)) \end{cases} \quad I = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

$\mathcal{Q}_{I+1}(t)$ denotes the outflow rate of tank \mathbb{T}_I at time t

Local Feedback Controller (LFC)

$$\Psi_A^{(I)}(x_2^{(I)}, u_I) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lambda_I u_I - \alpha_I x_2^{(I)} & 0.1 < u_I \leq 1 \\ -\vartheta_I x_2^{(I)} & 0 \leq u_I \leq 0.1, \end{cases}$$

[1] Vrachimis, Stelios, et al. "WaterSafe: A water network benchmark for fault diagnosis research." IFAC-PapersOnLine 55.6 (2022): 655-660.


Simulation results(1)

Isolation of Faulty Sensors

The faulty sensors are y_3 , y_7 and y_8 .

The faults $f_{y,3} = 8$, $f_{y,7} = 3$ and the intermittent fault as $f_{y,8} = 5 \quad t \in [2j, 2j + 0.5]$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$,

SFI results of the SFI module for subsystems $\Sigma_{s_i} \quad i = 1, \dots, 8$




Simulation results(1)

Isolation of Faulty Sensors

The faulty sensors are y_3 , y_7 and y_8 .

The faults $f_{y,3} = 8$, $f_{y,7} = 3$ and the intermittent fault as $f_{y,8} = 5 \quad t \in [2j, 2j + 0.5]$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$,

SFI results of the SFI module for subsystems $\Sigma_{s_i} \quad i = 1, \dots, 8$




Simulation results(1)

Isolation of Faulty Sensors

The faulty sensors are y_3 , y_7 and y_8 .

The faults $f_{y,3} = 8$, $f_{y,7} = 3$ and the intermittent fault as $f_{y,8} = 5 \quad t \in [2j, 2j + 0.5]$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$,

AFI results (fault detection) of the AFI module for $\Sigma^{(i)} \quad i = 1, \dots, 4$.




Simulation results(2)

Isolation of Faulty Actuator

The faulty actuators are u_1 and u_2 (i.e., $u_1^{(1)}$ and $u_1^{(2)}$).

- SFI results of the SFI Module for subsystems $\Sigma_{s_i} \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4$




[2] H. Tirandaz, C. Keliris, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation in a Class of Large-Scale Nonlinear Dynamical Systems", *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*, 2024.

Simulation results(2)

Isolation of Faulty Actuator

The faulty actuators are u_1 and u_2 (i.e., $u_1^{(1)}$ and $u_1^{(2)}$).

- Fault detection result of the AFI Module for subsystems $\Sigma^{(1)}$ and $\Sigma^{(2)}$




[2] H. Tirandaz, C. Keliris, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation in a Class of Large-Scale Nonlinear Dynamical Systems", *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*, 2024.

Simulation results(2)

Isolation of Faulty Actuator

The faulty actuators are u_1 and u_2 (i.e., $u_1^{(1)}$ and $u_1^{(2)}$).

- ▶ AFI results of the AFI Module for subsystems $\Sigma^{(1)}$




[2] H. Tirandaz, C. Keliris, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation in a Class of Large-Scale Nonlinear Dynamical Systems", *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*, 2024.

Simulation results(2)

Isolation of Faulty Actuator

The faulty actuators are u_1 and u_2 (i.e., $u_1^{(1)}$ and $u_1^{(2)}$).

- ▶ AFI results of the AFI Module for subsystems $\Sigma^{(2)}$



[2] H. Tirandaz, C. Keliris, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation in a Class of Large-Scale Nonlinear Dynamical Systems", *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*, 2024.

Actuator Fault Accommodation for a Class of Nonlinear Uncertain Interconnected Systems: An Adaptive Command Filtering-Based Scheme

Objectives:

- ▶ Nominal Controller Design
- ▶ Actuator Fault Accommodation

Literature Review

[1]. Lai G, et al., 2018,

Adaptive compensation for infinite number of actuator failures based on tuning function approach, *Automatica*.

- **Actuator fault compensation scheme**
- **Actuators with the same relative degrees**
- **No need for FDI**

Dynamical system:

$$\dot{x}_i = x_{i+1} + \theta^T \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1$$

$$\dot{x}_n = \varphi_0(\bar{x}_n, \xi) + \theta^T \varphi_n(\bar{x}_n, \xi) + \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \beta_j(\bar{x}_n, \xi) u_j$$

$$\dot{\xi} = \psi(\bar{x}_n, \xi) + \phi(\bar{x}_n, \xi) \theta$$

$$y = x_1,$$


[2]. Ruan Z, et al., 2020,

Performance-guaranteed fault-tolerant control for uncertain nonlinear systems via learning-based switching scheme, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, ¹

- Actuators with the same relative degrees
- Switching-based scheme
- No need for FDI

Dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i &= f_i(\bar{x}_i) + g_i(\bar{x}_i)x_{i+1} + d_i(t) \\ \dot{x}_n &= f_n(\bar{x}_n) + g_n^T(\bar{x}_n)u + d_n(t) \\ y &= x_1\end{aligned}$$



Another switching scheme is proposed in:

Yang, Qinmin, Shuzhi Sam Ge, and Youxian Sun. "Adaptive actuator fault tolerant control for uncertain nonlinear systems with multiple actuators." *Automatica* 60 (2015): 92-99.



Literature Review


[3]. Zhang K, et al., 2021.

Fault-tolerant control for systems with unmatched actuator faults and disturbances,
IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.

- Actuators with various relative degrees
- Centralized scheme
- Sliding surface FTC scheme
- It utilizes FDI information
- No modeling uncertainty

Consider a class of nonlinear over-actuated systems


$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\zeta} &= f(\zeta) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(\zeta)u_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^n D_i(\zeta)d_i(t) \\ y &= h(\zeta)\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$



Key contributions

1. **A distributed backstepping control scheme** is designed for systems with multiple fault-prone actuators, ensuring bounded signals in both healthy and faulty conditions.
2. **The "explosion of complexity"** issue associated with backstepping design is mitigated by applying a finite-time command filter technique.
3. **An adaptive approximation method** is proposed, overcoming limitations of existing uncertainty estimation techniques and accurately estimating both local and interconnected uncertainties.
4. **A unified actuator fault accommodation scheme** is introduced in this work that addresses both partial and total loss of actuator effectiveness, stabilizing the system and handling multiple fault-prone actuators, modeling uncertainty, and unknown interconnections.



System Timeline Schedule



Control objective:

- ▶ The output signal $y_I(t)$ tracks desired trajectory $y_{I,d}(t)$.
- ▶ All signals are bounded in healthy/faulty conditions.

Actuator Fault Accommodation Architecture



System description

Consider the I -th subsystem $\Sigma_I \quad I = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\Sigma_I : \begin{cases} \dot{x}_I = f_I(x_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{m_I} g_{I,i}(x_I) u_{I,i} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{n_I} d_{I,i}(x_I)}_{\text{Unknown}} \underbrace{\eta_I(x_I)}_{\text{Unknown}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n_I} q_{I,k}(x_I) \underbrace{\psi_I(X_I)}_{\text{Unknown}} \\ y_I = h_I(x_I) \end{cases}$$

Assumptions:

- ▶ **The triple $(f_I, g_{I,i}, h_I)$ has relative degree $r_{I,i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m_I$,**
- ▶ **The triple $(f_I, d_{I,j}, h_I)$ has relative degree j for all $j = 1, \dots, n_I$,**
- ▶ **The triple $(p_I, q_{I,k}, h_I)$ has relative degree k for all $k = 1, \dots, n_I$,**

System description

$$\Sigma_I: \begin{cases} \dot{x}_I = f_I(x_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{m_I} g_{I,i}(x_I) \textcolor{blue}{u}_{I,i} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_I} d_{I,i}(x_I) \eta_{I,j}(x_I) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_I} q_{I,k}(x_I) \psi_{I,k}(X_I) \\ y_I = h_I(x_I), \end{cases}$$

$$u_I = u_I^H + u_I^F,$$

How to distinguish PLOE from TLOE:

We have

$$u_{I,i}(t) = \mu_{I,i}(t) u_{I,i}^H(t) + \bar{u}_{I,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, m_I,$$

- **TLOE of actuator $u_{I,i}$, occurs when $\mu_{I,i} \approx 0$.**
- **PLOE of actuator $u_{I,i}$, occurs when $0 \ll \mu_{I,i} < 1$.**

System Normalization

System description

$$\Sigma_I: \begin{cases} \dot{x}_I = f_I(x_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{m_I} g_{I,i}(x_I)u_{I,i} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_I} d_{I,i}(x_I)\eta_{I,j}(x_I) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_I} q_{I,k}(x_I)\psi_{I,k}(X_I) \\ y_I = h_I(x_I), \end{cases}$$

System Normalization

$$\xi_{Iij} = L_{f_I}^{(j-1)} h_I(x_I) \Big|_{x=\Phi_I^{-1}(\xi_I, \zeta_I)} \quad j = 1, \dots r_{I,i}, i = 1, \dots m_I$$

↑↓

$$\xi_{I,i} \triangleq [h_I(x_I), L_{f_I} h_I(x_I), \dots, L_{f_I}^{(r_i-1)} h_I(x_I)]_{x=\Phi_I^{-1}(\xi_I, \zeta_I)}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$$


Then, by utilizing the above transformation, the actuator $u_{I,i} \quad i \in \{1, \dots, m_I\}$ can be designed to control subsystem Σ_I .

System Normalization

System description

$$\Sigma_I: \begin{cases} \dot{x}_I = f_I(x_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{m_I} g_{I,i}(x_I)u_{I,i} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_I} d_{I,i}(x_I)\eta_{I,j}(x_I) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_I} q_{I,k}(x_I)\psi_{I,k}(X_I) \\ y_I = h_I(x_I), \end{cases}$$

System Normalization



Objective:

We aim to estimate the unknown local and interconnected terms.

Why estimation?!

The majority of fault diagnosis investigations consider modeling uncertainty to be bounded by a known bound, i.e.,


$$|\eta(\mathbf{x})| \leq \bar{\eta} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$$

where $\bar{\eta}$ is a known constant/function.

Key challenges:

- Unknown bounds for unknown uncertainties,
- Large-magnitude bounds,
- Focuses on stability & not guarantees optimality.

System Timeline Schedule



To address modeling uncertainty and unknown interconnection terms:

➤ **Approximation ($0 \leq t \leq T^L$)**

$$\hat{\Xi}(x) \approx \hat{\theta}(t)\Omega(x) \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\theta}(t) = \mathcal{P}\left(\Gamma\Omega(t)e(y(t))\right)$$

➤ **Estimation ($t \geq T^L$)**

$$\hat{\Xi}(x) \approx \hat{\theta}^*\Omega(x)$$

Adaptive approximation

Objective:

We aim to estimate the unknown local and interconnected terms.

Literature review:

[1]. Caccavale, F., et al., 2009,,

Actuators fault diagnosis for robot manipulators with uncertain model, , *Control Eng. Pract.*..

- ▶ An SVM-based offline scheme considering five fault-free trajectories is applied for uncertainty estimation.

[2]. Reppa, V., et al., 2014.,

Adaptive approximation for multiple sensor fault detection and isolation of nonlinear uncertain systems. , *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*

- ▶ The variables are considered to be known limited intervals, i.e., $x_4 \in [-0.2, 0.2]$.

[3] Keliris, C., et al., 2017,,

An integrated learning and filtering approach for fault diagnosis of a class of nonlinear dynamical systems, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*..

- ▶ The variables are considered known limited intervals, i.e., $x_4 \in [-0.25, 0.25]$.

Adaptive approximation

Objective:

We aim to estimate the unknown local and interconnected terms.


Key challenges:

- ▶ Persistency of excitation,
- ▶ The convergence of $\hat{\theta}(t)$ to the optimal value θ^* cannot be guaranteed at finite time, i.e., $\dot{\hat{\theta}} \rightarrow 0$ but $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{I,i}^l} \hat{\theta}(t) \neq \theta^*$,

Example:

Modeling uncertainty is:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(x_1) &= \sin\left(\frac{1}{2}x_1\right) \\ &\approx \theta_0 + \theta_1 x^1 + \cdots + \theta_{19} x^{19},\end{aligned}$$



Adaptive approximation

We aim to estimate the unknown local and interconnected terms simultaneously as

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{Iik}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I) &\triangleq \overbrace{p_{I,k}^d(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i})\eta_{Iik}^x(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i})}^{\text{Local modeling uncertainty}} + \overbrace{p_{I,1}^q(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i})\psi_{I,1}(X_I)}^{\text{Unknown interconnected term}} \\ \Xi_{Iik}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I) &\triangleq \hat{\Xi}_{Iik}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I; \theta_{Iik}^*) + e_{\Xi_{I,k}}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I) \\ \hat{\Xi}_{I,k}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I; \theta_{Iik}^*) &= \Pi_{I,k}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I)\theta_{Iik}^*\end{aligned}$$

Assumption

In our work, the unknown function Ξ_{Iik} is considered to be

$$\Xi_{Iik}(\varkappa_1, \dots, \varkappa_N) = \Xi_{Iik}(\varkappa_1) + \dots + \Xi_{Iik}(\varkappa_N).$$

Hence, we have $\Pi_{I,k}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{I,k}} \Pi_{I,k}(\varkappa_j)$.

Dynamical System Estimation

$$\hat{\xi}_{Ij} = \xi_{Ii\{j+1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{I,k}} \Pi_{I,j}(\boldsymbol{\varkappa}_{I,k}^{(j)}) \hat{\theta}_{Iij}^{(j)} + k_{Ijj}(\xi_{Iij} - \hat{\xi}_{Iij}) \quad j = 1, \dots, r_{I,i} - 1$$
$$\hat{\xi}_{Iir_i} = \zeta_{Ii1} + p_{I,r_i}^g(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}) u_{I,i} + \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{I,k}} \Pi_{I,r_i}(\boldsymbol{\varkappa}_{I,i}^{(j)}) \hat{\theta}_{Iir_i}^{(j)} + k_{Irr_i}(\xi_{Iir_i} - \hat{\xi}_{Iir_i})$$
$$\zeta_{Iij} = \Gamma_{Iij}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}) \quad j = 1, \dots, n_I - r_{I,i}$$
$$\hat{y}_I = \hat{\xi}_{Ii1},$$

where

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}}_{Ik}^{(j)}(t) = \mathcal{P}_p \left(\Gamma_{I,k} \Pi_{I,k}^T(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I) \tilde{\xi}_{I,k} \right) \quad t \leq T_{I,i}^l \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, r_{I,i}, \\ \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{I,k}. \end{array}$$


Adaptive approximation

Challenge: $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_{I,i}^l} \hat{\theta}(t) \neq \theta^*$

Solution: By assembling data points $\hat{\eta}_{I,k}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_r)) = \sum_{s=1}^q \Pi'_{Ik,s}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_r)) \cdot \hat{\theta}_{Ik,s}^{(j)*}(t_r)$ where $\Pi_{I,k} = [\Pi'_{Ik,1}, \dots, \Pi'_{Ik,q}]$, we have

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Xi}_{I,k}^{(j)} \\ \hat{\Xi}_{I,k}^{(j)}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_1)) \\ \hat{\Xi}_{I,k}^{(j)}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_2)) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\Xi}_{I,k}^{(j)}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_m)) \end{bmatrix}}_{\hat{\Xi}_{I,k}^{(j)}} \approx \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \Pi'_{Ik,1}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_1)) & \cdots & \Pi'_{Ik,q}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_1)) \\ \Pi'_{Ik,1}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_2)) & \cdots & \Pi'_{Ik,q}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_2)) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Pi'_{Ik,1}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_m)) & \cdots & \Pi'_{Ik,q}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t_m)) \end{bmatrix}}_{\Pi'_{I,k}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)})} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\theta}_{Ik,1}^{(j)*} \\ \hat{\theta}_{Ik,2}^{(j)*} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\theta}_{Ik,q}^{(j)*} \end{bmatrix}}_{\hat{\theta}_{Ik}^{(j)*}},$$

Adaptive approximation




Modeling uncertainty

$$\overbrace{\eta^x = 2 \sin(0.5x_1) + \cos(0.5x_1),}^{}$$

Interconnection term

$$\overbrace{\psi(X_1) = 3X_1 \sin(X_1)}^{}$$

Adaptive approximation



Modeling uncertainty

$$\eta^x = 2 \sin(0.5x_1) + \cos(0.5x_1),$$

Interconnection term

$$\psi(X_1) = 3X_1 \sin(X_1)$$

Nominal Controller Design

Distributed command-filter-based backstepping controller $u_{I,i} = u_{I,i}^H$:

$$u_{I,i}^H \triangleq \frac{-1}{p_{I,r_i}^g(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i})} \left[L_{f_I}^{(r_i)} h_I(x_I) + \frac{1}{2} \nu_{I,r_i} + l_{I,r_i} z_{I,r_i} + \ell_{I,r_i} \sin(\gamma_{I,r_i}) \right. \\ \left. + \gamma_{I,\{r_i-1\}} + \nu_{I,\{r_i-1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{I,r_i}} \Pi_{I,r_i}(\varkappa_{I,r_i}^{(j)}(t)) \hat{\theta}_{I,r_i}^{(j)*} - \dot{\alpha}_{I,\{r_i-1\}} - y_{I,d}^{(r_i)} \right],$$

The virtual control law α_{Iik} :

$$\alpha_{Iik} \triangleq -\nu_{I,\{k-1\}} - \frac{1}{2} \nu_{Iik} - \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{I,k}} \Pi_{I,k}(\varkappa_{I,k}^{(j)}(t)) \hat{\theta}_{Iik}^{(j)*} - l_{Iik} z_{Iik} + \dot{\alpha}_{I,\{k-1\}} - \ell_{Iik} \sin(\gamma_{Iik}),$$

Fault Type Identification

Control Reconfiguration (will be addressed after fault detection)

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}} : \begin{cases} \dot{\hat{\xi}}_{\mathcal{F}_{Iir_i}} = \zeta_{i1} + p_{I,r_i}^g(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i})\hat{u}_{I,i} + \Pi_{I,r_i}(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i}, X_I)\hat{\theta}_{Iir_i} + k_{Irr_i}(\xi_{Iir_i} - \hat{\xi}_{\mathcal{F}_{Iir_i}}) + \Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{Iir_i}}\dot{\hat{\mu}}_{I,i} \\ \dot{\hat{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{F}_{Iir_i}} = k_{Irr_i}\Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{Iir_i}} + p_{I,r_i}^g(\xi_{I,i}, \zeta_{I,i})u_{I,i}^H \\ \hat{u}_{I,i} = \hat{\mu}_{I,i}u_{I,i}^H, \end{cases}$$

$$\dot{\hat{\mu}}_{I,i} = \mathcal{Q}_{I,i} - \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}}\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}}\frac{\hat{\mu}_{I,i}\hat{\mu}_{I,i}^T}{\hat{\mu}_{I,i}^T\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}}\hat{\mu}_{I,i}}\mathcal{Q}_{I,i}, \text{ where } \mathcal{Q}_{I,i} \triangleq \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}}(\Omega_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}})^T\tilde{y}_{\mathcal{F}_{I,i}}$$

- ▶ PLOE $0 \ll \hat{\mu}_{I,i} \leq 1 \Rightarrow$ Control reconfiguration: $u_{I,i} \triangleq \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}_{I,i}}u_{I,i}^H$
- ▶ TLOE $\hat{\mu}_{I,i} \approx 0 \Rightarrow$ Actuator switching $u_{I,i} \rightarrow u_{I,i+1}$

Simulation Results

Simulation Example: Consider a system consisting of two interconnected subsystems:

$$\Sigma_I : \begin{cases} \dot{x}_{I,1} = x_{I,3}^2 - 3x_{I,1} - x_{I,4} + u_{I,2} + \eta_{I,3}(x_I) \\ \dot{x}_{I,2} = -x_{I,1} - 6.3045u_{I,1} + 6.4654\eta_{I,2}(x_I) \\ \dot{x}_{I,3} = -x_{I,2} + 3x_{J,3} \sin(x_{J,3}) - 3.5544\eta_{I,1}(x_I) \quad I = 1, 2, \\ \dot{x}_{I,4} = -5x_{I,4} - x_{I,1} \sin(x_{I,1}) + \eta_{I,4}(x_I) \\ y_I = x_{I,3}, \end{cases}$$

Modeling uncertainty:

$$\eta_{I,1} = 0.7 \sin(0.5x_1) + 3.55 \cos(0.5x_1),$$

Unknown interconnected term:


$$\psi_{I,1} = 3x_{J,3} \sin(x_{J,3}),$$

Simulation Results

Simulation 1: (Healthy condition)

No faults occur neither in subsystems Σ_1 or Σ_2 .

Subsystem Σ_1 results:




Simulation Results

Simulation 1: (Healthy condition)

No faults occur neither in subsystems Σ_1 or Σ_2 .

Subsystem Σ_1 results:




Simulation Results

Simulation 1: (Healthy condition)

No faults occur neither in subsystems Σ_1 or Σ_2 .

Subsystem Σ_2 results:



Simulation Results

Simulation 2: (Stuck fault)

Actuator $u_{1,1}$ of Σ_1 become stuck at time $T_{I,1}^0 = 50 \text{ sec}$

Fault occurrence time:

$$T_{I,i}^0 = 50.0 \text{ sec}$$


Fault detection time:

$$T_{I,i}^d = 50.017 \text{ sec}$$

Stuck fault diagnosed time:

$$T_{I,i}^s = 50.453 \text{ sec}$$

Subsystem Σ_1 results:



Simulation Results

Simulation 2: (Stuck fault)


Actuator $u_{1,1}$ of Σ_1 become stuck at time $T_{I,i}^0 = 50 \text{ sec}$

Fault occurrence time: $T_{I,i}^0 = 50.0 \text{ sec}$

Fault detection time: $T_{I,i}^d = 50.017 \text{ sec}$

Stuck fault diagnosed time: $T_{I,i}^s = 50.453 \text{ sec}$

Subsystem Σ_1 results:



Simulation Results

Simulation 2: (Stuck fault)



Actuator $u_{1,1}$ of Σ_1 become stuck at time $T_{I,1}^0 = 50 \text{ sec}$

Fault occurrence time: $T_{I,i}^0 = 50.0 \text{ sec}$

Fault detection time: $T_{I,i}^d = 50.017 \text{ sec}$

Stuck fault diagnosed time: $T_{I,i}^s = 50.453 \text{ sec}$

Subsystem Σ_2 results: (fault propagation)



Simulation Results

Simulation 3: (Partial fault)


Actuator $u_{1,1}$ of Σ_1 become faulty (partial fault)

Fault occurrence time: $T_{I,i}^0 = 47.0 \text{ sec}$

Fault detection time: $T_{I,i}^d = 47.251 \text{ sec}$

$$u_{1,1}^F = -\frac{4}{5}u_{1,1}^H(t) \Rightarrow u_{1,1} = \frac{1}{5}u_{1,1}^H(t)$$

Subsystem Σ_1 results:



[3] H. Tirandaz, C. Keliris, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Actuator fault accommodation for a class of nonlinear uncertain interconnected systems: An adaptive command filtering-based scheme", *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, (Under Review), 2024.

Future Works:

Future work based on this thesis could focus on:

- ▶ **Actuator and Sensor Fault Accommodation**
- ▶ **Saturation-Based Actuator Fault Accommodation**
- ▶ **Decentralized Actuator Fault Diagnosis and Accommodation**

Publications:

1. Hamed Tirandaz, Christodoulos Keliris, and Marios Polycarpou. "Actuator fault detection and isolation in a class of nonlinear interconnected systems." *International Journal of Control*, 1-21, 2024.
2. Hamed Tirandaz, Christodoulos Keliris, and Marios Polycarpou. "Actuator and Sensor Fault Isolation in a Class of Large-Scale Nonlinear Dynamical Systems", *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*, 3(2), 57–72 2024.
3. Tirandaz, H., Keliris, C., & Polycarpou, M. M. Actuator fault accommodation for a class of nonlinear uncertain interconnected systems: An adaptive command filtering-based scheme . *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, (Under Review).

Thank you!