

17 Feedback Control Systems

Contents

- Overview
- 17-1** What Is Feedback Control?
- 17-2** Examples of Systems That Depend on Feedback Control
- 17-3** Poles, Zeros, and BIBO Stability
- 17-4** Steady-State Error
- 17-5** Time Delays
- 17-6** Transient Response
- 17-7** Cascade Controller Design
- 17-8** Design Examples
- Chapter 17 Summary
- Problems

Objectives

Learn to:

- Compute closed-loop transfer functions.
- Analyze open-loop and closed-loop systems in terms of their stability, transient response to a step input, and steady-state response to both step and ramp inputs.
- Understand the effects of poles and zeros on the above properties.
- Deal with time delays.
- In the case of a system adequately modeled by a low-order transfer function, design a feedback controller that regulates the system's output to a specified value, while respecting bounds on accuracy, overshoot, and settling time.



Figure 17-1: The upright balance of a Segway transporter is enabled by closed-loop control. The Segway uses a gyroscope to measure the angle of the platform with respect to the vertical. Electrical motors actuate the wheels attached to the platform. The wheels in turn move the base of the platform forward or backward, introducing a tilting moment on the platform and rider. A mathematical control algorithm called a compensator closes the loop between the sensor (gyroscope) and actuator (motors) by comparing the measured lean angle of the platform to its desired value, and computing, on the basis of a model, the required motor torques to achieve the desired lean angle.

Overview and Vocabulary

A control system is any collection of systems or devices that allows the behavior of another system to be regulated in a desired manner. The human body is full of control systems that regulate temperature, blood sugar concentration, heart rate, and equilibrium, to name just a few. The operation of all manner of technological devices is enhanced or even enabled by control systems. A cell phone contains a controller that automatically adjusts the transmission power so as to maximize battery life while maintaining a low transmission error rate. The cell phone would function correctly without this controller, but its battery would be exhausted more quickly, making the device less useful. On the other hand, a Segway transporter would tip over without a control system to maintain its upward balance, and hence without feedback control, the device would be unstable and useless.

This chapter will be devoted to the study of a particular class of feedback systems called ***unity feedback systems***. The word ***feedback*** refers to the fact that the output of the system to be controlled, which we will call a ***plant***, is fed back to the input of the plant, similar to the case of a feedback amplifier. The word ***unity*** refers to a simplified feedback structure that is common in many practical control systems.

When the input to a plant depends on its output through feedback, a closed-loop system is created. The closure of the loop allows many properties of the plant to be modified in profound ways. It is possible to cause the output of the plant to track a commanded value, with desirable transient qualities during the change from one ***setpoint*** to another, for example. The closure of the loop can stabilize a plant as well as destabilize it.

This chapter will show how to compute the transfer function of the closed-loop system. How the stability of the closed-loop system depends on the transfer functions in the loop will be made explicit, and how the system performs when test inputs are applied, specifically, step inputs. The complete response of the system, including both the steady-state and transient components, will be analyzed for specific input excitations. Finally, how to design a compensator to achieve desired steady-state and transient objectives in a closed-loop system will be treated for low-order plants.

Sensor: Device used to measure a signal, typically the output of a system. Examples include gyroscopes to measure the angle of a platform in a Segway, or a thermocouple to measure the temperature of an object.

Actuator: Device that provides power to change the input signal of a system. For example, in a Segway, the motors actuate the wheels. In a car's engine, the fuel injectors actuate the flow of fuel to the cylinders. In humans, muscles actuate the limbs.

Plant: Generic term for a system that is to be controlled. It is optional to include the actuators and sensors as part of the plant or to keep them separate from the plant.

Controller or compensator: Device that seeks to adjust the input signal to a plant in such a way that the output of the plant has specified characteristics. Common characteristics for the plant output include: holding steady at a constant value, called a setpoint; moving rapidly between two setpoints in a more or less monotonic fashion, as opposed to dramatically overshooting or undershooting the newly commanded setpoint; and holding a setpoint in the face of perturbations acting on the system.

Feedback, or feedback loop: Means that the input to the plant depends on the output of the plant. The connection of the plant's output to its input forms a loop, called a feedback loop. A common situation is when the plant's output is first compared to a reference command, and then the difference of these two signals, called the error signal, is passed through a compensator, whose output is then connected to the plant's input.

Steady-state response vs transient response: Roughly speaking, the steady-state response is the asymptotic behavior of a signal, while the transient response is “all of the wiggling around” a signal does before converging to a steady-state value.

Stability: A system is Bounded-Input Bounded Output stable, or BIBO stable for short, if bounded inputs always give rise to bounded outputs.

Transfer Function: Laplace transform of a linear time-invariant system. The use of transfer functions greatly simplifies the analysis of linear time-invariant ordinary differential equations. Many operations in the time domain involve rather complicated integrals, such as convolution, whereas in the Laplace domain, they reduce to algebraic operations, such as multiplication. Transfer functions are a convenient means to represent models of plants and compensators.

1-1 What is Feedback Control?

When you press on the accelerator pedal of your car, the engine produces more power. When you take your foot off the pedal, the engine does not stop; rather, it runs at a fixed idle speed, such as 750 RPM (revolutions per minute). Moreover, the engine maintains a constant idle speed even when the power load on the engine changes, such as when the air conditioner cycles on or off, or, assuming you have your foot on the brake, when you shift the transmission from *park* to *neutral* to *drive*. How is it possible for the engine to idle at a fixed speed under a variety of loads? The answer is feedback control. A sensor measures the speed of the engine and a “mechanism”, called a feedback controller, automatically adjusts the power requested from the engine so as to maintain a constant engine speed.

The engine system illustrates all the basic components of a ***feedback control system***. The key elements are: (i) a measured quantity that is to be regulated to a desired value (e.g., engine idle speed); this is typically defined to be the ***system output***; (ii) an ***input*** that can be varied so as to change the value of the output (e.g., throttle position); (iii) an element that determines how to adjust the input so as to drive the output to a desired value; this last element is called the ***controller***. The overall system is shown in Fig. 1-1, where the comparator computes the error between the desired output value and the current output value, and the controller seeks to drive this error to zero. Such a feedback control system is also known as a ***closed-loop control system*** due to the closed signal path that connects all four components (e.g., from Comparator to Controller to Plant to Measurement Device and back to Comparator).





Figure 1-1: *Plant* is the generic term for the system to be controlled. A key difference between a closed-loop and an open-loop control system is the absence of a loop in the latter.

In a feedback control system, information from the measured output of the system is used to modify the system's input and, consequently, alter the system's output. The controller is designed to adjust the input to the plant, based on the difference between the reference input and the measured output signal, in order to achieve a desired output signal. Feedback control systems can be found in almost every product that involves electronics, including robots, airplanes, computer hard drives, CD players, cell phones, automobiles, etc. Of course, there are many control systems in nature too. The human body contains a host of complex biologically-based feedback control systems that regulate everything from your heart rate to your ability to breathe, swallow and walk.

Control systems do not always involve feedback. Sometimes one just needs to regulate the sequence in which events occur, such as when coins inserted into a vending machine cause a selected product to be delivered and the correct change to be computed and returned to the customer. This type of control is called *sequential control* or *discrete-event control*.

Another type of non-feedback control is used in situations where measurements are either hard to make, or the economic cost of adding the necessary sensor to the system is too high. In these situations, the controller must determine the input to the plant on the basis of the reference input alone. Such a control method is called *open-loop control* for the obvious reason that the loop depicted in Fig. 1-1-(a) is no longer present because nothing is measured. You may be surprised to learn that the icon of high-tech industries, semiconductor chip manufacturing, is largely based on open-loop manufacturing processes. For example, the amount of microwave power applied to a reactive ion etcher to deliver a given etch rate is typically determined ahead of time by careful experimentation, based on the assumption that the machines being used are extremely repeatable from one manufacturing run to the next.

Although not all control systems utilize feedback control, many do. In an environment where conditions change over time, disturbances are present, or a sufficiently accurate model of the system is not available for pre-computing the required control signal, it can be very difficult, if not impossible, to precisely regulate the system's output using an open-loop control method. In these cases, adjusting the input as a function of a measured variable is more effective. *The use of feedback control reduces the need for a very accurate system model.*

Another reason for using feedback control is *stability*. Civilian aircraft are designed to be open-loop stable, meaning that even in the absence of feedback, the aircraft is stable, so that small changes to the control surfaces produce small changes in the aircraft's pitch, for example. There are cases, however, where it would be useful if small changes in the control surfaces produce large changes in pitch. In combat situations for fighter aircraft, speed of response is often the difference between life and death. The F-16 was the first military craft* to be deliberately designed to be unstable so that it could achieve extremely fast turning speeds. The airplane is so unstable that human reflexes are too slow to fly it. A sophisticated feedback control system is used to make the system stable and flyable, while maintaining very high maneuverability. On the downside, if a key actuator or sensor fails, the plane tumbles and disintegrates in less than a second!

In summary, feedback control (1) allows the output of a system to be regulated to a precise value in the absence of a precise system model or when the system is affected by an external disturbance, and (2) can be used to stabilize an otherwise unstable system. These and other important uses of feedback control will be highlighted through a series of examples.

Review Question 1-1: What is the difference between open-loop control and closed-loop control?

Review Question 1-2: What are the key elements of a feedback system?

1-2 Examples of Systems That Depend on Feedback Control

1-2.1 Adaptive Optics for Telescopes

Twinkling stars may be good for poetry, but they are not good for astronomy! The twinkling of a star refers to the slight jitter that the human eye perceives in the intensity and position of a star. This jitter is greatly magnified when viewed

*What was the first civilian aircraft to be designed to be open-loop unstable? The Wright brothers' 1903 aircraft that they successfully flew at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina! The pitch mode was unstable and had to be stabilized by the pilot acting as the feedback controller.




Figure 1-2: Adaptive-optics feedback loop. Planned ground-based telescopes with adaptive optics will have ten times the image sharpness of the Hubble Space Telescope.




Figure 1-3: Shack-Hartman Wavefront Sensor. The upper image shows a regular array of dots corresponding to no atmospheric distortion, while the lower image shows the result of distortion. **Source:** <http://www.ctio.noao.edu/~atokovin/tutorial/part3/wfs.html>

through a powerful telescope. The star's position relative to an observer on earth is not moving back and forth. Rather the atmosphere is distorting the star light as it passes through layers of varying temperature and wind speed. These atmospheric disturbances cause a star's apparent position and intensity to vary, and result in blurred images when stars are photographed through ground-based telescopes.

One solution to avoiding the blurring caused by atmospheric distortion is to move the telescope above the atmosphere. This was the motivation for the design and launch of the Hubble Space Telescope, which since 1993, has been delivering spectacular images. While the Hubble telescope is a marvelous technological feat, it is so expensive that we have only one such instrument in space. Ground-based telescopes are less expensive to build and are easier to maintain.

Feedback control provides a way to remove much of the distortion caused by the atmosphere as light passes through it on its way to a ground-based telescope. Figure 1-2 shows the key elements of an *adaptive optics* system. It uses a wavefront sensor, a deformable mirror, and feedback control to compensate for atmospheric distortion. The use of adaptive optics allows the Large Binocular Telescope located on Mount Graham near Safford, Arizona, to observe objects deeper into space than even the Hubble telescope. Planned ground-based telescopes with adaptive optics will have ten times the image sharpness of the Hubble.

The primary mirror of the telescope is composed of tens to hundreds of individual elements. The orientation of each mirror element can be independently regulated, as shown in Fig. 1-4, in order to flatten the wavefront. The shape of the wavefront is measured with a Shack-Hartman Wavefront Sensor, which projects the incoming star light through a set of lenses onto a charge-coupled device (CCD) array. In the absence of atmospheric perturbations, light from a distant source such as a star should have a planar or flat wavefront, as shown in the upper part of Fig. 1-3, and would create a regular array of dots. Due to atmospheric turbulence, the wavefront is no longer flat, as shown in the lower




Figure 1-4: A deformable mirror removing aberrations from a wavefront. The mirror consists of numerous individual mirror elements, each of which can be independently oriented by a feedback loop. **Source:** http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adaptive_optics

figure, creating an irregular array of dots. The displacement of the dots on the CCD array allows the local curvature of the wavefront to be computed. The control algorithm uses the array of measurements from the wavefront sensor to determine the required changes in orientation for each element in the mirror in order to flatten the wavefront.

The controller that determines the desired orientation of each element of the deformable mirror is designed on the basis of multi-variable control theory, a topic outside the scope of this book. For each element of the mirror, however, there is a second feedback loop that actually carries out the change in orientation, as shown in Fig. 1-5, and this feedback loop can be understood with methods developed in Chapter 6 and the current chapter.

Let θ be an angle of orientation of one of the mirror elements, say the roll angle, and let τ be the torque applied by a dc motor. The model in the time domain takes the form of a second-order differential equation

$$J\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) = K\tau(t),$$

where J is the lumped inertia of the mirror element and the motor that moves it, b represents friction in the mechanism, and K accounts for the gear ratio between the motor and the base of the mirror element. Instead of analyzing the differential equation in the time domain, we transform it to the s-domain, do our analysis and control design there, and only at the end, return to the time domain, just as we did for circuits in Chapter 6.

In particular, recall from Section 6-5 that a transfer function is the s-domain representation of a linear time-invariant differential equation. The mathematical model of the mirror element is expressed as

$$\theta(s) = P(s)\tau(s),$$




Figure 1-5: Closed-loop control system for positioning an individual element of the deformable mirror.

where s is the Laplace variable and $P(s)$ is the transfer function of the plant. Equivalently, $P(s)$ is the ratio of the Laplace transforms of the output and the input,

$$P(s) = \frac{\theta(s)}{\tau(s)}.$$

For the mirror element, the transfer function from torque to roll angle is given by

$$P(s) = \frac{K}{s(Js + b)}.$$

Figure 1-5 shows a closed-loop system for controlling the orientation of a mirror element. The angle θ is typically measured with an encoder, the dynamics of which are sufficiently fast that they can be neglected. $C(s)$ is the transfer function of the controller. How to design $C(s)$ to obtain a desired time-domain response will be discussed later in this chapter.

The desired orientation of the mirror element is determined by the controller in Fig. 1-2. The control system in adaptive optics is typical of many feedback systems in that it employs multiple loops. The *outer feedback loop* in Fig. 1-2 is providing commands to each of the *inner feedback loops* represented by Fig. 1-5. Each inner-loop controller is focused on precisely and quickly achieving the reference command or *setpoint* provided by the outer-loop controller. The outer-loop controller can be thought of as coordinating the actions of the inner-loop controllers so as to *attenuate the disturbances* introduced by the atmosphere. The decomposition of tasks simplifies the overall control design process. This chapter focuses on feedback designs that are typical of inner-loop control systems.

1-2.2 Segways, Bipedal Robots, and Devices that Balance

Consisting of two wheels, two electric motors, a battery, and a platform with handles, the Segway was introduced with great fanfare in 2001 as a revolution in personal transportation. The major novelty of course was the ability of the device to balance upright with a person riding on it. An additional attraction is its intuitive interface: to accelerate in the forward direction, the rider simply leans forward, and conversely, to brake forward motion or to back up, the rider leans backward. Steering is accomplished by rotating one of the wheels faster than the other. In recent models, the rider gives the steering command by leaning to the left or to the right as needed.

The seemingly “magical” balancing properties of the Segway are consequences of feedback control. Moreover, they can be traced back to an apparatus that has been popular in control laboratories for over 30 years. Indeed, Fig. 1-6 shows that the dynamic principles behind a Segway are very similar to those of an inverted pendulum on a cart, which has been a mainstay control experiment since the 1980s. The platform and rider of the Segway are analogous to the inverted pendulum, and the Segway’s wheels and motor assembly are analogous to the cart. The Segway has a motor attached between each wheel and the platform. If a motor applies a torque to a wheel in the clockwise direction, then standard physics implies that an equal and opposite torque is applied to the pendulum-like platform, causing it to accelerate in the counterclockwise direction. In the case of the inverted pendulum, if a motor applies a torque to a wheel in the clockwise direction, then the cart is accelerated to the right, causing the pendulum to accelerate in the counterclockwise direction.




Figure 1-6: A Segway and an inverted pendulum on a cart both involve upright balance. The Segway's platform behaves like an inverted pendulum. For each device, if the wheels are accelerated in the direction that the platform/pendulum is leaning, a restoring torque is generated that counters the lean, thereby straightening the platform/pendulum.




Figure 1-7: Closed-loop control system for maintaining upright balance in a Segway and an inverted pendulum on a cart.

By computing their mechanical models and doing a small signal approximation about the upright equilibrium points, it can be shown that, for each of these devices, the transfer function from motor torque to pendulum angle has the form

$$P(s) = \frac{K}{s^2 - a},$$

where $a > 0$. Consequently $P(s)$ has two real poles (roots of the denominator), one pole at $-\sqrt{a}$ and another at $+\sqrt{a}$. As we will see in Section 1-3, if one or more poles are positive, the system is unstable and feedback is required to stabilize it, as shown in Fig. 1-7. A stabilizing controller will be designed in Section 1-9.

The control principles that underly the Segway and the inverted pendulum on a cart are also present in many other machines, such as bipedal robots, as shown in Fig. 1-8. The body of the robot is balanced on its legs in a similar manner to how the platform of a Segway is balanced on its wheels. Moreover, similar principles apply to humans as well. While standing upright, lean your body forward at the waist and drive one of your legs backward. You will automatically provide a torque at your hip that pushes your hips forward while righting your torso! This is precisely what the feedback controller is doing on a Segway.

1-2.3 Hybrid Electric Vehicles

The word *hybrid* in a *Hybrid Electric Vehicle (HEV)* signifies that the vehicle has both a conventional power source, meaning an internal combustion engine, and an electrical power source, meaning a battery, and one or more electric machines that can operate as a motor, a generator, or both. The power sources can be connected to the wheels of the vehicle in a series configuration, parallel configuration, or a combination called a series-parallel configuration. In the parallel configuration shown in Fig. 1-9, power to the wheels can be provided by the internal combustion engine, the electric motor, or both at the same time.




Figure 1-8: The bipedal robot MABEL contains multiple pendulums.

A parallel HEV can operate as a conventional vehicle by connecting the internal combustion engine to the wheels through a transmission and differential, and disconnecting the electric machine. It can operate as an electric vehicle by having the electric machine function as a motor, drawing power from the battery and delivering it to the wheels. It can operate in electric-assist mode by providing power from the engine and motor simultaneously. It can operate in recharge mode by having the engine deliver more power to the wheels than is demanded by the driver, while the electric machine functions as a generator, drawing the surplus power from the wheels and depositing it in the battery for later use. The final mode is regenerative braking, where the engine is disconnected from the wheels, and the action of the electric machine as a generator creates a braking torque on the wheels, slowing the vehicle to a stop.

The coordination of all of these modes is handled by the *power management controller*. It has the task of determining which combination of power sources and transmission gear ratio will deliver the driver's requested power in the most economical way, while maintaining an adequate amount of charge in the battery. The optimal combination of power sources depends on the current speed of the vehicle, whether the engine is currently on or off, the amount of charge in the battery, and of course the power demanded by the driver, among other things. The power management controller monitors the relevant variables ten or more times per second and sends a gear request to the transmission, and power requests to the engine and electric machine, where a request for negative power from the electric machine means that power generation is required.

In turn, the commands from the power management controller activate numerous feedback controllers which assure that the engine, electric machine, and transmission function properly. For example, in the case of a gasoline engine, its power level is achieved by regulating the airflow via the throttle position, injecting the proper amount of fuel at the correct time in the combustion process, igniting the mixture by firing a spark plug, and taking numerous actions to minimize the production of pollutants. Each of these functions has associated feedback loops, many of which are based on signal measurements made every millisecond. An example feedback loop is shown in Fig. 1-10.

Consequently, the feedback control system for an HEV is organized in a hierarchical fashion as shown in Fig. 1-11. Recall that this was the case also for the Segway and the adaptive optics. Hierarchical control architectures are used in complex systems because it allows the feedback design process to be decomposed into a series of simpler steps.

Power is produced in a gasoline engine by combusting a mixture of gasoline and air. The low-level controller for regulating the fuel flow is shown in Figures 1-12 and 1-13. Because the exhaust gas exiting the engine contains nitrous-oxides, carbon monoxide, and other gases that contribute to smog, a catalytic convertor is used to remove these products of combustion. The chemistry of the catalytic convertor is such that it operates with maximal efficiency when




Figure 1-9: Hybrid Electric Vehicles or HEVs have at least two power elements. Shown in the upper left are an internal combustion engine and an electric machine that can be operated both as a motor and as a generator, while the remaining images are the various modes in which the two power sources can be operated. The vehicle's power management system chooses among the many modes in which the engine and motor-generator can be operated to minimize fuel consumption. **Source:** Original Drawing by Joe Lin, Huei Peng, and JWG.

the mass ratio of fuel to air is at a specific level called stoichiometry, which is the ratio of fuel and air at which, if the combustion process were perfect, there would be precisely two atoms of oxygen for each molecule of carbon and one atom of oxygen for each two atoms of hydrogen. For gasoline, the stoichiometric ratio of fuel to air is $1/14.64$ or 6.83×10^{-2} , meaning that 14.64 grams of air is needed to burn 1 gram of gasoline. The objective of the fuel controller is to very precisely meter the fuel flow such that a stoichiometric ratio is maintained.

Even though combustion is a very complicated chemical reaction, it neither creates nor destroys mass. Hence, the engine can be modeled as a time delay, meaning that mass in equals mass out, with the delay corresponding to the four-stroke cycle, intake-compression-combustion-exhaust, commonly used in gasoline engines for automobiles. The fuel-air ratio sensor has a time constant of roughly 7 ms, so here it has been neglected in order to simplify the model. In addition, the airflow has been assumed to be constant and equal to 20 g/s. In practice, the controller must also deal with variations in air flow rate, but this is not addressed here. The time delay varies with engine speed; at 1500 RPM, it is about 80 ms. A feedback controller for regulating the fuel-air mixture will be designed in Section 1-9.




Figure 1-10: Example low-level feedback loops that translate desired engine power into setpoint commands for the throttle and fuel injectors.




Figure 1-11: A typical hierarchical control system in an HEV. **Source:** Original Drawing by Joe Lin, Huei Peng, and JWG.




Figure 1-12: Model of the engine, focusing on the ratio of fuel to air, assuming a nominal air flow of 20 g/s.




Figure 1-13: Control system for achieving a stoichiometric ratio of fuel to air, assuming a nominal air flow of 20 g/s.

Review Question 1-3: What is the difference between outer-loop and inner-loop feedback control?

Review Question 1-4: What is a benefit of hierarchy in a feedback system?

1-3 Poles, Zeros and BIBO Stability

The Laplace transform greatly simplifies the analysis of linear systems in general, and linear feedback systems in particular. This section recalls some facts from Chapter 6 that will play an important role in the study of feedback. It will also introduce some additional vocabulary that the reader is likely to encounter when consulting other works on feedback control.

1-3.1 Poles and Zeros

Recall that a transfer function is *rational* if it can be expressed as the ratio of two polynomials. For a rational transfer function

$$G(s) = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)},$$

the polynomials $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ are said to be *coprime* if they have no common roots. In this case, the roots of $N(s)$ are the *zeros* of $G(s)$ and the roots of $D(s)$ are the *poles*. *If $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ have common factors, hence yielding common roots, the common factors must be canceled before determining the zeros and poles of the transfer function.*

Example 1-1 Zeros and Poles

Determine the zeros and poles of the transfer functions (a) $G_1(s) = \frac{2}{s^2 - 1}$, (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{s+2}{s^2 - 1}$, (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{s+1}{s^2 - 1}$, and (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{2s-4}{s^2 + 2s + 2}$.

Solution:

(a) $N_1(s) = 2$ has no roots and $D_1(s) = s^2 - 1 = (s-1)(s+1)$ has roots ± 1 . $N_1(s)$ and $D_1(s)$ are therefore coprime; it follows that $G_1(s)$ has no zeros and two poles at ± 1 .

(b) $N_2(s)$ has one root -2 which is distinct from the roots of $D_2(s)$, which are ± 1 . Thus $N_2(s)$ and $D_2(s)$ are coprime and it follows that $G_2(s)$ has one zero at -2 and two poles at ± 1 .

(c) $N_3(s) = s+1$ has one root -1 which is also a root of $D_3(s) = s^2 - 1$. Thus $N_3(s)$ and $D_3(s)$ are *not coprime*. To determine the zeros and poles of $G_3(s)$, the common factor of $(s+1)$ is removed, yielding

$$G_3(s) = \frac{s+1}{(s+1)(s-1)} = \frac{1}{s-1}.$$

It follows that $G_3(s)$ has no zeros and one pole at 1 .

(d) $N_4(s) = 2(s-2)$ has a root at 2 , which is distinct from the roots of $D_4(s) = (s+1+j)(s+1-j)$, which are $-1 \pm j$. $N_4(s)$ and $D_4(s)$ are therefore coprime; it follows that $G_4(s)$ has a zero at 2 and two poles at $-1 \pm j$.

1-3.2 BIBO Stability

A linear time-invariant system is ***causal*** if present values of the output do not depend on future values of the input. If the system has a rational transfer function $G(s)$, then the system is causal if, and only if, the degree of the numerator is less than or equal to the degree of the denominator. Transfer functions that satisfy this property have a special name, they are said to be ***proper***. A system is *bounded-input bounded-output* stable, or ***BIBO stable*** for short, if the output is bounded whenever the input is bounded. To be extra clear, the word “whenever” here means the output must remain bounded for “all possible” bounded inputs.

A system with a proper rational transfer function is BIBO stable if, and only if, its poles have negative real parts. In other words, the stability of a rational transfer function

$$G(s) = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)},$$

is completely determined by its poles as long as the degree of the numerator polynomial is less than or equal to the degree of the denominator polynomial. The zeros do not play a role in stability.

To illustrate the connections between time-domain models, transfer functions, poles, and BIBO stability, consider a system represented by a first-order differential equation with input $x(t)$ and output $y(t)$,

$$\dot{y}(t) - y(t) = x(t).$$

In the s-domain, the model becomes

$$Y(s) = G(s)X(s),$$

where the transfer function is

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{s-1}.$$

The pole is $s = +1$, and thus the system is unstable.

For definiteness, suppose the input is a unit step. Then

$$Y(s) = \frac{1}{s-1} \frac{1}{s}.$$

Applying the method of partial fraction expansion,

$$Y(s) = -\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{s-1}.$$

Taking the inverse Laplace transform yields

$$y(t) = (e^t - 1) u(t). \quad (1.1)$$

From this equation, the output $y(t)$ is unbounded, diverging to infinity as t goes to infinity, as shown in the upper half of Fig. 1-14.

On the other hand, for the model

$$\dot{y}(t) + y(t) = x(t),$$

the transfer function is

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{s+1}.$$

The pole is $s = -1$, and hence the system is BIBO stable. Computing the output in response to a unit-step input gives

$$y(t) = (1 - e^{-t}) u(t). \quad (1.2)$$

From this equation, the output converges to 1 as t goes to infinity, and, in particular, it is bounded for all $t \geq 0$, as illustrated in the lower half of Fig. 1-14.




Figure 1-14: For a positive real pole, bounded inputs can give rise to unbounded outputs, whereas for a negative real pole, bounded inputs always give rise to bounded outputs.

Example 1-2 BIBO Stability

Determine the stability of the transfer functions $G_1(s) = \frac{2}{s^2-1}$, $G_2(s) = \frac{s+2}{s^2-1}$, $G_3(s) = \frac{s+1}{s^2-1}$, and $G_4(s) = \frac{2s-4}{s^2+2s+2}$ analyzed in the previous example, and in addition, the transfer function $G_5(s) = \frac{s-1}{s}$.

Solution:

$G_1(s)$, $G_2(s)$ and $G_3(s)$ each has a pole at 1, and thus they are unstable. The poles of $G_4(s)$ are $-1 \pm j$, which have negative real parts, and hence the transfer function is BIBO stable. $G_5(s)$ has a pole at the origin, and hence it is unstable.

At this point, the role of the zeros seems somewhat mysterious. The zeros will come into the picture when closed-loop systems are analyzed.

If a transfer function is rational, but not proper, do the poles still determine its stability? The short answer is no. If you are curious as to why not, consider $G(s) = s$, which corresponds to a differentiator, that is, the system

$$y(t) = \frac{dx(t)}{dt},$$

where $x(t)$ is the input. The input $\sin(t^2)$ is bounded, since it takes values between -1 and 1 , but the corresponding output $y(t) = 2t \cos(t^2)$ is unbounded. You might be thinking that the transfer function has no poles, and therefore it is untrue that all of its poles have negative real parts! Instead of arguing semantics, consider the parallel connection of a differentiator and the stable transfer function $\frac{1}{s+2}$, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} G(s) &= G_a(s) + G_b(s) \\ &= s + \frac{1}{s+2} \\ &= \frac{s(s+2)}{s+2} + \frac{1}{s+2} \\ &= \frac{s^2 + 2s + 1}{s+2}. \end{aligned}$$

A quick calculation shows that its two zeros are both -1 and its pole is -2 . But the system is not BIBO stable because the bounded input $\sin(t^2)$ produces the output

$$y(t) = y_a(t) + y_b(t),$$

where $y_a(t) = 2t \cos(t^2)$, which is unbounded, and the second term, being the output of a system with BIBO stable transfer function $G_b(s)$, must be bounded. The sum of an unbounded signal and a bounded signal is unbounded. Thus a bounded input has produced an unbounded output and the system is unstable.

1-3.3 Simplified Stability Test

When the transfer function is proper, BIBO stability is equivalent to checking that the poles have negative real parts. It is possible to determine whether or not the roots of a polynomial have negative real parts without explicitly computing the roots. This nifty trick will prove useful in feedback design.

For real numbers a_1 and a_0 , the roots of the quadratic equation

$$s^2 + a_1 s + a_0 = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

have negative real parts if, and only if, $a_1 > 0$ and $a_0 > 0$. For a cubic equation, the result is, for real numbers a_2 , a_1 , and a_0 , the roots of the equation

$$s^3 + a_2 s^2 + a_1 s + a_0 = 0 \quad (1.4)$$

have negative real parts if, and only if, $a_2 > 0$, $a_0 > 0$, and $a_1 - \frac{a_0}{a_2} > 0$.

Similar results can be given for polynomials of arbitrary degree. The computations are typically organized in a table called the *Routh array*.

Example 1-3 Roots of quadratic and cubic equations

Determine whether the given polynomials have roots with negative real parts or not. (a) $q_1(s) = s^2 + 4s + 2$, (b) $q_2(s) = s^2 - 3s + 4$, (c) $q_3(s) = -2s^2 - 5s - 6$, and (d) $q_4(s) = 4s^3 + 2s^2 + s + 3$.

Solution:

(a) For $q_1(s)$, $a_1 = 4 > 0$ and $a_0 = 2 > 0$, thus its roots have negative real parts.

(b) For $q_2(s)$, $a_1 = -3 < 0$, therefore at least one root has a non-negative real part.

(c) The leading coefficient of the polynomial $q_3(s)$ is not equal to one, so the polynomial seems to be not covered by the given conditions. However, the roots of $q_3(s)$ are clearly the same as the roots of

$$q'_3(s) = -\frac{1}{2}q_3(s) = s^2 + \frac{5}{2}s + 3,$$

for which $a_1 = 2.5 > 0$ and $a_0 = 3 > 0$, showing that its roots have negative real parts.

(d) Similarly, the roots of $q_4(s)$ are the same as the roots of

$$q'_4(s) = \frac{1}{4}q_4(s) = s^3 + 0.5s^2 + 0.25s + 0.75,$$

for which $a_2 = 0.5 > 0$, $a_0 = 0.75 > 0$, but

$$a_1 - \frac{a_0}{a_2} = -1.25 < 0,$$

and therefore at least one root has a non-negative real part.

1-3.4 Irrational transfer functions

All of the emphasis here has been placed on rational transfer functions. An important *irrational* transfer function is e^{-Ts} , for $T > 0$, which corresponds to a time delay by T in the time domain, namely,

$$y(t) = x(t - T).$$




Figure 1-15: Unity negative feedback system.

While it is possible to define poles and zeros of irrational transfer functions, it will not be pursued here. Instead, in Sec. 1-6, a *rational approximation* of a time delay will be introduced. This will allow poles and zeros of a time delay to be easily defined and understood.

Review Question 1-5: Is BIBO stability always determined by the poles of a transfer function?

Review Question 1-6: Is it possible to test for BIBO stability of a transfer function without solving for the poles?

Review Question 1-7: What is the difference between a rational transfer function and an irrational transfer function?

Exercise 1-1: Check the BIBO stability of the transfer functions $G_1(s) = \frac{2s^2+4s+6}{s+1}$, $G_2(s) = \frac{s-2}{s(s+2)}$, $G_3(s) = \frac{s-1}{s^2+6s+11}$, and $G_4(s) = \frac{2s+4}{s^3+2s^2+4s+10}$.

Answer: (a) unstable, (b) unstable, (c) BIBO stable, (d) unstable.

1-4 Unity Feedback Systems

Section 1-2 demonstrated that feedback systems come in many configurations. A common configuration, and the easiest one to study when first learning the subject of feedback control, is the *unity feedback system* shown in Fig. 1-15. It is also called a *negative feedback system* due to the minus sign on the feedback loop at the summer. In this figure, $Y(s)$ is the system output, $R(s)$ is the reference command, and $E(s)$ is the error between the output and the reference. The reference command $R(s)$ normally specifies the desired output of the system. When the reference command is a constant, the reference value is also called a *setpoint*. The transfer function in the *forward path* is $G(s)$, whereas the transfer function in the *feedback path* is one, which gives the name of a *unity* feedback system.

1-4.1 Closed-loop transfer functions

The block diagram in Fig. 1-15 is equivalent to the following set of linear equations

$$E(s) = R(s) - Y(s) \quad (1.5)$$

$$Y(s) = G(s)E(s). \quad (1.6)$$

Solving these two equations for $Y(s)$ as a function of $R(s)$ results in

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= G(s)(R(s) - Y(s)) \\ &= G(s)R(s) - G(s)Y(s), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$Y(s) + G(s)Y(s) = G(s)R(s),$$

which is equivalent to

$$(1 + G(s))Y(s) = G(s)R(s).$$

Hence

$$Y(s) = \frac{G(s)}{1 + G(s)}R(s), \quad (1.7)$$

from which it follows that the transfer function from $R(s)$ to $Y(s)$ is

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{G(s)}{1 + G(s)}. \quad (1.8)$$

The same steps can be repeated to determine the transfer function from $R(s)$ to $E(s)$,

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

and

$$(1 + G(s))E(s) = R(s).$$

Thus,

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{1 + G(s)}R(s), \quad (1.9)$$

which yields the transfer function as

$$\frac{E(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{1}{1 + G(s)}. \quad (1.10)$$

A small warning: if $G(s) = -1$, then $1 + G(s) = 0$, and the above transfer functions become undefined. There is a technical term for this, namely, the feedback system is *ill-posed*. As long as $G(s) \neq -1$, the above derivations are correct and the closed-loop transfer functions are defined. In practice, ill-posedness is rarely an issue and consequently no more will be said about the possibility of a feedback system being ill-posed.

1-4.2 Closed-loop poles and zeros

Consider a unity feedback system with rational forward-path transfer function $G(s) = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)}$, where $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ are the numerator and denominator polynomials. Simple calculations show that the two transfer functions associated with the unity feedback system are also rational, namely,

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{\frac{N(s)}{D(s)}}{1 + \frac{N(s)}{D(s)}} = \frac{N(s)}{D(s) + N(s)}, \quad (1.11)$$

and

$$\frac{E(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{N(s)}{D(s)}} = \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)}. \quad (1.12)$$

In each case, the numerator and denominator have been multiplied by $D(s)$ to simplify the expressions to a ratio of polynomials.

Before defining the poles and zeros of a feedback loop, a small technical result needs to be settled. If $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ are coprime (no common roots), then the polynomials $N(s)$ and $D(s) + N(s)$ are coprime, and the polynomials $D(s)$ and $D(s) + N(s)$ are coprime as well. To show the first statement, suppose that s_1 is a root of $N(s)$, that is, $N(s_1) = 0$. Can it also be a root of $D(s) + N(s)$? The answer is no, because if $N(s_1) = 0$, then $D(s_1) + N(s_1) = D(s_1)$. Hence, if $D(s_1) + N(s_1) = 0$, then $D(s_1) = 0$, which shows that s_1 would then have to be a root of $D(s_1)$, which is not possible due to $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ being coprime. The identical argument applies to the second case as well.

Hence, if $N(s)$ and $D(s)$ have no common roots, then there are no “pole-zero” cancellations between the numerator and denominator of the transfer functions $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$ and $\frac{E(s)}{R(s)}$. This fact leads to the following defintion.

The poles of the feedback loop are the roots of

$$q(s) = D(s) + N(s) = 0, \quad (1.13)$$

which is called the **characteristic equation**. The polynomial $q(s)$ is called the **characteristic polynomial**. As one would expect, BIBO stability of the closed-loop system is determined by the closed-loop poles, namely, the roots of $q(s)$.

Because we are normally interested in shaping the transient response of the transfer function from reference command to output, the zeros of interest to us are the roots of $N(s)$.

The closed-loop zeros are the roots of $N(s)$. It follows that the zeros of the forward-path transfer function are also the closed-loop zeros of the corresponding unity feedback loop.

Even though it is a slight abuse of terminology, the zeros of $G(s)$ are often called the open-loop zeros and the poles of $G(s)$ are often called the open-loop poles. This terminology makes sense, because, if one *opens the loop* by disconnecting the feedback path from the summer in Fig. 1-15, the transfer function from $R(s)$ to $Y(s)$ is $G(s)$.

Example 1-4 Closed-loop transfer functions

Consider a unity feedback system with forward-path transfer function $G(s) = \frac{2(s+2)}{(s-1)(s+1)}$. Determine the transfer functions $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$ and $\frac{E(s)}{R(s)}$.

Solution:

By inspection, $N(s) = 2(s+2)$ and $D(s) = (s-1)(s+1) = s^2 - 1$. Hence,

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{N(s)}{D(s) + N(s)} = \frac{2(s+2)}{(s^2 - 1) + (2s + 4)} = \frac{2(s+2)}{s^2 + 2s + 3},$$

and

$$\frac{E(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)} = \frac{s^2 - 1}{(s^2 - 1) + (2s + 4)} = \frac{s^2 - 1}{s^2 + 2s + 3}.$$

Example 1-5 Closed-loop zeros and poles

For the unity feedback system above, determine the closed-loop zeros and poles and compare them to the open-loop zeros and poles.




Figure 1-16: Cascade control system configuration, where $C(s)$ is the transfer function of the compensator and $P(s)$ is the transfer function of the plant.

Solution:

The closed-loop zeros and poles are determined by $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$. Hence there is a zero at -2 and two poles at $-1 \pm j\sqrt{2}$. The feedback system is therefore BIBO stable because the real part of the two poles is negative. The open-loop zeros and poles are determined by $G(s)$, which has a zero at -2 and poles at ± 1 . The open-loop system is thus unstable because one of the poles has a non-negative real part. The open-loop system and closed-loop system have the same zeros.

1-4.3 Cascade Control Architecture

Figure 1-16 is a refinement of the unity feedback system, where the forward path is written as a *cascade* connection of a *compensator* $C(s)$ and *plant* $P(s)$. Recall that “plant” is the generic term for the system that is to be controlled. The input to the plant is denoted $X(s)$. The plant input is the means by which the plant output is changed. For the Segway, the plant input was the torque at the wheels provided by the motors, while for the fuel-air ratio control system, it was the fuel flow rate provided by the fuel injectors.

The compensator is the system or device that determines how to vary the input to the plant to regulate the plant output. In the cascade control configuration of Fig. 1-16, the compensator acts on $E(s)$, the *error* between the reference command $R(s)$ and the measured output $Y(s)$. When the error is zero, the plant output is exactly following or *tracking* the reference command. One way to think of the compensator is that it is attempting to steer the plant input so that the plant output tracks the reference command. Equivalently, the compensator seeks to drive the error between the reference and output signals to zero.

A key objective of this chapter is the design of the compensator $C(s)$, based on properties of the plant $P(s)$ and the desired output. Before tackling this problem, it is first necessary to determine how the closed-loop transfer function depends on the compensator. This is accomplished by identifying $G(s) = C(s)P(s)$ in Fig. 1-15, leading to

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{C(s)P(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)} \quad (1.14)$$

and

$$\frac{E(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{1}{1 + C(s)P(s)}. \quad (1.15)$$

Because $X(s) = C(s)E(s)$, it follows that

$$\frac{X(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{C(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)}. \quad (1.16)$$

Example 1-6 Proportional feedback applied to an unstable first-order plant

Suppose the plant has transfer function $P(s) = \frac{1}{s-1}$ and the compensator is a *proportional feedback* $C(s) = K$, where K is a gain to be chosen. Determine the transfer function $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$ and evaluate its stability as a function of K .

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} &= \frac{C(s)P(s)}{1+C(s)P(s)} \\ &= \frac{K \frac{1}{s-1}}{1+K \frac{1}{s-1}} \\ &= \left(\frac{K \frac{1}{s-1}}{1+K \frac{1}{s-1}} \right) \left(\frac{s-1}{s-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{K}{s-1+K}.\end{aligned}$$

The pole of the transfer function is the root of the polynomial, $s - 1 + K = 0$, yielding the pole $1 - K$. The closed-loop system is therefore BIBO stable if, and only if, $K > 1$.

Example 1-7 Proportional feedback applied to an unstable second-order plant

Suppose the plant is instead $P(s) = \frac{1}{s(s-2)}$, with the previous proportional feedback $C(s) = K$. Determine the transfer function $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$ and evaluate its stability as a function of K .

Solution:

Evaluating the closed-loop transfer function gives

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{K}{s^2 - 2s + K}.$$

The poles of the transfer function are the roots of the polynomial $s^2 - 2s + K = 0$. Applying the result of (1.3), it is seen that the coefficient $a_1 = -2 < 0$ is independent of the value of the gain K , and hence at least one root will have a non-negative real part. The closed-loop system is therefore unstable for all values of the gain K , and something more sophisticated than proportional feedback is required to stabilize the system.

1-4.4 Common Compensators

Some common compensators are listed here. A few remarks about the potential utility of each compensator is given, though, at this time, not enough material has been covered to justify these statements. *These remarks should be taken as a preview of things to come.*

Each of the compensators allows the gain of the forward path to be adjusted. It will be seen later in the chapter that increasing the gain in the forward path of a unity feedback system is useful for reducing the steady-state error. Recall that a small error means that the output is accurately following the reference command of the system.

Proportional compensator

$$C(s) = K_P$$

A proportional compensator allows the gain of the forward path to be adjusted. It adds neither zeros nor poles to the forward path of the feedback loop. For first-order systems, gain adjustment alone can achieve stability.

PD or Proportional-Derivative compensator

$$C(s) = K_P + K_D s = K_D \left(s + \frac{K_P}{K_D} \right)$$

A PD compensator allows the gain of the forward path to be adjusted. It adds a zero in the forward path at $-\frac{K_P}{K_D}$, but has no poles. The derivative action of a PD compensator will prove useful for stabilizing a system and for reducing oscillations.

Integral compensator

$$C(s) = K_I \frac{1}{s}$$

An integral compensator allows the gain of the forward path to be adjusted. It adds a pole at the origin to the forward path, but does not have a zero. It will be shown in Section 1-5 that a pole at the origin in the forward path leads to zero steady-state error for step commands. On the other hand, a pole at the origin is unstable, and thus care must be taken in the feedback loop to stabilize it.

PI or Proportional-Integral compensator

$$C(s) = K_P + K_I \frac{1}{s} = K_P \frac{s + \frac{K_I}{K_P}}{s}$$

A PI compensator allows the gain of the forward path to be adjusted. It adds to the forward path a pole at the origin and a zero at $-\frac{K_I}{K_P}$. It combines the advantages of PD control and integral control. Specifically, its primary role is to achieve zero steady-state error for step commands. The zero can be used to offset the destabilizing effect of the pole at the origin.

PID or Proportional-Integral-Derivative compensator

$$\begin{aligned} C(s) &= K_P + K_I \frac{1}{s} + K_D s \\ &= \frac{K_D s^2 + K_P s + K_I}{s} \\ &= K_D \frac{s^2 + K_P / K_D s + K_I / K_D}{s} \end{aligned}$$

Each of the previous compensators is a special case of the PID compensator, obtained by setting one or more of the coefficients to zero. A PID compensator has two zeros and a pole at the origin. The zeros can be real or complex, depending on the coefficients of the numerator polynomial. If the zeros are real, then the PID compensator can be viewed as a cascade of a PD compensator with a PI compensator. This observation will be used to simplify the design of a PID compensator.

Caveat

The PD compensator is improper. Hence, it is both noncausal and unstable. The same holds for the PID compensator as well. In engineering practice, the derivative term is implemented as follows

$$K_D \frac{s}{\tau s + 1}, \quad (1.17)$$

which is causal and BIBO stable for $\tau > 0$. Intuitively, for $\tau > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\frac{s}{\tau s + 1} \approx s.$$

This practical version of a derivative is usually referred to as a *dirty derivative*. When analyzing control systems, the “ideal” derivative is employed due to its ease of use.

It is possible to avoid the derivative issue all together by using what is called a *lead compensator*

$$C(s) = K \frac{s+z}{s+p},$$

where $p > z > 0$. The PD compensator with dirty derivative has this form for all $\tau > 0$, $K_P > 0$, and $K_D > 0$. Most undergraduate textbooks dedicated to control discuss lead compensators.

1-4.5 Pole-Zero Cancellations

When forming the cascade of a compensator and a plant in a unity feedback system, as shown in Fig. 1-16, there is the possibility that a zero of the compensator $C(s)$ is also a pole of the plant $P(s)$, or vice versa, namely, a pole of the compensator is also a zero of the plant. This is called a *pole-zero cancellation*, because, literally, when forming $C(s)P(s)$, a pole and zero have been canceled. Is this allowed? Does it cause any problems?

If the pole being canceled has a negative real part, then the cancellation is called a *stable pole-zero cancellation* and generally causes no problems in the feedback loop. Such cancellations are allowed. Otherwise, if the real part of the pole is zero or positive, it is called an *unstable pole-zero cancellation* and this is a disaster for a feedback loop. *Unstable pole-zero cancellations are never used in practice!*

The reader willing to accept the above statements can move on to the next section of the chapter. Otherwise, to understand why unstable pole-zero cancellations are not used in practice, consider a unity feedback loop with plant

$$P(s) = \frac{1}{(s-1)(s+1)}.$$

Two PD-type feedback controllers will be analyzed,

$$C_1(s) = K(s-1), \text{ and } C_2(s) = K(s+1),$$

with the “disastrous” choice studied first.

The compensator $C_1(s)$ induces an unstable pole-zero cancellation. Straightforward computations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} &= \frac{C_1(s)P(s)}{1+C_1(s)P(s)} \\ &= \frac{K \frac{1}{(s+1)}}{1+K \frac{1}{(s+1)}} \\ &= \frac{K}{s+1+K}, \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1-17: $D(s)$ is a disturbance at the plant input.

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E(s)}{R(s)} &= \frac{1}{1 + C_1(s)P(s)} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + K \frac{1}{(s+1)}} \\ &= \frac{K(s+1)}{s+1+K}. \end{aligned}$$

Each of these transfer functions is BIBO stable for all $K > -1$, so the unstable pole-zero cancellation seems to be quite benign.

The problem is lurking at the plant input. Figure 1-17 shows a disturbance acting at the input to the plant. Physically, the disturbance could arise from noise in the electronics used to implement the controller, or imperfections in the actuation of the plant. Setting $R(s) = 0$ and computing the transfer function from the disturbance to the output gives

$$\left. \frac{Y(s)}{D(s)} \right|_{R(s)=0} = \frac{P(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)}.$$

Applying this to the first controller yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y(s)}{D(s)} &= \frac{P(s)}{1 + C_1(s)P(s)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{(s-1)(s+1)}}{1 + K(s-1) \frac{1}{(s-1)(s+1)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{(s+1)(s-1) + K(s-1)} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{s-1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{s+1+K} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In this transfer function, the “canceled” pole shows up! For all choices of K , there is a pole at 1 (for $K \leq -1$, there are two unstable poles, which is even worse). No matter how the gain is chosen, the transfer function is unstable. *Consequently, bounded disturbances at the plant input, no matter how small they are, can give rise to unbounded outputs, which is unacceptable.*

Turning to the second compensator, similar calculations yield

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{K}{s - 1 + K},$$

$$\frac{E(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{(s - 1)}{s - 1 + K},$$

and

$$\frac{Y(s)}{D(s)} = \left(\frac{1}{s + 1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{s - 1 + K} \right),$$

all of which are BIBO stable for $K > 1$. *A stable pole-zero cancellation does not introduce “hidden” problems.*

Review Question 1-8: In a unity feedback system, do the closed-loop poles depend on the open-loop zeros?

Review Question 1-9: What are some common compensators?

Review Question 1-10: What is a pole-zero cancellation? Can it only involve one transfer function?

Review Question 1-11: Can an unstable system be stabilized with open-loop control?

Exercise 1-2: Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = 3(s + 4)$ and the plant is $P(s) = \frac{10}{s^2 + 6s + 8}$. Determine $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$.

Answer: $\frac{30}{s+32}$

Exercise 1-3: Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = 3(s - 2)$ and the plant is $P(s) = \frac{10}{s^2 + 2s - 8}$. Determine $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$.

Answer: There is an unstable pole-zero cancellation. A good control engineer will not proceed any further.

Exercise 1-4: Give the names of the following compensators $C_1(s) = \frac{2s^2 + 4s + 6}{s}$, $C_2(s) = 10\frac{s+3}{s}$, $C_3(s) = 22$, and $C_4(s) = 11(s + 9)$

Answer: (a) PID, (b) PI, (c) proportional, (d) PD.

1-5 Steady-state Error

This section analyzes how accurately a control system can track reference signals in steady state. Two particular reference commands will be studied, a unit step and a unit ramp. These are *universal signals* used when specifying the steady-state performance of a control system.

1-5.1 System Type

Consider the unity feedback system in Fig. 1-15, with forward-path transfer function $G(s)$. The *system type* is the number of poles of $G(s)$ at the origin. In particular, the system has type- j , for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, if

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{s^j} \frac{N(s)}{d(s)} \quad (1.18)$$

and $N(0) \neq 0$ and $d(0) \neq 0$. The condition $N(0) \neq 0$ means that there are no zeros at the origin and the condition $d(0) \neq 0$ means there are no other poles at the origin.

Example 1-8 System Type

Determine the system type for each of the transfer functions below.

$$G_1(s) = \frac{s-1}{s^3+4s+2}$$

$$G_2(s) = \frac{s^2+7s+11}{s^2(s^4+5s^3+3s^2-2s+4)}$$

$$G_3(s) = \frac{4}{s^4+5s^3+3s^2-2s}$$

$$G_4(s) = \frac{s}{s^2+2s+2}$$

Solution:

System	Type
$G_1(s)$	0
$G_2(s)$	2
$G_3(s)$	1
$G_4(s)$	0

Note that the denominator of $G_3(s)$ can be written as $s(s^3+5s^2+3s^1-2)$. Note also that in the case of $G_4(s)$, the zero at the origin does not make the system type equal to -1 because a system's type must be a non-negative integer.

Consider now the unity feedback system shown in Fig. 1-16, where the forward-path transfer function is the cascade of a compensator $C(s)$ and a plant $P(s)$. *The system type is the number of poles at the origin for the product $C(s)P(s)$.* Assuming that neither $C(s)$ nor $P(s)$ has a zero at the origin, the system type is then the sum of the compensator type and the plant type. *In determining system type, the source of the poles at the origin is unimportant; they can come from the plant or the compensator.*

Example 1-9 System Type with $C(s)$ and $P(s)$

Determine the system type for each of the pairs of compensators and plants below.

$$C_1(s) = \frac{2}{s}, \quad P_1(s) = \frac{4}{s+4}$$

$$C_2(s) = \frac{2}{s}, \quad P_2(s) = \frac{s+2}{s^2(s^4+5s^3+3s^2-2s+4)}$$

$$C_3(s) = -\frac{2}{s+1}, \quad P_3(s) = \frac{4}{s^2+2}$$

$$C_4(s) = \frac{5}{s^2}, \quad P_4(s) = \frac{s}{s^2+2s+2}$$

$$C_5(s) = \frac{2}{s(s+1)}, \quad P_5(s) = \frac{(s+1)(s+2)}{s^4+5s^3+3s^2-2s}$$

Solution:

System	Type
$C_1(s)P_1(s)$	1
$C_2(s)P_2(s)$	3
$C_3(s)P_3(s)$	0
$C_4(s)P_4(s)$	<i>undefined</i>
$C_5(s)P_5(s)$	2

The compensator $C_4(s)$ has type 2 and the plant $P_4(s)$ has type 0. However, the product $C_4(s)P_4(s)$ has an unstable pole-zero cancellation, due to the plant having a zero at the origin, and thus the system type is undefined for this compensator-plant cascade. As discussed previously, one should never build a system with an unstable pole-zero cancellation.

1-5.2 Steady-state error for step and ramp inputs

The steady-state error, or e_{SS} , is the asymptotic value of the error signal defined in Figures 1-15 and 1-16. The steady-state error depends on the reference command and the forward-path transfer function. The expression for the error signal was derived in Eqs. (1.9) and (1.15).

Step Inputs

Assume the reference command is a unit-step function, so that $R(s) = \frac{1}{s}$, and assume that $G(s) = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)}$. Then, by Eqn. (1.12), $E(s)$ is given by

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{1 + G(s)} \frac{1}{s} = \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)} \frac{1}{s}.$$

Provided that the poles of $sE(s)$ have negative real parts, application of the Final Value Theorem, (Table 6-2), leads to

$$\begin{aligned} e_{SS} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} sE(s) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)} \frac{1}{s} \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above calculation, it is seen that the poles of $sE(s)$ are precisely the poles of the closed-loop transfer function.

Hence, we arrive at the important conclusion: if the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, then the steady-state error for a unit-step command is well defined and is given by

$$e_{SS} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)}. \quad (1.19)$$

In particular, if the system has *Type-0*

$$e_{SS} = \frac{D(0)}{D(0) + N(0)} \neq 0.$$

If the system has a pole at the origin, then $D(0) = 0$. Therefore, if the system has *Type-1, or greater*

$$e_{SS} = 0.$$

Ramp Inputs

Assume the reference command is a unit-ramp function, so that $R(s) = \frac{1}{s^2}$, and assume that $G(s) = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)}$. Then, by the Final Value Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{ss} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} sE(s) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s \frac{1}{1 + G(s)} \frac{1}{s^2} \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)} \frac{1}{s^2} \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{D(s)}{D(s) + N(s)} \frac{1}{s} \end{aligned}$$

provided the poles of $sE(s)$ have negative real parts. If the system has type-0, then the poles of $sE(s)$ are given by the poles of the closed-loop transfer function plus a pole at the origin. Strictly speaking, the Final Value Theorem does not apply. However, if the closed-loop transfer function is BIBO stable, it can be shown that the steady-state error grows without bound. Assume therefore the system has type-1 or greater, and write $D(s) = s^j d(s)$ for $j \geq 1$. Then the poles of $sE(s)$ are once again equal to the poles of the closed-loop transfer function.

Hence, we arrive at the important conclusion: if the closed-loop system is BIBO stable and type-1 or greater, then the steady-state error for a unit-ramp command is well defined and is given by

$$e_{ss} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{s^{j-1} d(s)}{s^j d(s) + N(s)}. \quad (1.20)$$

In particular, if the system has *Type-1*

$$e_{ss} = \frac{d(0)}{N(0)}, \quad (1.21)$$

whereas if the system has *Type-2, or greater*

$$e_{ss} = 0. \quad (1.22)$$

Example 1-10 Steady-state error

- (a) Consider a unity feedback system with plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{s+4}$ and a proportional compensator $C_1(s) = 10$. Using the expressions developed in this section, determine the steady-state error for a unit-step input and for a unit-ramp input.
- (b) Repeat the analysis for the PI-compensator $C_2(s) = 10\frac{s+3}{s}$.

Solution:

- (a) The forward-path transfer function is

$$C_1(s)P(s) = \frac{40}{s+4} = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)},$$

which has type-0. The pole of the closed-loop system satisfies

$$q(s) = s + 4 + 40 = s + 44 = 0,$$

and thus the closed-loop system is BIBO stable. For a step input, the steady-state error is

$$e_{ss} = \frac{D(0)}{D(0) + N(0)} = \frac{4}{40 + 4} = \frac{1}{11} \approx 0.091$$

Because the system has type-0, it cannot track a ramp input with finite error. In other words, the error is unbounded.

The step and ramp responses are shown in Fig. 1-18. The calculation of the time-domain expressions are given in Example 1-11 below. In engineering practice, if the time-domain signals are required, they are usually computed numerically by a computer-aided control design program, rather than by tedious hand calculations!

(b) In the second case, the forward-path transfer function is

$$C_2(s)P(s) = \frac{40(s+3)}{s(s+4)} = \frac{N(s)}{sd(s)},$$

which has type-1. The poles of the closed-loop system satisfy

$$q(s) = s(s+4) + 40(s+3) = s^2 + 44s + 120 = 0,$$

and thus the closed-loop system is BIBO stable. For a step input, the steady-state error is

$$e_{ss} = 0.$$

For a ramp input, the steady-state error is

$$e_{ss} = \frac{d(0)}{N(0)} = \frac{4}{120} = 0.033$$

The step and ramp responses are shown in Fig. 1-19. The steady-state error for a ramp input is finite because, asymptotically, the time traces of the output and reference are parallel. Physically, this is what it means to track a ramp input with a bounded error. Going back to Fig. 1-18 for the ramp input, the time traces of the output and reference diverge, leading to unbounded error.

It is common to express the steady-state error as a percentage, by taking the ratio of the error and the magnitude of the input, and then multiplying by 100%. Hence, in the previous example, because the inputs have unit magnitudes, the first compensator results in a 9.1% error for step input, while the second compensator results in a 3.3% error for a ramp input.

Example 1-11 Steady-state error revisited

Rework part (a) of Example 1-10, but this time, compute e_{ss} by finding the time domain expression for $e(t)$ and taking the limit as t goes to infinity. The purpose of this example is to show that our expressions for the steady-state error, based on the Final Value Theorem, eliminate many tedious calculations.

Solution:

From Eqn. (1.15), when the input is a step, $E(s)$ is given by

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{1 + C_1(s)P(s)} \frac{1}{s} = \frac{s+4}{s+44} \frac{1}{s}.$$




Figure 1-18: (a) Step response for Example 1-10 for the compensator $C_1(s)$. The system type is zero, and thus there is a non-zero steady-state error for a step input. (b) Ramp response for Example 1-10 for the compensator $C_1(s)$. The system type is zero, and thus the error for a ramp input grows without bound.




Figure 1-19: (a) Step response for Example 1-10 for the compensator $C_2(s)$. The system type is one, and thus the steady-state error for a step input is zero. (b) Ramp response for Example 1-10 for the compensator $C_2(s)$. The system type is one, and thus there is a non-zero, but bounded, steady-state error for a ramp input.

By partial fraction expansion,

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{11} \frac{1}{s} + \frac{10}{11} \frac{1}{s+44},$$

and therefore,

$$e(t) = \frac{1}{11} (1 + 10e^{-44t}) u(t).$$

It follows that

$$e_{SS} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = \frac{1}{11},$$

as previously determined.

For completeness, the output is also computed. From Eqn. (1.14), $Y(s)$ is given by

$$Y(s) = \frac{C_1(s)P(s)}{1+C_1(s)P(s)} \frac{1}{s} = \frac{40}{s+44} \frac{1}{s}.$$

By partial fraction expansion,

$$Y(s) = \frac{10}{11} \frac{1}{s} - \frac{10}{11} \frac{1}{s+44},$$

and therefore,

$$y(t) = \frac{10}{11} (1 - e^{-44t}) u(t).$$

When the input is a ramp,

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{1 + C_1(s)P(s)} \frac{1}{s^2} = \frac{s+4}{s+44} \frac{1}{s^2}.$$

By partial fraction expansion,

$$E(s) = \frac{5}{242} \frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{11} \frac{1}{s^2} - \frac{5}{242} \frac{1}{s+44},$$

and therefore,

$$e(t) = \frac{5}{242} (1 - e^{-44t}) u(t) + \frac{1}{11} t u(t).$$

It follows that

$$e_{ss} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = \infty,$$

which is unbounded, as previously determined. Following similar steps to compute the output gives

$$y(t) = -\frac{5}{242} (1 - e^{-44t}) u(t) + \frac{10}{11} t u(t).$$

Review Question 1-12: What is the type of a system?

Review Question 1-13: What is the role of BIBO stability in steady-state error?

Review Question 1-14: Why are ramp inputs more difficult to track than step inputs?

Review Question 1-15: Does error have units? What about percent error?

Exercise 1-5: The following pairs of compensators and plants result in BIBO-stable closed-loop systems. For step inputs and for ramp inputs, determine the nature of the steady-state error: unbounded; bounded, but nonzero; zero.

$$C_1(s) = 10,$$

$$P_1(s) = \frac{4}{s-4}$$

$$C_2(s) = 10,$$

$$P_2(s) = \frac{10}{s(0.1s+1)}$$

$$C_3(s) = \frac{s+5}{s},$$

$$P_3(s) = \frac{4}{s+9}$$

$$C_4(s) = 10 \frac{s+5}{s},$$

$$P_4(s) = \frac{s+2}{s(s+5)}$$

Answer:

System	Step	Ramp
$C_1(s)P_1(s)$	nonzero	unbounded
$C_2(s)P_2(s)$	zero	nonzero
$C_3(s)P_3(s)$	zero	nonzero
$C_4(s)P_4(s)$	zero	zero

1-6 Time Delays




Figure 1-20: Time delays are ubiquitous in physical systems.

A time delay is a ubiquitous physical phenomenon. It can arise from the amount of time it takes to transmit a signal between two points, or from the amount of time it takes to do a computation in an embedded microprocessor. In the s-domain, the transfer function of a time delay is *irrational*,

$$\frac{Y(s)}{X(s)} = e^{-sT}, \quad (1.23)$$

that is, it cannot be expressed as the ratio of two polynomials. For the purposes of analyzing control systems, it is useful to have a *rational approximation* of a time delay. Because a time delay is *causal*, we will seek to preserve this property when approximating the transfer function by a ratio of two polynomials.

1-6.1 Rational approximation of e^x

Recall from calculus that $e^x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{x}{n}\right)^n$. Hence, an n-th order polynomial approximation of e^x is

$$e^x \approx \left(1 + \frac{x}{n}\right)^n. \quad (1.24)$$

Applying this approximation to a time delay yields

$$e^{-sT} \approx \left(1 + \frac{-sT}{n}\right)^n.$$

While the approximation is rational, from Section 1-3, it is not causal because the degree of the numerator is greater than the degree of the denominator.

1-6.2 Causal rational approximation

A causal approximation can be obtained by first expressing

$$e^{-sT} = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}sT}}{e^{\frac{1}{2}sT}},$$

and only then using the approximation given in (1.24). This yields

$$e^{-sT} \approx \frac{\left(1 - \frac{sT}{2n}\right)^n}{\left(1 + \frac{sT}{2n}\right)^n} = \frac{\left(\frac{2n}{T} - s\right)^n}{\left(\frac{2n}{T} + s\right)^n}. \quad (1.25)$$

Because the degree of the numerator does not exceed the degree of the denominator, the transfer function is causal.




Figure 1-21: The pole and zero of a first-order approximation of a time delay are symmetric about the imaginary axis. There are two poles and zeros for a second-order approximation of a time delay and they also are real and symmetric about the imaginary axis.

In most cases, it is enough to take $n = 1$ or $n = 2$ to obtain a reasonable approximation:

$$\text{First-order approx. } e^{-sT} \approx \frac{1-sT/2}{1+sT/2} \quad (1.26)$$

$$\text{Second-order approx. } e^{-sT} \approx \frac{(1-sT/4)^2}{(1+sT/4)^2}. \quad (1.27)$$

The poles and zeros are shown in Fig. 1-21.

1-6.3 Poles and zeros

The rational approximation of a time delay given in (1.25) has n poles in the open left-half plane, all equal to $-2n/T$, and it has n zeros in the right-half plane, all equal to $2n/T$. Hence, a time delay introduces right-half plane zeros. We will see later that right-half plane zeros lead to unexpected behavior in a step response of a transfer function.

Review Question 1-16: Give an example of a system that has a time delay in it.

Review Question 1-17: Can you think of a situation where it may be useful to insert a time delay into a control system for a plant?

Exercise 1-6: The following transfer functions are rational approximations of time delays. Determine the time delay. $G_1(s) = \frac{1-s}{1+s}$, $G_2(s) = \frac{1-0.05s}{1+0.05s}$, $G_3(s) = \frac{(1-2s)^2}{(1+2s)^2}$, and $G_4(s) = \frac{10-s}{10+s}$.

Answer: (a) 2 s, (b) 0.1 s, (c) 8 s, (d) 0.2 s.




Figure 1-22: Typical step response of an underdamped system.

1-7 Transient Response

Thus far, we have learned how to compute closed-loop transfer functions, evaluate their stability, and analyze steady-state tracking performance for step and ramp inputs. This section looks at the transient response of a system to an abrupt change in input, that is, the **step response**. The primary objective is to relate the qualitative features of the step response to the poles and zeros of the transfer function.

1-7.1 Common performance specifications

In this section, it is irrelevant whether the system being considered is open loop or closed loop. Let the Laplace-transform representation of the system be

$$Y(s) = G(s) \frac{1}{s},$$

where $\frac{1}{s}$ is the Laplace transform of a unit-step input, $Y(s)$ is the output, and $G(s)$ is the transfer function, which is assumed to be BIBO stable. Let $y(t)$ be the resulting time response of the output, as shown in Fig. 1-22. Because the transfer function is stable, Section 1-5.1 shows that $y(t)$ asymptotically converges to a steady-state value, denoted here by y_∞ .

The key qualitative features of interest are listed below:

1. **Peak value:** y_{max} is the peak value of the output.

In the case that the output monotonically approaches its steady-state value y_∞ , as in Fig. 1-23 for example, then y_{max} is defined to be y_∞ .

2. **Percent overshoot:** $y_{max} - y_\infty$ is the amount the output exceeds its steady-state value, which could be zero, as indicated above. The percent overshoot is given by

$$\text{Percent overshoot} = \frac{y_{max} - y_\infty}{y_\infty} \times 100\%$$

3. **Rise time:** two values are commonly used, namely

- (a) time to go from 10% to 90% of final value
- (b) time to go from 0% to 100% of final value

4. **5% settling time** = $\min\{T \geq 0 : |y(t) - y_\infty| \leq 0.05y_\infty, \forall t \geq T\}$. In other words, the 5% settling time T_s is the smallest $T > 0$ such that

$$0.95y_\infty \leq y(t) \leq 1.05y_\infty \quad (1.28)$$

for all $t \geq T$. Though not used here, the 2% settling time is fairly common as well.

5. **Peak Time:** Time to reach y_{max} ; it could be infinite.

We will see in Section 1-8 that feedback design requires good rules of thumb for relating the overall system's performance to the zeros and poles of the transfer function. These rules of thumb are developed next.

1-7.2 First-order system without a zero

Consider a first-order system with unity DC gain, meaning that $G(0) = 1.0$, namely

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{\tau s + 1}. \quad (1.29)$$

When $\tau > 0$, it is called the **time constant** of the system. The pole is then given by $-1/\tau$. The step response can be computed to be

$$y(t) = 1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

which is shown in Fig. 1-23. The time constant is the time it takes the step response to go from zero to 63.21% of its final value. The step response has no overshoot, and thus both the peak time and the 0% to 100% rise time are infinite.

Because it is easier to remember round numbers, it is common to estimate the time constant by the time it takes the step response to go from zero to 60% of its final value. In the spirit of the zero to 60% approximation for the time constant, the 10% – 90% rise time is approximately equal to 2τ and the 5% settling time is approximately equal to 3τ . These are summarized below for later use:

0% to 60% of final value = τ ,	
10% to 90% rise time = 2τ ,	
5% settling time = 3τ .	

(1.30)

If the transfer function is instead $K \frac{1}{\tau s + 1}$, so that the DC gain is K , the above approximations remain valid because they depend only on percentage changes in the output, and not on absolute values. This is an important advantage in expressing quantities in relative terms, or percentages.




Figure 1-23: The step response of a first-order system has 10% – 90% rise time approximately equal to 2τ , no overshoot, and its 5% settling time is approximately 3τ .

1-7.3 Second-order system without zeros

Consider a second-order system with unity DC gain,

$$G(s) = \frac{a_0}{s^2 + a_1 s + a_0}, \quad (1.31)$$

where $a_0 > 0$ and $a_1 > 0$ are assumed for BIBO stability. The step response of the system becomes straightforward to understand when the model is re-parameterized in terms of the **damping ratio** ζ and **undamped natural frequency** ω_n , defined as

$$\omega_n^2 = a_0 \quad (1.32)$$

$$2\zeta\omega_n = a_1. \quad (1.33)$$

This gives,

$$G(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}, \quad (1.34)$$

where

$$\omega_n = \sqrt{a_0} \quad (1.35)$$

$$\zeta = \frac{a_1}{2\omega_n} = \frac{a_1}{2\sqrt{a_0}}. \quad (1.36)$$

The step response for a range of damping ratios is shown in Fig. 1-24. When the damping ratio ζ is between zero and one, there is overshoot and the output oscillates before settling to its final value. When the damping ratio is one or greater, there is no overshoot. The speed with which the step response converges to its steady-state value is determined by the undamped natural frequency. When ω_n is small, the response is sluggish, meaning the settling time and rise time are long, and when ω_n is large, the response is rapid. For example, if $\omega_n = 1000$, the time scale in Fig. 1-24 becomes milliseconds, whereas, if $\omega_n = 1/60$, the time scale is minutes.

The system in (1.34) is said to be in **standard form**. Note that if the model has instead the form

$$G'(s) = \frac{k}{s^2 + a_1 s + a_0}, \quad (1.37)$$

then it can be re-expressed as

$$G'(s) = \frac{k}{a_0} \frac{a_0}{s^2 + a_1 s + a_0} = K \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}, \quad (1.38)$$

where $K = \frac{k}{a_0}$. The gain K introduces a change of scale in the system's output, but it does not change the percent overshoot, settling time, rise time, etc.




Figure 1-24: Step response of a standard second-order system. For $0 < \zeta < 1$, there is overshoot and for $\zeta \geq 1$, there is not. Note that the x -axis is $\omega_n t$. **Source:** textbook, **Automatic Control Systems by B. Kuo.**

Poles

Applying the quadratic formula, the poles of the transfer function are computed to be

$$s_{1,2} = -\zeta \omega_n \pm \omega_n \sqrt{\zeta^2 - 1}.$$

Depending on the sign of $\zeta^2 - 1$, three cases are possible:

- **underdamped** $0 < \zeta < 1$: a pair of complex conjugate poles;
- **critically damped** $\zeta = 1$: two repeated real poles; and
- **overdamped** $\zeta > 1$: two distinct real poles.

Step Response

The step response for the three different types of standard second-order systems are described in detail. The derivations follow in a separate subsection to avoid breaking up the flow of this introductory overview.

Underdamped ($0 < \zeta < 1$)

The poles are complex and equal to

$$s_{1,2} = -\zeta \omega_n \pm j\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}. \quad (1.39)$$

Using the method of partial fraction expansion, the step response is computed to be, for $t \geq 0$,

$$y(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} e^{-\zeta \omega_n t} \sin(\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2} t + \theta), \quad (1.40)$$




Figure 1-25: The complex poles of an underdamped system give rise to overshoot and oscillations in the step response.

where, from Fig. 1-25,

$$\cos(\theta) = \frac{\zeta \omega_n}{\omega_n} = \zeta.$$

The decaying, sinusoidal nature of the output is clearly seen.

The peak value is determined by computing the time derivative of the output, setting it to zero, and evaluating the relative maxima and minima. Doing so gives

$$y_{\max} = 1 + e^{\frac{-\zeta\pi}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}}, \quad (1.41)$$

$$\text{percent overshoot} = 100e^{\frac{-\zeta\pi}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}} \% \quad (1.42)$$

$$\text{peak time } T_p = \frac{\pi}{\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}}. \quad (1.43)$$

The 0 – 100% rise time is given by

$$t_r = \frac{\pi - \theta}{\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}}. \quad (1.44)$$

Though the exact calculation of the settling time is difficult, for $0.3 \leq \zeta \leq 0.9$, the following approximation is usually sufficient,

$$5\% \text{ settling time} \approx \frac{3}{\zeta \omega_n}. \quad (1.45)$$

Critically damped ($\zeta = 1$)

The transfer function has two, repeated real poles and can be written as

$$G(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{(s + \omega_n)^2}. \quad (1.46)$$

Following the method of partial fraction expansion, the step response is computed to be

$$y(t) = 1 - e^{-\omega_n t} - \omega_n t e^{-\omega_n t}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1.47)$$




Figure 1-26: The step response of a critically damped ($\zeta = 1$), second-order system with no zeros is monotonic.

By computing the time derivative of the output, it can be shown that for all $t \geq 0$, $\dot{y}(t) > 0$ and therefore, there are neither oscillations nor overshoot; moreover, the peak time is infinite. An approximation of the settling time is given by

$$5\% \text{ settling time} \approx \frac{4.8}{\omega_n}. \quad (1.48)$$

Overdamped ($\zeta > 1$)

The transfer function has two, distinct real poles and can be written as

$$G(s) = \frac{p_1}{s + p_1} \frac{p_2}{s + p_2} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p_1}s + 1} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p_2}s + 1},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= \omega_n \left[\zeta - \sqrt{\zeta^2 - 1} \right] \\ p_2 &= \omega_n \left[\zeta + \sqrt{\zeta^2 - 1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.49)$$

Following the method of partial fraction expansion, the step response is computed to be

$$y(t) = 1 - \frac{p_2}{p_2 - p_1} e^{-p_1 t} - \frac{p_1}{p_1 - p_2} e^{-p_2 t}. \quad (1.50)$$

By computing the time derivative of the output, it can also be shown that for all $t \geq 0$, $\dot{y}(t) > 0$, which implies that the output monotonically approaches its final value, and thus there is no overshoot and the peak time is infinite, as shown in Fig. 1-27.




Figure 1-27: Step response of an overdamped, second-order system with no zeros.

Because there is no overshoot, the primary qualitative feature of the output is its settling time.

- (a) For $1 < \zeta < 1.5$, the poles are close to one another and the terms in (1.50) decay at similar rates. An exact value for the settling time is difficult to compute, but a good approximation can be shown to be

$$5\% \text{ settling time} \approx \frac{6.4}{\omega_n} (\zeta - 1) + \frac{4.8}{\omega_n}. \quad (1.51)$$

- (b) For $\zeta \geq 2$, the poles are far apart because $p_2 \geq 10p_1$. In this case, the last term in (1.50) decays much more rapidly than the second term. Moreover,

$$\frac{p_2}{p_2 - p_1} \approx 1,$$

and thus,

$$y(t) \approx 1 - e^{-p_1 t}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.52)$$

which is the step response of a first-order system with time constant $\tau = 1/p_1$, that is,

$$G(s) \approx \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p_1}s + 1}. \quad (1.53)$$

Consequently, the 5% settling time can be estimated from the corresponding formula for a first-order system, namely

$$5\% \text{ settling time} \approx \frac{3}{p_1}.$$

1-7.4 Derivations of the Step Responses

Example 1-12 Underdamped step response

Use the method of partial fraction expansion to compute the step response for a system with an underdamped second-order transfer function

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

Solution:

The poles of $G(s)$ are given in Eqn. (1.39). Hence, by the method of partial fraction expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= G(s) \frac{1}{s} \\ &= \frac{A_1}{s} + \frac{B_1}{s + \zeta \omega_n - j\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{B_2}{s + \zeta \omega_n + j\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= 1 \\ B_1 &= \frac{\omega_n}{j2\sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} \frac{1}{-\zeta \omega_n + j\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} \\ B_2 &= B_1^*. \end{aligned}$$

The term B_1 is a product of two complex numbers. Expressing the second one in exponential form gives

$$\frac{1}{-\zeta \omega_n + j\omega_n \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega_n}} e^{j\theta},$$

where

$$\cos(\theta) = \frac{\zeta \omega_n}{\omega_n} = \zeta.$$

Taking the inverse Laplace transform of $Y(s)$ term by term yields (**Richard: please fix equation overflow**)

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= u(t) - \frac{\omega_n}{\sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} \left(\frac{1}{2j} e^{-\zeta \omega_n t + j(\omega_n + \theta)t} - \frac{1}{2j} e^{-\zeta \omega_n t - j(\omega_n + \theta)t} \right) u(t) \\ &= u(t) - \frac{\omega_n}{\sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}} e^{-\zeta \omega_n t} \left(\frac{1}{2j} e^{j(\omega_n + \theta)t} - \frac{1}{2j} e^{-j(\omega_n + \theta)t} \right) u(t). \end{aligned}$$

Euler's formula then gives the result introduced earlier in Eqn. (1.40).

Example 1-13 Critically-damped step response

Use the method of partial fraction expansion to compute the step response for a system with a critically-damped second-order transfer function

$$G(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{(s + \omega_n)^2}.$$

Solution:

The transfer function $G(s)$ has repeated poles at $-\omega_n$. Hence, by the method of partial fraction expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= G(s) \frac{1}{s} \\ &= \frac{A_1}{s} + \frac{A_2}{s + \omega_n} + \frac{A_3}{(s + \omega_n)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}A_1 &= 1 \\A_2 &= -1 \\A_3 &= -\omega_n.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the inverse Laplace transform of $Y(s)$ term by term gives the result in Eqn. (1.47).

Example 1-14 Overdamped step response

Use the method of partial fraction expansion to compute the step response for a system with an overdamped second-order transfer function

$$G(s) = \frac{p_1}{s + p_1} \frac{p_2}{s + p_2},$$

where p_1 and p_2 are given by Eqn. (1.49).

Solution:

The transfer function has distinct real poles. Straightforward calculations yield,

$$\begin{aligned}Y(s) &= G(s) \frac{1}{s} \\&= \frac{A_1}{s} + \frac{A_2}{s + p_1} + \frac{A_3}{s + p_2},\end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}A_1 &= 1 \\A_2 &= -\frac{p_2}{p_2 - p_1} \\A_3 &= -\frac{p_1}{p_1 - p_2}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the inverse Laplace transform of $Y(s)$ term by term gives the result in Eqn. (1.50).

1-7.5 Effects of zeros

Zeros in a transfer function can profoundly alter the transient response. It all depends on where they are located with respect to the poles. This will be illustrated by considering a single zero in a second-order system,

$$\tilde{G}(s) = \frac{(\frac{1}{z}s + 1)\omega_n^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}, \quad (1.54)$$

which has a zero at $-z$. For the purposes of our analysis, the zero has been introduced in such a way that it does not change the DC gain of the transfer function. While this excludes $z = 0$, it is fine from a practical point of view. The value of z can be either positive or negative, placing the zero in the left-half or right-plane plane, respectively. Recall that a time delay has a zero in the right-half plane.

As shown in Figures 1-28 through 1-31, the effects of a zero are somewhat different for underdamped, critically damped, and overdamped systems. The case of underdamped systems is explained in detail; a few remarks will be made about the other cases.

Underdamped $0 < \zeta \leq 1$

- $z < 0$, then the zero is in the right-half plane, which is called a *non-minimum phase zero*. A very special phenomenon happens: the step response exhibits undershooting, meaning that the output initially moves in a direction opposite to the commanded value. Zeros in the left-half plane do not cause undershooting.
- $|z| > 10\zeta\omega_n$, the zero can be neglected in the sense that the step response is essentially indistinguishable from that of a system without a zero.
- $|z| \approx 5\zeta\omega_n$, the zero can be neglected in the sense that the step response exhibits only a slight increase in overshoot and settling time from that of a system without a zero.
- $|z| \approx 2\zeta\omega_n$, the zero has a significant effect on the step response step response. For $z > 0$, the 0-100% rise time is reduced by 50% and the overshoot is approximately doubled. For $z < 0$, the undershoot is roughly double the nominal overshoot.
- $|z| \approx \zeta\omega_n$, the zero has a profound effect on the step response step response. For $z > 0$, the 0-100% rise time is reduced by 75% and the overshoot is quadrupled. For $z < 0$, the undershoot may be 100% or more.
- $|z| < 0.5\zeta\omega_n$, the step response is hardly recognizable as that of a second-order system!

Overdamped and critically damped, $\zeta \geq 1$

Zeros can also strongly affect the behavior of overdamped systems as shown in Figures 1-30 and 1-31. When the zero is in the right-half plane, undershooting occurs. When the zero is in the left-half plane and is to the right of the two real poles, overshooting occurs. Even though there is overshooting, the response does not oscillate. The output reaches a peak value and then decays monotonically to its steady-state value. When the zero is between the two poles, or to the left of both poles, no overshooting occurs.




Figure 1-28: Effect of zeros on an underdamped second-order system. The plots on the left are s-domain plots, where the x-axis is the real part and the y-axis is the imaginary part. The plots on the right are time-domain step-response plots where the x-axis is time and the y-axis is the output $y(t)$. The parameters have been set to $\zeta = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\omega_n = \sqrt{2}$, so that the real part of the poles is $\zeta\omega_n = -1$. In these plots, the zero is in the left-half plane as indicated by the circles at -5.0, -2.0, -1.0, and -0.5.

Underlying reason

Let $Y'(s)$ be the output of the transfer function in (1.54), when the input is a unit step. $Y'(s)$ can be written as

$$Y'(s) = Y(s) + \frac{1}{z}sY(s),$$

where $Y(s)$ is the step response of a standard second-order system without a zero. In the time domain, recalling that $\frac{d}{dt} \leftrightarrow s$, we have

$$y'(t) = y(t) + \frac{1}{z} \frac{dy(t)}{dt}.$$

When z is large in magnitude, its reciprocal is small, and the added derivative term has little effect, meaning that $y'(t) \approx y(t)$. When z is small in magnitude, its reciprocal is large, and the derivative term can dominate the sum,




Figure 1-29: Effect of zeros on an underdamped second-order system. The parameters have been set to $\zeta = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\omega_n = \sqrt{2}$, so that the real part of the poles is $\zeta\omega_n = -1$. In these plots, the zero is in the right-half plane, giving rise to undershoot.

in which case, $y'(t)$ is very different from $y(t)$. For zeros in the left-half plane, $z > 0$. It follows that when $y(t)$ is increasing, its derivative is positive, and therefore $y'(t) = y(t) + \frac{1}{z} \frac{dy(t)}{dt} > y(t)$, leading to faster response and increased overshoot. When $z < 0$, it can be shown that

$$\left. \frac{dy'(t)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} < 0,$$

and thus $y'(t)$ initially decreases, giving rise to undershooting.




Figure 1-30: Effect of zeros on an overdamped second-order system. The parameters have been set to $\zeta = 1.5$ and $\omega_n = 2$, so that the poles are $-1, -4$. In these plots, the zero is in the left-half plane. When the zero is to the right of both poles, there is overshooting, but no oscillation.

Review Question 1-18: What is some of the common terminology used to describe the step response of a system?

Review Question 1-19: What are the key parameters of a second-order system without zeros, and how do these parameters relate to the step response?

Review Question 1-20: Are the zeros of a transfer function important? Why?

Review Question 1-21: Can a step response exhibit both undershoot and overshoot?

Review Question 1-22: Is the suspension system of your car overdamped, underdamped, or critically damped? What about the last elevator you rode in? When it stopped at your floor, was the response overdamped, underdamped, or critically damped?




Figure 1-31: Effect of zeros on an overdamped second-order system. The parameters have been set to $\zeta = 1.25$ and $\omega_n = 2$, so that the poles are $-1, -4$. In these plots, the zero is in the right-half plane, giving rise to undershoot.

Exercise 1-7: For each of the following transfer functions, determine the damping ratio and the undamped natural frequency: $G_1(s) = \frac{2^2}{s^2+2(0.6)s+2^2}$, $G_2(s) = \frac{25}{s^2+2s+25}$, $G_3(s) = \frac{1}{s^2+6s+9}$, and $G_4(s) = \frac{3}{2s^2+24s+18}$.

Answer: (a) $\omega_n = 2$ and $\zeta = 0.6$ (b) $\omega_n = 5$ and $\zeta = 0.2$, (c) $\omega_n = 3$ and $\zeta = 1.0$, (d) $\omega_n = 3$ and $\zeta = 2.0$.

Exercise 1-8: Which of the following overdamped transfer functions will exhibit overshoot in the step response?

$$G_1(s) = \frac{10(s+4)}{(s+2)(s+6)}, G_2(s) = \frac{0.1s-1}{s^2+20s+25}, G_3(s) = \frac{s+1}{s^2+8s+12}, \text{ and } G_4(s) = \frac{3}{2s^2+24s+18}.$$

Answer: (a) No overshoot, (b) Undershoot, not overshoot, (c) Overshoot, (d) No overshoot.

1-8 Cascade Controller Design

Control system design is in some sense the opposite of control system analysis. In analysis, one seeks to predict the response of a system to inputs. In design, one seeks to select the components in a system so that it will perform in a desired manner. This section tackles the problem of designing closed-loop systems to achieve stability, rapid response, low oscillation, and low steady-state error. It will draw upon all of the results we have developed throughout the chapter.

1-8.1 First-order Systems

First-order systems provide an opportunity to explore feedback concepts without too many complications. Consider therefore a first-order plant, possibly unstable, and without a zero,

$$P(s) = \frac{k_0}{s + p_0}. \quad (1.55)$$

The initial design objective is to create a stable, closed-loop system with a 5% settling time of T_s seconds for a step input.

The design process begins by translating the specification for the transient response to the desired location of the closed-loop pole, or, equivalently for a first-order system, the desired time constant. From our analysis of first-order




Figure 1-32: A cascade compensator and plant in a unity feedback loop.

systems, we obtain

$$\tau_{des} = \frac{T_s}{3}. \quad (1.56)$$

Proportional Feedback

The next step in the design process is to select the compensator and solve for the unknown gain or gains. The simplest compensator is proportional feedback in a unity feedback configuration, as in Fig. 1-32; hence we start with

$$C(s) = K_P. \quad (1.57)$$

The closed-loop system is then

$$G_{cl}(s) = \frac{C(s)P(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)} = \frac{K_P k_0}{s + p_0 + K_P k_0},$$

which has time constant

$$\tau_{cl} = \frac{1}{p_0 + K_P k_0}.$$

Setting τ_{cl} equal to τ_{des} and solving for the compensator gain yields

$$K_P = \frac{\frac{1}{\tau_{des}} - p_0}{k_0}. \quad (1.58)$$

The final step is to compute the step response and verify that the design meets the specifications.

Example 1-15 Stable first-order system

Suppose that $P(s) = \frac{2}{s+2}$, which has a time constant of 500 ms, and hence a 5% settling time of 1.5 s. It is desired that the closed-loop system be five times as fast, with a 5% settling time of 300 ms. Design an appropriate controller.

Solution:

A proportional compensator is selected. From (1.56), the desired time constant is 100 ms. Following the steps outlined above, or immediately applying (1.58), yields

$$K_P = 4.$$

The step response is shown in Fig. 1-33 along with the error between the reference command and the output. It is observed that the steady-state error is 0.2, in other words, the error is 20%.

A system that is open-loop unstable is illustrated next.




Figure 1-33: Step response and steady-state error for $P(s) = \frac{2}{s+2}$ and $C(s) = 4$. Black is the unit step input signal, blue is the closed-loop system's step response, and red is the tracking error.

Figure 1-34: Step response and steady-state error for $P(s) = \frac{2}{s-1}$ and $C(s) = 5.5$. Black is the unit step input signal, blue is the closed-loop system's step response, and red is the tracking error.

Example 1-16 Unstable first-order system

Suppose that $P(s) = \frac{2}{s-1}$ and the objective is closed-loop stability with a 5% settling time of 300 ms. Design an appropriate controller.

Solution:

A proportional compensator is selected. From (1.56), the desired time constant is 100 ms and the required compensator gain is computed to be

$$K_P = 5.5$$

The step response is shown in Fig. 1-34 along with the error between the reference command and the output. It is observed that the steady-state error is -0.1 .

In most applications, the sign of the error is irrelevant, only its magnitude counts. Hence, even in the above case when $e_{SS} = -0.1$, one still says the error is 10%, meaning that its magnitude is 10%.

In these examples, the steady-state error is 20% and 10%, respectively. Can it be reduced?

Consider once again the general first-order plant given in (1.55) and the proportional compensator in (1.57). Assume that $p_0 \neq 0$, meaning the plant is type-0. From Sect. 1-4, the transfer function of the error is

$$\frac{E(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{1}{s + p_0 + K_P k_0}.$$

Assuming that K_P has been chosen consistent with BIBO stability, then the steady-state error for a unit-step input is

$$e_{ss} = \frac{p_0}{p_0 + K_P k_0}. \quad (1.59)$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{|K_P| \rightarrow \infty} e_{ss} = 0.$$

The feedback gain can never be set to infinity, but the above analysis demonstrates that the magnitude of the steady-state error can be made as small as desired by taking $|K_P|$ to be sufficiently large, assuming, once again, that closed-loop stability can be assured.

Example 1-17 Stable First-order system continued

Consider again the system in Example 1-15. Determine K_P so that the magnitude of the steady-state error is 10%, 5%, 2%, and 1%. For each value of K_P , determine the time constant of the closed-loop system as well as the 5% settling time.

Solution:

In most applications, the sign of the steady-state error is unimportant; only its magnitude counts. A steady-state error of 5% is equivalent to $e_{ss} = \pm \frac{1}{20}$, which from Equation (1.59), is equivalent to

$$2 + 2K_P = \pm 40.$$

There are two solutions, $K_P = 19$ and $K_P = -21$. In this case, only the positive solution yields a stable closed-loop system because the pole is equal to $-2 - 2K_P$, that is, -40 for $K_P = 19$ and +40 for $K_P = -21$. The time constant is then $\frac{1}{40}$, or 25 ms, which gives a 5% settling time of 75 ms. The other entries of the table are completed in a similar manner.

% Error	K_P	τ_{cl}	5% T_s
10	9	50 ms	150 ms
5	19	25 ms	75 ms
2	49	10 ms	30 ms
1	99	5 ms	15 ms

In addition to decreasing the steady-state error, high gain, meaning large values of K_P , causes a system to respond faster. This appears to be a beneficial side effect of increasing the gain. *Could there possibly be any drawbacks to high gain?* Yes, there are drawbacks; two are highlighted here: high gain leads to large signals at the plant input, which may exceed physical limits; in addition, a closed-loop system becomes more susceptible to being destabilized by small time delays as the gain increases.

For the sake of clarity, these potential pitfalls are now illustrated on the system presented in Example 1-15. The same qualitative features, however, are present in essentially all feedback systems.

Figure 1-35 shows the input signal to the plant of Example 1-15 for various values of the compensator gain K_P . It is seen that the peak of the control signal increases as the compensator gain increases. Indeed, from Equation (1.16),

$$\frac{X(s)}{R(s)} = K_P \frac{k_0}{s + p + K_P k_0}.$$




Figure 1-35: Input signals to the plant $P(s) = \frac{2}{s+2}$ for various compensator gains.




Figure 1-36: A delay inserted into a unity feedback system for the purpose of checking robustness.

While a linear model assumes that the input can take any real value, physical systems have limits beyond which the input cannot be increased. For example, once the throttle in a car's engine is wide open, nothing more can be done to increase the air flow. Hence, one drawback is that the gain required to achieve a sufficiently small error may give rise to impractical values of the plant input.

However, even if the model is perfectly linear and can tolerate very large inputs, there is a second reason that the compensator gain cannot be made arbitrarily large. Suppose that either the sensor used to measure the plant output has a small time delay, or the implementation of the compensator in a microprocessor is subject to a small computational delay. The corresponding closed-loop system is illustrated in Fig. 1-36. We replace the time delay with a first-order rational approximation,

$$e^{-sT} \approx \frac{1 - sT/2}{1 + sT/2} = \frac{2/T - s}{2/T + s},$$

and then compute the closed-loop transfer function

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} &= 2K_p \frac{(2/T - s)}{(s + 2)(2/T + sy) + 2K_p(2/T - s)} \\ &= 2K_p \frac{(2/T - s)}{s^2 + 2(1 + 1/T - K_p)s + (1 + K_p)4/T}. \end{aligned}$$

The characteristic equation is

$$s^2 + \underbrace{2(1 + 1/T - K_p)}_{a_1} s + \underbrace{(1 + K_p)4/T}_{a_0} = 0.$$

The poles will have negative real parts if, and only if, both a_1 and a_0 are positive. Because $T > 0$ for a time delay, the conditions are

$$1 + K_p > 0$$

and

$$(1 + 1/T - K_P) > 0.$$

These two conditions are equivalent to

$$-1 < K_P < 1 + 1/T.$$

To make things concrete, suppose the time delay is 20 ms, that is, one-fiftieth of a second. Then any gain of

$$K_P \geq 1 + \frac{1}{.02} = 51$$

results in an unstable closed-loop system.

An obvious question is whether small steady-state error be achieved without high gain? The answer was given in Section 1-5: if the forward-path transfer function has type-1, and the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, then the steady-state error for a step input is zero, irrespective of the gain. This idea is developed next in the context of controller design.

PI Control

Consider a PI compensator

$$C(s) = K_P + \frac{K_I}{s} = K_P \frac{s + K_I/K_P}{s}, \quad (1.60)$$

which we have explicitly written as a product; specifically, a proportional feedback with gain K_P multiplying a zero over a pole at the origin,

$$\frac{s+z}{s},$$

where $z = K_I/K_P$. *This way of writing the compensator will allow us to bootstrap the design of a PI compensator off the design of a proportional compensator.* The forward-path transfer function $C(s)P(s)$ is now type-1, due to the pole at the origin, and hence, if the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, it will have zero steady-state error for a step input.

PI Compensator Design Procedure

- Select the proportional gain K_P according to (1.58) in order to achieve a closed-loop time-constant or settling-time specification that is 10% to 30% faster than the given specification. This is to account for the low-pass filtering introduced by the integrator.
- Initially select the integrator gain by $z = K_I/K_P = 0.1\omega_g$, where ω_g is the gain crossover frequency defined below in (1.61).
- Compute the step response of the closed-loop system. If the step response is sluggish, systematically increase z by increments of $0.1\omega_g$.

The gain crossover frequency is defined by

$$|K_P P(j\omega_g)| = 1. \quad (1.61)$$

The above formula assumes that the DC gain is greater than unity, that is, $|K_P P(0)| > 1$.

For the first-order plant given in (1.55), the gain crossover frequency satisfies

$$\frac{|K_P k_0|}{\sqrt{\omega_g^2 + p_0^2}} = 1,$$

which gives

$$\omega_g = \sqrt{(K_P k_0)^2 - p_0^2}. \quad (1.62)$$

The gain crossover frequency can also be read off a Bode plot; this will be illustrated in the next example.

Example 1-18 Stable First-order system with PI control

Consider again the system in Example 1-15. Design a compensator so that the 5% settling time is 300 ms and there is zero steady-state error for a step input.

Solution:

The gain K_P is chosen to achieve a 5% settling time of 240 ms, which is 20% less than the specification, yielding

$$K_P = 5.25.$$

The gain crossover frequency is computed to be

$$\omega_g = 10.3 \text{ rad/s};$$

it can also be read from Fig. 1-37. The step response of the closed-loop system is shown in Figure 1-38 for $z = 0.1\omega_g$ and $z = 0.2\omega_g$. The 5% settling time of the latter is approximately 280 ms, which is quite close to the desired 300 ms. Solving for K_I when $z = 0.2\omega_g$ gives

$$K_I = K_P z = (5.25)(0.2)(10.3) = 10.8$$

Therefore the final compensator is

$$C(s) = 5.25 + \frac{10.8}{s}.$$

Zero steady-state error has been achieved without the use of high-gain control. The input signal to the plant is shown in Fig. 1-39, which should be compared with the input signals in Fig. 1-35, where only proportional control was used to achieve small steady-state error.




Figure 1-37: Bode plot of $K_P P(s)$. The gain crossover frequency is where the magnitude is 0 dB.




Figure 1-38: Step responses for the plant $P(s) = \frac{2}{s+2}$ for two PI compensators.

1-8.2 Second-order Systems

We now consider a second-order system without a zero,

$$P(s) = \frac{k_0}{s^2 + a_1 s + a_0}. \quad (1.63)$$

As in the case of first-order systems, we will first address the transient response, which includes stability, and then take up steady-state error.

The design process begins by translating the specifications for the transient response into the desired location of the closed-loop poles. We will continue to assume that one of the specifications is the 5% settling time. For simplicity and




Figure 1-39: Example input signal to the plant $P(s) = \frac{2}{s+2}$ under PI control. The input goes to the constant value required to achieve the desired output value.

definiteness, we will take the second specification to be the percent overshoot. From Section 1-7, the poles are uniquely determined by the damping ratio ζ and the undamped natural frequency ω_n . If we further assume that $0 < \zeta < 1$, then the transient specifications relate to the desired closed-loop poles via

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta &\leftrightarrow \text{percent overshoot} = 100e^{\frac{-\zeta\pi}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}} \% \\ \omega_n &\leftrightarrow 5\% \text{ settling time} \approx \frac{3}{\zeta\omega_n}.\end{aligned}\quad (1.64)$$

In the above expression, the limit as $\zeta \rightarrow 1$ yields no overshoot. Common numbers to keep in mind for the damping ratio are given in the table below.

ζ	\approx Overshoot	True Overshoot
1.0	0 %	0.00 %
0.9	0 %	0.15 %
0.8	2 %	1.5 %
0.7	5 %	4.6 %
0.6	10 %	9.5 %
0.5	15 %	16.3 %

PD Control

The next step in the design process is to select the compensator and solve for the unknown gain or gains. A PD compensator will be assumed in a unity feedback configuration, as in Fig. 1-32. Hence we start with

$$C(s) = K_P + K_D s.$$

The closed-loop system is then

$$\begin{aligned}G_{cl}(s) &= \frac{C(s)P(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)} \\ &= k_0 \frac{K_P + K_D s}{s^2 + (a_1 + K_D k_0)s + (a_0 + K_P k_0)} \\ &= k_0 \frac{K_D(s + K_P/K_D)}{s^2 + (a_1 + K_D k_0)s + (a_0 + K_P k_0)},\end{aligned}$$

which shows that the characteristic equation is

$$s^2 + \underbrace{(a_1 + K_D k_0)}_{2\zeta\omega_n} s + \underbrace{(a_0 + K_P k_0)}_{\omega_n^2} = 0.$$

Identifying the various terms and performing elementary algebra show the relationship between the compensator gains and the closed-loop poles to be

$$\begin{aligned} K_P &= \frac{\omega_n^2 - a_0}{k_0} \\ K_D &= \frac{2\zeta\omega_n - a_1}{k_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.65)$$

Due to the PD compensator, the closed-loop transfer function has a zero at $-K_P/K_D$. Recall that Section 1-7 showed that a zero could significantly alter the step response of a system. This will motivate a modification to our unity feedback configuration.

Example 1-19 Stabilizing an oscillator

Given that $P(s) = \frac{1}{0.5s^2+2}$, which has poles $\pm j2$, it is desired that the closed-loop system have less than 5% overshoot and a 5% settling time of 700 ms. Show that the step response of the open-loop system has sustained oscillations and then design a controller to meet the objectives for the closed-loop system.

Solution:

In the s-domain, the response of the open-loop system to a step input is

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= P(s) \frac{1}{s} \\ &= \frac{2}{(s+j2)(s-j2)} \frac{1}{s} \\ &= \frac{A_1}{s} + \frac{A_2}{s+j2} + \frac{A_3}{s-j2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \\ A_2 &= -\frac{1}{4} \\ A_3 &= -\frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the inverse Laplace transform term-by-term and applying Euler's formula leads to

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \frac{1}{2}u(t) - \frac{1}{4}e^{-j2t}u(t) - \frac{1}{4}e^{j2t}u(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos(2t))u(t). \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1-40: Step response and steady-state error for $P(s) = \frac{1}{0.5s^2+2}$ and $C(s) = 16.7 + 4.3s$.

Hence the step response of the open-loop system is a sustained oscillation at a frequency of 2 rad/s.

For the controller, a PD compensator is assumed. From the overshoot specification, the damping ratio is selected to be $\zeta = 0.7$. From the settling time specification and (1.64), the undamped natural frequency is computed to be $\omega_n = 6.1$. Following the control design steps outlined above, or immediately applying (1.65), yields

$$K_P = 16.7 \text{ and } K_D = 4.3.$$

The step response is shown in Fig. 1-40 along with the error between the reference command and the output. The steady-state error is 11%. The 5% settling time is 1.2 s, almost twice the design value. The percent overshoot is evaluated to be

$$\frac{y_{max} - y_\infty}{y_\infty} \times 100\% = \frac{1.13 - 0.89}{0.89} \times 100\% = 27\%,$$

more than five times the design value.

To understand why the transient performance differs from the design specifications, we have to recall that the PD compensator introduced a zero in the forward path of the feedback loop. Where did the zero of the PD compensator end up in relation to the closed-loop poles? The zero is at

$$-\frac{K_P}{K_D} = -3.88,$$

which places it to the right of the poles, which have real part

$$-\zeta \omega_n = -4.27.$$

Based on Fig. 1-28, the large overshoot is fully expected. How to address this problem by adding an extra degree of freedom to the compensator design is developed next.

Figure 1-41 presents a small but important modification to the standard unity feedback system. A “filter” has been placed on the reference signal before it enters the summing junction. Formally, $F(s)$ is called a **precompensator**, and the block diagram is called a **two-degree-of-freedom controller** because of the additional design freedom afforded by $F(s)$. The transfer function from reference to output is

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = F(s) \frac{C(s)P(s)}{1 + C(s)P(s)},$$

which is simply the product of the transfer functions of the precompensator and the standard unity feedback loop.




Figure 1-41: Two-degree-of-freedom control configuration.

The precompensator can be used to remove unwanted left-half plane zeros in the transfer function by the deliberate creation of stable pole-zero cancellations. If there are no unstable pole-zero cancellations, the control loop with the precompensator is BIBO stable if, and only if, both the precompensator and the control loop without the precompensator are BIBO stable. Moreover, if $F(0) = 1$, that is, the precompensator has unity DC gain, then the steady-state error for a unit-step input is the same, with or without the precompensator, namely

$$e_{ss} = \frac{1}{1 + C(0)P(0)}.$$

Example 1-20 Stabilizing an oscillator continued

Consider again the system in Example 1-19, where it was desired that the closed-loop system have less than 5% overshoot and a 5% settling time of 700 ms. Use a two-degree-of-freedom controller to remove the troublesome zero introduced by the PD compensator.

Solution:

The PD compensator $C(s)$ is retained. The precompensator is selected as

$$F(s) = \frac{z}{s+z} = \frac{1}{\frac{s}{z} + 1},$$

where $z = \frac{K_p}{K_D} = 3.88$. This cancels the zero with a stable pole. The step response of the system is shown in Fig. 1-42. The overshoot and settling time specifications are now met.

Remark: While a precompensator with a unity dc gain does not change the steady-state error for a step input, it does modify the steady-state error for a ramp input. For obvious reasons, assume the unity feedback loop and the precompensator are both BIBO stable. If the precompensator is given by $F(s) = \frac{z}{s+z}$, and $C(s)P(s) = \frac{N(s)}{s^j d(s)}$ (that is, it has type-j), then the steady-state error is given by:

Type-1

$$e_{ss} = \frac{d(0)}{N(0)} + \frac{1}{z}. \quad (1.66)$$

Type-2, or greater

$$e_{ss} = \frac{1}{z}. \quad (1.67)$$

In the above, the error is defined by $E(s) = R(s) - Y(s)$, the difference between the reference and the output, as was done in Section 1-6.




Figure 1-42: Step response when using a precompensator. The plant is $P(s) = \frac{1}{0.5s^2+2}$, $C(s) = 16.7 + 4.3s = 4.3(s + 3.88)$ and $F(s) = \frac{3.88}{s+3.88}$.

PID Control

The steady-state error in Example 1-19 is already reasonably small, but for the sake of argument, let's suppose it is desired to achieve zero steady-state error. Then the system's type must be augmented by introducing an integrator in the compensator.

Consider therefore a PID compensator

$$C(s) = K_P + \frac{K_I}{s} + K_D s = \underbrace{\left(\frac{s+z}{s}\right)}_{PI} \underbrace{(\bar{K}_P + \bar{K}_D s)}_{PD},$$

which we explicitly write as a product of a PI compensator and a PD compensator, similar to how the PI compensator was factored in (1.60). *This way of writing the compensator will allow us to bootstrap the design of a PID compensator off the design of a PD compensator.* The forward-path transfer function $C(s)P(s)$ is now type-1, due to the pole at the origin, and hence, if the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, it will have zero steady-state error for a step input. The gains of the PID compensator are related to the terms in its factored form by

$$K_P = \bar{K}_D z$$

$$K_I = \bar{K}_P z$$

$$K_D = \bar{K}_D.$$

PID Compensator Design Procedure

- Select the PD gains \bar{K}_P and \bar{K}_D according to (1.65) in order to achieve a settling-time that is 10% to 30% faster than the given specification. This is to account for the low-pass filtering introduced by the integrator. *For stable plants, the overshoot specification can be left unchanged. For unstable plants, it is often necessary to design for less overshoot, anticipating that an unstable pole will cause additional oscillation.*
- Initially select the zero of the PI compensator by setting $z = 0.1\omega_g$, where ω_g is the gain crossover frequency defined below in (1.68).
- Compute the step response of the closed-loop system. If the step response is sluggish, systematically increase z by increments of $0.1\omega_g$.

The gain crossover frequency is defined by

$$|(\bar{K}_P + j\bar{K}_D \omega_g)P(j\omega_g)| = 1. \quad (1.68)$$

This formula assumes that the DC gain is greater than unity, that is, $|\bar{K}_P P(0)| > 1$. For a second-order plant, an explicit formula for the gain crossover frequency can be given, but it is too unwieldy. It is much easier to read the gain crossover frequency off a Bode plot.

Example 1-21 Stabilizing an oscillator continued

Consider again the system in Example 1-19 with the following closed-loop design objectives: a step response with less than 5% overshoot, a 5% settling time of 700 ms or less, and zero steady-state error. Design an appropriate controller.

Solution:

A PID compensator is designed in two stages: first a PD compensator is designed to meet the transient specification and then a PI compensator in the special form,

$$\frac{s+z}{s},$$

is designed to meet the steady-state-error specification. For the PD compensator, the steps in Example 1-20 are repeated to achieve a 5% settling time of 500 ms instead of 700 ms to account for the low-pass filtering of the PI compensator. The objective of a 5% overshoot is retained, though a more conservative approach would be to design for a 2% overshoot. From the overshoot specification, the damping ratio is selected to be $\zeta = 0.7$. From the settling time specification, the undamped natural frequency is computed to be $\omega_n = 8.57$. Following the control design steps outlined above, or immediately applying (1.65), yields

$$\bar{K}_P = 34.7 \text{ and } \bar{K}_D = 6.0$$

The PD compensator adds a zero at

$$-\frac{\bar{K}_P}{\bar{K}_D} = -5.8,$$

and hence an appropriate precompensator is

$$F(s) = \frac{5.8}{s + 5.8}.$$

From the Bode plot in Fig. 1-43, the gain crossover frequency is determined to be

$$\omega_g = 13.4 \text{ rad/s.}$$

For $z = 0.1\omega_g$, the PI compensator is

$$\frac{s+1.34}{s},$$

and the overall PID compensator is

$$C(s) = \left(\frac{s+1.34}{s} \right) (34.7 + 6s) = \frac{6s^2 + 42.77s + 46.54}{s}.$$

Figure 1-44 shows the step response of the closed-loop system with the PID compensator and the precompensator. The transient and steady-state specifications are met.




Figure 1-43: Bode plot of $(\bar{K}_P + \bar{K}_D s)P(s)$. The gain crossover frequency is where the magnitude is 0 dB.




Figure 1-44: Step response when using a PID compensator and a precompensator. The plant is $P(s) = \frac{1}{0.5s^2 + 2}$, $C(s) = \frac{6s^2 + 42.77s + 46.54}{s}$ and $F(s) = \frac{5.8}{s + 5.8}$.

Role of specifications

We'll finish up this introduction to feedback design with an observation that the level of complexity of a feedback design problem depends on the design specifications, as well as the plant.

Example 1-22 Specifications are important

Suppose that $P(s) = \frac{5}{s(s+10)}$, which has one pole at -10 and another at the origin. Design controllers for each of the following sets of specifications:

- **Spec-1:** It is desired that the closed-loop system have no overshoot, a 5% settling time of approximately 1 s, and zero steady-state error for a step command.
- **Spec-2:** It is desired that the closed-loop system have no overshoot, a 5% settling time of approximately 500 ms, and zero steady-state error for a step command.
- **Spec-3:** It is desired that the closed-loop system have no overshoot, a 5% settling time of approximately 100 ms, and zero steady-state error for a step command.

Solution:

Because the plant is type-1, closed-loop stability will imply zero steady-state error for a step input. On a whim, let's try to meet Spec-1 with a proportional controller instead of a PD compensator. For $C(s) = K_P$, the closed-loop system is

$$G_{cl}(s) = \frac{K_P P(s)}{1 + K_P P(s)} = \frac{5K_P}{s^2 + 2(1)5s + 5K_P},$$

and thus $K_P = 5$ yields a critically-damped, second-order system with no zeros, and hence has no overshoot. From $\omega_n = 5$, the 5% settling time is estimated to be

$$\frac{4.8}{5} < 1,$$

so all of the requirements of Spec-1 are met.

Turning to Spec-2, it is straightforward to check that increasing K_P in the proportional compensator decreases the damping ratio, leading to overshoot. On the other hand, decreasing K_P results in a system that is overdamped and too sluggish to meet the settling time specification.

A PD compensator is therefore considered for Spec-2. If the solution of a critically-damped system is maintained, that is $\zeta = 1$, then the undamped natural frequency is selected such that

$$\frac{4.8}{\omega_n} = 0.5,$$

leading to

$$\omega_n = 9.6$$

From (1.65), the gains are determined to be

$$K_P = 18.4 \text{ and } K_D = 1.84$$

The closed-loop poles are therefore both at -9.6, while the zero of the PD compensator is at -10, which is to the left of the poles, and does not cause overshoot as shown in Fig. 1-45.

The PD compensator is retuned for Spec-3, once again for a critically-damped response. The undamped natural frequency is

$$\frac{4.8}{\omega_n} = 0.1,$$

leading to

$$\omega_n = 48$$

From (1.65), the gains are determined to be

$$K_P = 461 \text{ and } K_D = 17.2$$

The closed-loop poles are therefore both at -48, while the zero of the PD compensator is at -26.8, which is to the right of the poles, causing overshoot as shown in Fig. 1-46. A precompensator would be required to meet the specifications.

At each step, more exacting design specifications have led to additional complexity in the feedback loop.




Figure 1-45: Step response when using a PD compensator without a precompensator. The plant is $P(s) = \frac{5}{s(s+10)}$, and $C(s) = 18.4 + 1.84s$.




Figure 1-46: Step response when using a PD compensator without a precompensator. The plant is $P(s) = \frac{5}{s(s+10)}$, and $C(s) = 461 + 17.2s$.

1-8.3 Dealing with More Complicated Systems

The method we have been following has allowed us to assign all of the poles of first- and second-order systems in order to meet a set of transient and steady-state design specifications. Assigning all the poles breaks down rapidly beyond the cases we have considered. To be sure, a few more tricks can be brought to bear, thereby slightly extending the range of systems that can be treated using the approach developed in this chapter, and these extensions will be outlined in the design examples of the next section and in the homework exercises. Nevertheless, faced with a plant with four poles and a zero, even these extensions do not work very often. So what is an aspiring control designer to do?

At the junior or senior undergraduate level, most universities offer a course in feedback control. There you will be exposed to the Root Locus Method of Evans, and Frequency Domain Methods of Nyquist and Bode. These methods will allow you to treat single-input, single-output, linear plants of considerable complexity. You will also be able to consider more comprehensive design specifications. At the masters level, many universities offer courses in multivariable linear systems, nonlinear systems, stochastic systems, adaptive systems, discrete-event systems, and much more. Control systems is a very active research area, rich with theoretical questions and exciting, novel applications.

Review Question 1-23: What is the role of a PD compensator?

Review Question 1-24: What is the role of a PI compensator?

Review Question 1-25: Why are precompensators helpful?

Review Question 1-26: What happens when high gain is used in a feedback system? Name both good and bad outcomes.

Review Question 1-27: If the approach we have developed for feedback control design does not extend well to more complicated systems, why was it presented?

Exercise 1-9: Consider again the system in Example 1-16. Determine K_P so that the magnitude of the steady-state error is 10%, 5%, 2%, and 1%. For each value of K_P , determine the time constant of the closed-loop system as well as the 5% settling time.

Answer:

% Error	K_P	τ_{cl}	5% T_s
10	5.5	100 ms	300 ms
5	10.5	50 ms	150 ms
2	25.5	20 ms	60 ms
1	55.5	10 ms	30 ms

Exercise 1-10: Design an appropriate precompensator for Example 1-22 in the case of Spec-3.

Answer: $F(s) = \frac{26.8}{s+26.8}$.

Exercise 1-11: Suppose that $P(s) = \frac{5}{s^2+2s+1}$, which has poles $-1 \pm j$. It is desired that the closed-loop system have less than 5% overshoot and a 5% settling time of 500 ms. Design an appropriate PD compensator and, if necessary, a precompensator as well. Determine the steady-state error for a step input.

Answer: $C(s) = 14.3 + 2.2s$ and $F(s) = \frac{6.5}{s+6.5}$. The steady-state error is 1.38%.

Exercise 1-12: For the above plant and controller combination, the gain crossover frequency is $\omega_g = 12.3$ rad/s. Modify the controller so that the closed-loop system can track a ramp input with a bounded error.

Answer: $C(s) = (14.3 + 2.2s)\frac{s+1.2}{s} = \frac{2.2s^2+16.9s+17.2}{s}$.

1-9 Design Examples

This section develops feedback control systems for two real-world examples from Section 1-2, namely, fuel-air mixture regulation in gasoline engines and balance control of a Segway. The calculations are more involved than the pedagogical examples worked elsewhere in the chapter, but the design techniques remain the same.

1-9.1 Fuel-Air Ratio Control

This example works through one of the many feedback loops present in a vehicle powered by a gasoline engine. Recall from Fig. 1-10, the exhaust from a gasoline engine is passed through a catalytic convertor in order to remove pollutants from the combustion process. The catalyst operates at an efficiency of 99% or greater when the mixture of fuel and air is maintained at a stoichiometric ratio, which for gasoline is 6.83×10^{-2} . Deviations in the mixture of as little as




Figure 1-47: A unity feedback system for achieving a stoichiometric mixture of fuel and air. The nominal engine model assumes the air flow is 20 g/s. An important source of uncertainty is the actual air flow into the engine as air meters are imperfect devices.

Source: Original Drawing by JWG.

1% can reduce the efficiency of the catalytic convertor to 97%. While this may still seem very efficient, it triples the amount of pollutants exhausted to the atmosphere, and in fact, such a car would not pass Federal emissions regulations! The requirements on the fuel-air mixture control system are very stringent.

One obvious approach to regulating the fuel is to measure the air flow entering the engine, multiply it by the stoichiometric value for gasoline to determine the required amount of fuel, and then command the fuel injectors to deliver precisely that much fuel. This is open-loop control. If the fuel injectors were perfect, and if the air meter were perfect, open-loop control would be an acceptable solution. Unfortunately, the manufacturing tolerances on the fuel injectors are not that tight; variability of $\pm 2\%$ is common. A similar amount of error is common in the air meter. Hence, it is clear that an open-loop control solution is not viable.

Figure 1-47 shows a feedback loop for regulating the fuel-air mixture in a gasoline engine. It assumes that the ratio of fuel to air in the exhaust stream is measured with a sensor; robust, accurate sensors are available and have been used in cars for the past 20 years. As mentioned above, two important sources of uncertainty in the overall system are the air meter and the fuel injectors. Because the efficiency of the catalyst depends on the ratio of fuel to air, it is sufficient to consider errors in the air meter in the following analysis.

The controller is designed on a *nominal* model that assumes the air flow is measured perfectly and the fuel injectors deliver the requested fuel with perfect precision. The controller will then be tested on a more realistic model, reflecting air-meter inaccuracy.

If the engine is operating at 1500 revolutions per minute (RPM), then a nominal time delay is 80 ms. The nominal engine model is therefore

$$P_{nom} = \frac{1}{20} e^{-0.08s} \approx \frac{1}{20} \frac{1 - 0.04s}{1 + 0.04s},$$

where the time delay has been replaced with a first-order rational approximation (see Section 1-6). In this application, an integral compensator is typically used. The nominal air flow of 20 g/s is absorbed into the compensator, giving

$$C(s) = 20 \frac{K_I}{s}.$$

A gain of $K_I = 7.5$ results in the step response from commanded fuel-air ratio to measured fuel-air ratio shown in Fig. 1-48; the overshoot is 8% and the 5% settling time is 410 ms. Figure 1-49 shows that the integrator in the controller provides asymptotically exact mixture control even when the air meter has an error of $\pm 10\%$.

For this system, the setpoint is always held fixed at stoichiometry. Hence, a more interesting performance metric is how accurately the closed-loop system is able to maintain the fuel-air mixture at stoichiometry in the face of time-varying imperfections in the air measurement. Such measurement errors could arise because air meters are somewhat nonlinear. Consequently, as the air flow varies, the air-meter gain appears to vary. Figure 1-50 shows a time-varying air-meter gain of $+2\%$ about a nominal value of 1. The resulting percent error in the fuel-air mixture is shown in Fig. 1-51. The feedback loop quickly corrects for errors in the measured air flow. An open-loop system could not compensate for similar errors. In practice, changes in the air-meter gain are not as drastic as the steps used here and the resulting error is correspondingly lower. From this figure, it is easy to appreciate how feedback control allows the fuel-air system to operate very accurately in the face of significant model and measurement imperfections. Insensitivity to variations in the plant parameters is important in practical systems.




Figure 1-48: Fuel-air ratio step response in normalized units so that 1.0 represents stoichiometry.




Figure 1-49: Fuel-air ratio step response in normalized units so that 1.0 represents stoichiometry. The actual air flow is 20 g/s, but the controller delivers asymptotically exact mixture regulation even when the air meter reports 18 or 22 g/s.

1-9.2 Segway

Figure 1-52 shows a Segway robotic mobile platform. It uses the same balancing principles as the Segway transporter. While the robot can turn, as well as move forward and backward, we will simplify the model and only look at its motion along a straight line.

The robot is essentially an inverted pendulum on wheels. Because of this, the transfer function decomposes as shown in Fig. 1-53. We will take advantage of this structure in the design of the feedback controller. In particular, we will first design a controller that stabilizes the body orientation of the robot, and then we will design a controller to regulate the speed of the robot. The choice of speed over position is because most users want their wireless controller to have the equivalent of a steering wheel, which we are ignoring, and a gas pedal, which we are interpreting as horizontal speed.




Figure 1-50: 2% changes in the air meter gain are applied to check the robustness of the feedback system.




Figure 1-51: Percent error in the fuel-air ratio versus time. The traces show the fuel-air mixture controller rejecting 2% step changes in the apparent air meter gain. The plot on the right is a zoom showing the detailed response. In practice, the air-meter gain is slowly varying and the resulting error is significantly smaller than shown.

The transfer function from motor torque to body orientation is

$$\frac{\theta(s)}{\tau(s)} = \frac{-0.65}{s^2 - 15.5}.$$

The open loop poles are ± 3.94 , and thus the robot is unstable and requires feedback for stabilization, which comes as no surprise. We design a PD controller to achieve a damping ratio of $\zeta = 0.7$ and a 5% settling time of 500 ms, which is equivalent to an undamped natural frequency of $\omega_n = 8.57$ rad/s. Applying (1.65) yields the PD compensator

$$C_1(s) = K_P + K_D s = -137.6 - 18.6s.$$

The PD compensator places a zero at $-\frac{K_P}{K_D} = -7.4$, and thus an appropriate precompensator is

$$F(s) = \frac{7.4}{s + 7.4}.$$

The closed-loop system is shown in Fig. 1-54. The step response is shown in Fig. 1-55. The steady-state error is 21%, but this is unimportant. Our only objective here is to stabilize the upright orientation of the robot's body. This has been accomplished using methods developed in the chapter. We have not broken a sweat yet!



Figure 1-52: Segway robotic mobile platform. While it uses the same balancing principles as the Segway transporter, it is easier to model because there is not a person riding it.




Figure 1-53: Transfer function of the Segway robot, without feedback control. The transfer function can be expressed in a cascade form where the motor torque affects the body orientation, which in turn affects the horizontal displacement of the robot. This cascade structure will be exploited in the design of the controller.

The next step in the design process is to control the horizontal velocity or speed of the robot. This is where the cascade structure in the Segway model comes into play. Referring back to Fig. 1-53, the body-orientation controller of Fig. 1-54 is inserted, along with a second, outer, unity feedback loop, as shown in Fig. 1-56. The transfer function of the Seqway, from motor torque τ to horizontal velocity v , is now present.

The design of the outer-loop compensator $C_2(s)$ is based on the transfer function from θ^{des} to the cart's horizontal velocity, v . At first glance, this seems to present a very complex design problem. However, the plant is a cascade of the transfer function from θ^{des} to θ and the transfer function from θ to v . In other words, the plant is

$$P_2(s) = \frac{\theta(s)}{\theta^{des}(s)} \frac{\theta(s)}{v(s)}.$$




Figure 1-54: Unity feedback system for stabilizing the upright posture of the robot. The controller is designed on the basis of the first transfer function shown in Fig. 1-53, namely, the transfer function from motor torque τ to angle θ .




Figure 1-55: Body orientation θ (rad) versus time (s). Step response of the combined precompensator and PD compensator for stabilizing the upright posture of the robot.

From our work on stabilizing the body orientation, we have that

$$\frac{\theta(s)}{\theta^{des}(s)} = \frac{89}{s^2 + 12s + 73.5},$$

which is a stable second-order system. From the model of the Segway robot,

$$\frac{\theta(s)}{v(s)} = \frac{-0.32s^2 + 3.4}{s}.$$

Combining these yields the plant model

$$P_2(s) = \frac{89}{s^2 + 12s + 73.5} \frac{-0.32s^2 + 3.4}{s},$$

which is quite a bit simpler than you may have expected. The plant has zeros at ± 3.26 , and is type-1, due to the pole at the origin.

A simple controller is proposed, of the form

$$C_2(s) = K \frac{3.26}{s + 3.26},$$

which cancels the left-half plane zero, and of course, does not attempt to cancel the right-half plane zero. This leaves a stable transfer function and a pole at the origin, which can be stabilized with a simple gain. Figure 1-57 shows the step response for three values of the gain K . Based on these step responses, $K = 0.2$ is selected so that the response is quite smooth. If you want a hotrod robot, then try $K = 0.3$.

The step response exhibits undershooting, which we recognize is due to the right-half plane zero. The source of the right-half plane zero is due to the physics of the robot. Indeed, to move the base of the robot in a given direction, the body must be leaned in the desired direction of travel or it will tip over. Hence, from rest, a movement of the robot is accomplished by initially moving the base in the opposite direction, leaning the body over, and then moving in the planned direction. The initial displacement in the opposite direction is the undershooting seen in Fig. 1-57.




Figure 1-56: Unity feedback system for stabilizing the horizontal velocity of the robot, in addition to its upright balance. The inner loop of the feedback system is the controller shown in Fig. 1-54. The outer loop takes advantage of the cascade decomposition of the Segway's transfer function, as shown in Fig. 1-53. The outer-loop controller regulates horizontal speed by varying the lean angle of the robot's body.




Figure 1-57: Velocity (m/s) versus time (s). Three step responses for the outer-loop controller applied to the Segway mobile robot.

Chapter's Key Relationships

- Unity feedback system: $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{G(s)}{1+G(s)}$
- If $G(s) = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)}$, then $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)+N(s)}$
- PID Compensator $C(s) = K_P + K_I \frac{1}{s} + K_D s$
- Type-j system $G(s) = \frac{1}{s^j} \frac{N(s)}{d(s)}$
- Type-0 system $e_{ss} = \frac{D(0)}{D(0)+N(0)} \neq 0$ for a step input
- First-order approximation $e^{-sT} \approx \frac{1-sT/2}{1+sT/2}$
- First-order system $G(s) = \frac{1}{\tau s + 1}$
5% settling time 3τ
- Standard second-order system $G(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2}$
- Underdamped second-order system

$$\zeta \leftrightarrow \text{percent overshoot} = 100e^{\frac{-\zeta\pi}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}} \%$$

$$\omega_n \leftrightarrow 5\% \text{ settling time} \approx \frac{3}{\zeta\omega_n}.$$

ζ	\approx Overshoot	True Overshoot
1.0	0 %	0.00 %
0.9	0 %	0.15 %
0.8	2 %	1.5 %
0.7	5 %	4.6 %
0.6	10 %	9.5 %
0.5	15 %	16.3 %

CHAPTER HIGHLIGHTS

- Feedback is an essential feature in a wide range of devices.
- Feedback can stabilize a system. It also allows the output of a system to be regulated to a precise value.
- The s-domain is an important tool for analyzing feedback systems.
- The stability of a transfer function is determined by its poles, as long as the transfer function is rational and proper.
- The zeros of a transfer function have a strong effect on the transient response. A BIBO stable transfer function with a zero in the right-half plane exhibits undershooting in the step response.
- The poles of a unity feedback system depend on both the poles and the zeros of the forward-path transfer function.
- Stable pole-zero cancellations can be advantageous in feedback design. Unstable pole-zero cancellations are never used in feedback design.
- A BIBO-stable unity feedback system can track a step input with zero steady-state error provided the forward-path transfer function has at least one pole at the origin.
- Time delays can be approximated by rational transfer functions which have right-half plane zeros.
- For a first-order system, the transient response to a step input is determined by the time constant. For a second-order system without a zero, the transient response to a step input is determined by the damping ratio and the undamped natural frequency.
- In feedback design, common objectives involve stability, the transient response to a step input, and the steady-state error for a step input. For first-order systems, stability and the transient response can be tuned with a proportional compensator. For second-order systems, a PD compensator is used. In both cases, once the closed-loop poles have been tuned for stability and good transient performance, zero steady-state error for a step input can be achieved with a PI compensator.
- A precompensator in a two-degree-of-freedom feedback design deliberately creates stable pole-zero cancellations to reduce overshoot.
- High-order systems can be addressed with the root locus method of Evans and frequency domain methods of Bode and Nyquist.

GLOSSARY OF IMPORTANT TERMS

Provide definitions or explain the meaning of the following terms:

BIBO stable
cascade compensator
characteristic equation
closed-loop system
coprime polynomials
critically damped
damping ratio
feedback control system
gain crossover frequency
open-loop system
overdamped
overshoot
PD compensator
PI compensator
PID compensator
precompensator
pole of a transfer function
pole-zero cancellation
proper transfer function
proportional compensator
rational approximation
rise time
setpoint
steady-state error
system type
two-degree-of-freedom controller
undamped natural frequency
underdamped
undershoot
unity feedback system
zero of a transfer function
5% settling time

Exercise Solutions

Exercise 1-13: Check the BIBO stability of the transfer functions $G_1(s) = \frac{2s^2+4s+6}{s+1}$, $G_2(s) = \frac{s-2}{s(s+2)}$, $G_3(s) = \frac{s-1}{s^2+6s+11}$, and $G_4(s) = \frac{2s+4}{s^3+2s^2+4s+10}$.

Answer:

- (a) Because the degree of the numerator is greater than the degree of the denominator, the transfer function is improper and unstable.
- (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{s-2}{s(s+2)}$. The numerator has root +2 and the denominator has roots 0 and -2. The numerator and denominator are coprime and therefore the roots of the denominator are the poles. The pole at the origin has a non-negative real part, and therefore the transfer function is unstable.
- (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{s-1}{s^2+6s+11}$. The numerator has a root at +1. All of the roots of the denominator have negative real parts because $a_1 = 6$ and $a_0 = 11$ are both positive. Hence, the numerator and denominator are coprime and the roots of the denominator are the poles. The transfer function is therefore BIBO stable.
- (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{2s+4}{s^3+2s^2+4s+10}$. The numerator has a root at -2. For the denominator, we identify $a_2 = 2$, $a_1 = 4$ and $a_0 = 10$, which are all positive. We then check

$$a_2 - \frac{a_1}{a_0} = 2 - \frac{4}{10} = 1.6 > 0,$$

and thus all of the roots of the denominator have negative real parts. It is easily checked that -2 is not a root of the denominator because $(-2)^3 + s(-2)^2 + 4(-2) + 10 = 2 \neq 0$. It follows that the numerator and denominator are coprime and therefore the roots of the denominator are the poles, which all have negative real parts, proving BIBO stability.

Remark: It was not necessary to verify that -2 was not a root of the denominator. Indeed, suppose it had been. Then the poles would have been the remaining roots of the denominator, all of which have negative real parts, and hence the system would still have been BIBO stable.

Exercise 1-14: Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = 3(s+4)$ and the plant is $P(s) = \frac{10}{s^2+6s+8}$. Determine $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$.

Answer: $C(s)P(s) = 3(s+4)\frac{10}{(s+2)(s+4)} = \frac{30}{s+2}$. We identify $N(s) = 30$ and $D(s) = s+2$. Consequently,

$$\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)} = \frac{N(s)}{D(s)+N(s)} = \frac{30}{s+32}.$$

Exercise 1-15: Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = 3(s-2)$ and the plant is $P(s) = \frac{10}{s^2+2s-8}$. Determine $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$.

Answer: $C(s)P(s) = 3(s-2)\frac{10}{(s-2)(s+4)}$. Because there is an unstable pole-zero cancellation, the closed-loop system is poorly designed and must be modified before proceeding further.

Exercise 1-16: Give the names of the following compensators $C_1(s) = \frac{2s^2+4s+6}{s}$, $C_2(s) = 10\frac{s+3}{s}$, $C_3(s) = 22$, and $C_4(s) = 11(s+9)$

Answer: The given answers are self explanatory.

Exercise 1-17: The following pairs of compensators and plants result in BIBO-stable closed-loop systems. For step

inputs and for ramp inputs, determine the nature of the steady-state error: unbounded; bounded, but nonzero; zero.

$$C_1(s) = 10,$$

$$P_1(s) = \frac{4}{s-4}$$

$$C_2(s) = 10,$$

$$P_2(s) = \frac{10}{s(0.1s+1)}$$

$$C_3(s) = \frac{s+5}{s},$$

$$P_3(s) = \frac{4}{s+9}$$

$$C_4(s) = 10 \frac{s+5}{s},$$

$$P_4(s) = \frac{s+2}{s(s+5)}$$

(a) $C_1(s)P_1(s) = \frac{40}{s-4}$, and thus the type is 0. Because we are given that the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, we conclude that a step input will have a nonzero but bounded steady-state error, while a ramp input will result in an unbounded error.

(b) $C_2(s)P_2(s) = \frac{10}{s(0.1s+1)}$, and thus the type is 1. Because we are given that the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, we conclude that a step input will have a zero steady-state error, while a ramp input will result in an bounded, nonzero steady-state error.

(c) $C_3(s)P_3(s) = \frac{4(s+5)}{s(s+9)}$, and thus the type is 1. Because we are given that the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, we conclude that a step input will have a zero steady-state error, while a ramp input will result in an bounded, nonzero steady-state error.

(d) $C_4(s)P_4(s) = \frac{10(s+2)}{s^2}$, after performing a stable pole-zero cancellation, and thus the type is 2. Because we are given that the closed-loop system is BIBO stable, we conclude that both step inputs and ramp inputs will have zero steady-state error.

Exercise 1-18: The following transfer functions are rational approximations of time delays. Determine the time delay.

$$G_1(s) = \frac{1-s}{1+s}, G_2(s) = \frac{1-0.05s}{1+0.05s}, G_3(s) = \frac{(1-2s)^2}{(1+2s)^2}, \text{ and } G_4(s) = \frac{10-s}{10+s}.$$

Answer: (a) 2 s, (b) 0.1 s, (c) 8 s, (d) 0.2 s.

Answer:

The general form of a first-order approximation is

$$e^{-sT} \approx \frac{1 - sT/2}{1 + sT/2} = \frac{2/T - s}{2/T + s},$$

while the general form of a second-order approximation is

$$e^{-sT} \approx \frac{(1 - sT/4)^2}{(1 + sT/4)^2} = \frac{(4/T - s)^2}{(4/T + s)^2}.$$

Substituting in the specific numbers for the various cases yields:

$$(a) G_1(s) = \frac{1-s}{1+s} = \frac{1-sT/2}{1+sT/2} \Rightarrow T = 2 \text{ s.}$$

$$(b) G_2(s) = \frac{1-0.05s}{1+0.05s} = \frac{1-sT/2}{1+sT/2} \Rightarrow T = 0.1 \text{ s.}$$

$$(c) G_3(s) = \frac{(1-2s)^2}{(1+2s)^2} = \frac{(1-sT/4)^2}{(1+sT/4)^2} \Rightarrow T = 8 \text{ s.}$$

$$(d) G_4(s) = \frac{10-s}{10+s} = \frac{2/T - s}{2/T + s} \Rightarrow T = 0.2 \text{ s.}$$

Exercise 1-19: For each of the following transfer functions, determine the damping ratio and the undamped natural frequency: $G_1(s) = \frac{2^2}{s^2 + 2(0.6)s + 2^2}$, $G_2(s) = \frac{25}{s^2 + 2s + 25}$, $G_3(s) = \frac{1}{s^2 + 6s + 9}$, and $G_4(s) = \frac{3}{2s^2 + 24s + 18}$.

Answer: Once a BIBO stable is expressed in the form

$$G(s) = K \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_n s + \omega_n^2},$$

the damping ratio and undamped natural frequency are evident.

- (a) $G_1(s) = \frac{2^2}{s^2 + 2(0.6)2s + 2^2}$ shows that $\zeta = 0.6$ and $\omega_n = 2$.
- (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{25}{s^2 + 2s + 25} = \frac{5^2}{s^2 + 2(0.2)(5)s + 5^2}$ shows that $\zeta = 0.2$ and $\omega_n = 5$.
- (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{1}{s^2 + 6s + 9} = \frac{1}{9} \frac{3^2}{s^2 + 2(1)(3)s + 3^2}$ shows that $\zeta = 1$ and $\omega_n = 3$.
- (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{3}{2s^2 + 24s + 18} = \frac{3}{18} \frac{3^2}{s^2 + 2(2)(3)s + 3^2}$ shows that $\zeta = 2$ and $\omega_n = 3$.

Exercise 1-20: Which of the following overdamped transfer functions will exhibit overshoot in the step response?

$$G_1(s) = \frac{10(s+4)}{(s+2)(s+6)}, G_2(s) = \frac{0.1s-1}{s^2+20s+25}, G_3(s) = \frac{s+1}{s^2+8s+12}, \text{ and } G_4(s) = \frac{3}{2s^2+24s+18}.$$

- (a) The zero lies between the two poles, and hence there is no overshoot. Though it is not required, it is noted that because the zero is in the left half plane, there is no undershoot.
- (b) There is a zero at +10, meaning the zero lies in the right half plane, giving rise to undershoot, but not overshoot.
- (c) The zero is at -1, which lies to the right of the two poles at -6 and -2. Hence, there is overshoot.
- (d) There is no zero, and hence no possibility of overshoot for an overdamped system.

Exercise 1-21: Consider again the system in Example 1-16. Determine K_P so that the magnitude of the steady-state error is 10%, 5%, 2%, and 1%. For each value of K_P , determine the time constant of the closed-loop system as well as the 5% settling time.

Answer:

Once again, the sign of the steady-state error is unimportant; only its magnitude counts. A steady-state error of 5% is equivalent to $e_{ss} = \pm \frac{1}{20}$, which from Equation (1.59), is equivalent to

$$-1 + 2K_P = \pm 20.$$

There are two solutions, $K_P = 10.5$ and $K_P = -9.5$. In this case, only the positive solution yields a stable closed-loop system because the pole is equal to $1 - 2K_P$, that is, -20 for $K_P = 10.5$ and +20 for $K_P = -9.5$. The time constant is then $\frac{1}{20}$, or 50 ms, which gives a 5% settling time of 150 ms. The other entries of the table are completed in a similar manner.

% Error	K_P	τ_{cl}	5% T_s
10	5.5	100 ms	300 ms
5	10.5	50 ms	150 ms
2	25.5	20 ms	60 ms
1	55.5	10 ms	30 ms

Exercise 1-22: Design an appropriate precompensator for Example 1-22 in the case of Spec-3.

Answer:

The PD compensator has a zero at -26.8. Hence, an appropriate precompensator is $F(s) = \frac{26.8}{s+26.8}$.

Exercise 1-23: Suppose that $P(s) = \frac{5}{s^2+2s+1}$, which has poles $-1 \pm j$. It is desired that the closed-loop system have less than 5% overshoot and a 5% settling time of 500 ms. Design an appropriate PD compensator and, if necessary, a precompensator as well. Determine the steady-state error for a step input.

Answer: From Eq. (1.64), the desired damping ratio is $\zeta = 0.7$. The undamped natural frequency is computed for a settling time of 500 ms, yielding $\omega_n = 8.57$. The system is already in the form of Eq. (1.63). Applying Eq. (1.65), yields

$$K_P = 14.29 \text{ and } K_D = 2.20.$$




Figure 1-58: Step response and steady-state error for $P(s) = \frac{5}{s^2+2s+1}$, $C(s) = 14.29 + 2.2s$ and $F(s) = \frac{6.5}{s+6.5}$.

The PD-compensator places a zero in the forward path at $-K_P/K_D = -6.5$. A precompensator is designed to create a stable pole-zero cancellation,

$$F(s) = \frac{6.5}{s+6.5}.$$

The step response with the PD compensator and precompensator is shown in Fig. 1-58 along with the error between the reference command and the output. It is observed that the steady-state error is 1.38%, as can be verified by direct calculation.

Exercise 1-24: For the above plant and controller combination, the gain crossover frequency is $\omega_g = 12.3$ rad/s. Modify the controller so that the closed-loop system can track a ramp input with a bounded error.

Answer:

Following our standard design rule of placing the zero of the PI compensator at $0.1\omega_g$, the compensator becomes $C(s) = (14.3 + 2.2s)\frac{s+1.2}{s} = \frac{2.2s^2 + 16.9s + 17.2}{s}$.

Applying Eq. (1.66), the steady-state error for a ramp input is

$$e_{SS} = \frac{1}{85.76} + \frac{1}{6.5} = 0.01655 \leftrightarrow 1.655\%.$$

Without the precompensator, the ramp steady-state error would have been

$$e_{SS} = \frac{1}{85.76} \leftrightarrow 1.17\%,$$

as given by Eq. (1.21).




Figure 1-59: Step response and steady-state error for $P(s) = \frac{5}{s^2+2s+1}$, $C(s) = \frac{2.2s^2+16.9s+17.2}{s}$ and $F(s) = \frac{6.5}{s+6.5}$. The steady-state error for a step input is zero, the overshoot is 5% and the 5% settling time is 500 ms.

HW Problems

Section 1-3: Poles, Zeros and BIBO Stability

1.1 For each of the following transfer functions, first determine the poles and zeros, and then assess BIBO stability.

(a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{s^2+5s+6}$

(b) $G_2(s) = \frac{s-1}{s^2-1}$

(c) $G_3(s) = \frac{2s^2+8s+8}{s+2}$

(d) $G_4(s) = \frac{3s+4}{s^2+s+1}$

1.2 The numerator and denominator of the following transfer functions are coprime. Assess BIBO stability without explicitly computing the poles.

(a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{s^2+5s+1}$

(b) $G_2(s) = \frac{s+4}{s^2-s+1}$

(c) $G_3(s) = \frac{2s^2+8s+8}{s^3+4s^2+5s+6}$

(d) $G_4(s) = \frac{3s+4}{3s^3+6s^2+6s+12}$

1.3 For each of the transfer functions below, find all (real) values of the parameter b yielding BIBO stability.

(a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{s^2+(5-b)s+1}$

(b) $G_2(s) = \frac{s+4}{-3s^2+(3b-8)s+2-b}$

(c) $G_3(s) = \frac{2s^2+8s+8}{s^3-(2+b)s^2+5s+b}$

(d) $G_4(s) = \frac{3s+4}{4s^3+4bs^2+(5+b)s+6}$

Section 1-4: Unity Feedback Systems

1.4 Consider a unity feedback system as in Fig. 1-15. Compute $\frac{Y(s)}{R(s)}$ and $\frac{E(s)}{R(s)}$ for the following forward-path transfer functions:

- (a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{s+2}$
 (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{10}{2s-3}$
 (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{8(s+4)}{s^2-2s+2}$
 (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{8(s-4)}{s^2-s+2}$

1.5 Determine the poles and zeros of the closed-loop systems in Problem 1-9.2.

1.6 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. The closed-loop system is BIBO stable for the proportional compensator $C(s) = 5$ and plant $P(s) = \frac{2}{2s-3}$. Find the range of $z > 0$ for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable when the proportional compensator is replaced with the PI compensator $C(s) = 5\frac{s+z}{s}$.

1.7 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. The closed-loop system is BIBO stable for the PD compensator $C(s) = 5(s+4)$ and plant $P(s) = \frac{1}{s^2-1}$. Find the range of $z > 0$ for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable when the PD compensator is replaced with the PID compensator $C(s) = 5(s+4)\frac{s+z}{s}$.

1.8 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. The closed-loop system is BIBO stable for the proportional compensator $C(s) = 3$ and plant $P(s) = \frac{1-s}{s+10}$. Find the range of $z > 0$ for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable when the proportional compensator is replaced with the PI compensator $C(s) = 3\frac{s+z}{s}$.

1.9 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. The closed-loop system is BIBO stable for the PD compensator $C(s) = 5(s+4)$ and plant $P(s) = \frac{1-0.1s}{s^2-1}$. Find the range of $z > 0$ for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable when the PD compensator is replaced with the PID compensator $C(s) = 5(s+4)\frac{s+z}{s}$.

Section 1-5: Steady-state Error

1.10 Assume a unity feedback system and determine the system type for each of the pairs of compensator and plant below.

- (a) $C_1(s) = 10$ and $P_1(s) = \frac{4}{s+4}$
 (b) $C_2(s) = \frac{s+1}{s}$ and $P_2(s) = \frac{s+2}{5s^3+3s^2+8s+4}$
 (c) $C_3(s) = \frac{2}{s+1}$ and $P_3(s) = \frac{4}{s(s+4)}$
 (d) $C_4(s) = \frac{s}{s+1}$ and $P_4(s) = \frac{s+2}{s(s^2+2s+2)}$
 (e) $C_5(s) = 2 + 4s$ and $P_5(s) = \frac{(s+1)(s+2)}{s^4+3s^2}$

1.11 Consider a unity feedback system with plant $P(s) = \frac{8}{s-4}$ and proportional compensator $C_1(s) = 20$. Determine the steady-state error for a unit-step input and for a unit-ramp input. Repeat the analysis for the PI-compensator $C_2(s) = 20\frac{s+3}{s}$.

1.12 Consider a unity feedback system with plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{s(s+4)}$ and a proportional compensator $C_1(s) = 10$. Determine the steady-state error for a unit-step input and for a unit-ramp input. Repeat the analysis for the PI-compensator $C_2(s) = 20\frac{s+10}{s}$.

1.13 Consider a unity feedback system with plant $P(s) = \frac{10}{0.2s+1}$ and proportional compensator $C(s) = K$. Determine the values of K for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable. For those values of K resulting in a BIBO-stable closed-loop system, determine the steady-state error for a step input.

1.14 This problem compares an open-loop controller to a closed-loop controller for the simplest possible plant,

$$y(t) = P_0 x(t),$$

where P_0 is a constant. It is assumed that lower and upper bounds for P_0 are known, namely,

$$8 \leq P_0 \leq 12,$$

but the precise value of P_0 is unknown. In the s-domain, the system model is $Y(s) = P_0 X(s)$.

- (a) For a nominal value of $P_0 = 10$, design an open-loop controller to set the output to a desired setpoint y^* . Evaluate the steady-state error for the extreme values of P_0 , namely, 8 and 12, when $y^* = 1$. Note that the error is the difference between the reference value and the plant output, that is, $e(t) = r(t) - y(t)$.
- (b) Assume a unity feedback system and proportional compensator $C(s) = K_P$. Set the reference to y^* , the desired value of y . Compute the steady-state error as a function of the compensator gain K_P and plant gain P_0 . For $K_P = 10$ and $K_P = 50$, determine the steady-state error for the two extreme values of P_0 as well as for the nominal value.
- (c) Assume a unity feedback system and integral compensator $C(s) = \frac{K_I}{s}$. Set the reference to y^* , the desired value of y . Show that the system is BIBO stable for all $K_I > 0$ and $P_0 > 0$. Deduce that zero steady-state error can be achieved without knowing anything about the gain of this simple plant, except that its sign is positive.

Section 1-6: Time delays

1.15 Determine a first-order rational approximation for each of the following time delays:

- (a) e^{-s}
- (b) $e^{-0.01s}$
- (c) e^{-2s}
- (d) $e^{-0.005s}$

1.16 Determine a second-order rational approximation for each of the following time delays:

- (a) e^{-s}
- (b) $e^{-0.01s}$
- (c) e^{-2s}
- (d) $e^{-0.005s}$

1.17 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = 5$ and the plant is $P(s) = 4\frac{e^{-Ts}}{s+5}$. Determine the smallest value of $T > 0$ that will destabilize the closed-loop system, when a first-order rational approximation is used for the time delay. Repeat the problem using a second-order rational approximation for the time delay and compare the answers.

1.18 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = K$ and the plant is $P(s) = 4\frac{e^{-0.1s}}{s+5}$. Determine the smallest value of $K > 0$ that will destabilize the closed-loop system, when a first-order rational approximation is used for the time delay. Repeat the problem using a second-order rational approximation for the time delay and compare the answers.

1.19 The following transfer functions are rational approximations of time delays. Determine the time delay.

- (a) $\frac{1-0.25s}{1+0.25s}$
- (b) $\frac{8-s}{8+s}$
- (c) $\frac{(1-s)^2}{(1+s)^2}$
- (d) $\frac{(4-s)^4}{(4+s)^4}$

Section 1-7: Transient Response

1.20 For each of the following open-loop transfer functions, estimate the 5% settling time for a step input.

(a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{0.5s+1}$

- (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{8}{2s+6}$
 (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{10}{2s-3}$
 (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{1}{s+2}$

1.21 For each of the following open-loop transfer functions, estimate the overshoot and 5% settling time for a step input.

- (a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{s^2+1.4s+1}$
 (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{4}{s^2+2.4s+4}$
 (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{4}{2s^2+12s+50}$
 (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{4}{s^2-1.4s+1}$

1.22 For each of the following open-loop transfer functions, estimate the overshoot and 5% settling time for a step input.

- (a) $G_1(s) = \frac{2}{s^2+2s+1}$
 (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{2}{s^2+12s+4}$
 (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{2}{2s^2+30s+50}$
 (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{2}{s^2+3s+9}$

1.23 Consider a unity feedback system as in Fig. 1-15, with forward-path transfer functions given below. In each case, estimate the closed-loop system's overshoot and 5% settling time for a step input.

- (a) $G_1(s) = \frac{4}{s+2}$
 (b) $G_2(s) = \frac{10}{2s-4}$
 (c) $G_3(s) = \frac{16}{s(s+4)}$
 (d) $G_4(s) = \frac{1}{(s+4)(s+2)}$
 (e) $G_5(s) = \frac{92}{s^2+48s-100}$

1.24 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = K$ and the plant is $P(s) = \frac{s+2}{s(s-6)}$. Determine $K > 0$ so that the closed-loop system is critically damped. Determine whether or not the corresponding step response will exhibit overshoot.

1.25 Consider a unity feedback system as shown in Fig. 1-16. Assume the compensator is $C(s) = K$ and the plant is $P(s) = \frac{s+5}{s^2+4s+3}$. Determine $K > 0$ so that the closed-loop system is critically damped. Determine whether or not the corresponding step response will exhibit overshoot. **Hint:** there are two solutions for K .

Section 1-8: Cascade Controller Design (Proportional and PD Compensators)

1.26 Assume a unity feedback system. Design a proportional compensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{6}{5s+1}$ so that the 5% settling time is 3 s. Evaluate the steady-state error for a step input.

1.27 Assume a unity feedback system. Design a proportional compensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{s-10}$ so that the 5% settling time is 75 ms. Evaluate the steady-state error for a step input.

1.28 Assume a unity feedback system. Design a proportional compensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{-2}{s+4}$ so that the 5% settling time is 100 ms. Evaluate the steady-state error for a step input.

1.29 Assume a unity feedback system. Let the plant be $P(s) = \frac{s+4}{s-10}$ and the compensator be $C(s) = K$.

- (a) Determine the pole of the closed-loop system as a function of K . For $K = -1$, does something “peculiar” occur?

- (b) Find all $K \neq -1$ for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable.
- (c) Evaluate the closed-loop pole as $K \rightarrow \infty$ and compare it to the location of the zero.
- (d) Evaluate the closed-loop pole as $K \rightarrow -\infty$ and compare it to the location of the zero.
- (e) Determine K so that the closed-loop system has a pole corresponding to a 200 ms time constant.

1.30 Assume a unity feedback system. Let the plant be $P(s) = \frac{s+4}{s-10}$ and the compensator be $C(s) = K \frac{1}{s+4}$.

- (a) Determine the pole of the closed-loop system as a function of K .
- (b) Determine the range of K for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable. Allow both positive and negative gains.
- (c) Determine K so that the closed-loop system has a pole corresponding to a 200 ms time constant.

1.31 An open-loop plant is given as $P(s) = \frac{3}{s^2+5s+1}$.

- (a) Estimate the percent overshoot and 5% settling time for the open-loop plant.
- (b) Assume now a unity feedback system with a precompensator. For the plant $P(s)$, design a PD compensator and precompensator so that the overshoot is approximately 10% and the 5% settling time is approximately 1 s.
- (c) Evaluate the steady-state error of the closed-loop system for a step input.

1.32 Assume a unity feedback system with a precompensator. Design a PD compensator and precompensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{s(s-1)}$ so that the overshoot is approximately 5% and the 5% settling time is approximately 100 ms. Evaluate the steady-state error for a step input and for a ramp input.

1.33 Assume a unity feedback system. Let the plant be $P(s) = \frac{s+4}{(s+1)(s-1)}$ and the compensator be $C(s) = K$.

- (a) Determine the poles of the closed-loop system as a function of K .
- (b) Determine the range of K for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable. Allow both positive and negative gains.
- (c) Evaluate the closed-loop poles as $K \rightarrow \infty$ and compare them to the location of the zero. Repeat for $K \rightarrow -\infty$.

1.34 The objective of this problem is to illustrate some of the limitations of our approach to feedback design when applied to a second-order system with a zero. Such limitations motivate the development of design techniques that consider compensators other than PID, and that do not attempt to assign arbitrarily all of the poles of the closed-loop system. We assume a unity feedback system with plant $P(s) = \frac{s+4}{(s+1)(s-1)}$ and compensator $C(s) = K_P + K_D s$.

- (a) Determine the characteristic equation of the closed-loop system as a function of K_P and K_D .
- (b) For $K_D = -1$, does something “peculiar” happen in the characteristic equation of the closed-loop system? If in addition, $K_P = 4$, what happens?
- (c) For $K_D \neq -1$, find all values of K_P for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable.
- (d) Assume that $K_D \neq -1$. Show that if $\omega_n^2 - 8\zeta\omega_n + 16 \neq 0$, it is possible to find K_P and K_D so that the roots of the characteristic equation have damping ratio ζ and undamped natural frequency ω_n . The expressions for K_P and K_D will be considerably more complicated than the corresponding expressions in Eq. (1.65), which are valid for second-order systems without a zero.

1.35 The objective of this problem is to illustrate the potential benefit of compensators that are more general than PID. Consider a unity feedback system with a precompensator. Let the plant be $P(s) = \frac{s+4}{(s+1)(s-1)}$ and the compensator be $C(s) = \frac{K_P + K_D s}{s+4}$. Choose the gains K_P and K_D and a precompensator so that the overshoot is approximately 5% and the 5% settling time is approximately 100 ms. Evaluate the steady-state error for a step input and for a ramp input.

1.36 Consider a plant $P(s) = \frac{2}{s^2+4}$ and compensator $16 + 4s$. Insert a time delay e^{-Ts} in the forward path, as in Fig. 1-36. Using a first-order approximation for the time delay, determine the range of $T > 0$ for which the closed-loop system remains BIBO stable.

Section 1-8: Cascade Controller Design (PI and PID Compensators)

1.37 Assume a unity feedback system. Design a PI compensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{6}{5s+1}$ so that the 5% settling time is 3 s and the steady-state error for a step input is zero. Evaluate the steady-state error for a ramp input.

1.38 Assume a unity feedback system. Design a PI compensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{-2}{s+4}$ so that the 5% settling time is 100 ms and the steady-state error for a step input is zero. Evaluate the steady-state error for a ramp input.

1.39 This problem will illustrate some of the challenges associated with using a PI compensator when the plant is unstable. The objective is to create a closed-loop system with a 5% settling time of 100 ms and zero steady-state error for the plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{s-2}$. The PI compensator is expressed in the form $K_P \frac{s+z}{s}$.

- (a) Assume a unity feedback system. Design a *proportional compensator* K_P to achieve a 5% settling time of 80 ms, while ignoring for the moment that steady-state error objective. Determine the poles of the closed-loop system.
- (b) Determine the gain crossover frequency ω_g . Following the procedure in the chapter, evaluate the step response of the closed-loop system consisting of the plant and the PI compensator for $z = 0.1\omega_g$ and $z = 0.2\omega_g$. Your step responses should have overshoot and fail the settling time specification. Though it is optional, you may wish to evaluate the step response for $z = 0.05\omega_g$, $z = 0.3\omega_g$, and $z = 0.4\omega_g$ just to convince yourself that adjusting the zero location does not help to meet the settling time specification.
- (c) Fix $z = 0.1\omega_g$ and compute the poles of the closed-loop system.
- (d) Include a precompensator in your feedback design, with

$$F(s) = \frac{s/4.8 + 1}{s/4 + 1},$$

and evaluate the step response. You should now meet the specs. What has the precompensator done? The zero of the precompensator is approximately canceling the pole of the closed-loop system that is due to the integrator of the PI compensator, while the pole is approximately canceling the zero that is due to the PI compensator.

(e) Without redesigning the compensator or the precompensator, evaluate the step response when the plant is perturbed from its nominal value; specifically, assume $P_1(s) = \frac{3}{s-2}$, $P_2(s) = \frac{5}{s-2}$, $P_3(s) = \frac{4}{s-1.5}$, and $P_4(s) = \frac{4}{s-2.5}$. The objective is to evaluate the insensitivity of your feedback design to changes in the parameters of the plant.

1.40 Assume a unity feedback system with a precompensator. Design a PID compensator and precompensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{3}{s^2+5s+4}$ so that the overshoot is approximately 5%, the 5% settling time is approximately 1 s and the steady-state error for a step input is zero. Evaluate the steady-state error for a ramp input.

1.41 Assume a unity feedback system with a precompensator. Design a PID compensator and precompensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{(s-1)(s+1)}$ so that the overshoot is approximately 5%, the 5% settling time is approximately 1 s, and the steady-state error for a step input is zero. To meet the overshoot specification, you will need to use an idea from Prob. 1-9.2.

1.42 Assume a unity feedback system with a precompensator. Design a PID compensator and precompensator for the plant $P(s) = \frac{4}{s(s+10)}$ so that the overshoot is approximately 5%, the 5% settling time is approximately 100 ms, and the steady-state error for a ramp input is zero.

Section 1-9: Design Examples

1.43 Design an integral compensator for the fuel-air mixture system when the nominal model is $P_{nom} = \frac{1}{40}e^{-0.04s} \approx \frac{1}{40} \frac{s-50}{s+50}$. Make the 5% settling time as rapid as possible, subject to an upper bound of 5% on the overshoot. Evaluate the robustness of the closed-loop system to $\pm 2\%$ changes in the air meter gain.

1.44 Reconsider the fuel-air mixture system with plant $P_{nom} = \frac{1}{20}e^{-Ts}$ and compensator $C(s) = 20 \frac{K_I}{s}$, with $K_I = 7.5$. Using a first-order approximation of the time delay, determine the range of $T > 0$ for which the closed-loop system is BIBO stable.

1.45 Consider a Segway robot where the transfer function from motor torque to body orientation is

$$\frac{\theta(s)}{\tau(s)} = \frac{-2.38}{s^2 - 34.3}.$$

Design a PD compensator and precompensator to achieve a damping ratio of $\zeta = 0.7$ and a 5% settling time of 200 ms.

1.46 Consider a Segway robot where the transfer function from motor torque to body orientation is

$$\frac{\theta(s)}{\tau(s)} = \frac{-2.38}{s^2 - 34.3}.$$

Design a PD compensator and precompensator to achieve a damping ratio of $\zeta = 1$ and a 5% settling time of 200 ms.

1.47 Suppose that the robot's transfer function from torque to horizontal velocity is

$$\frac{v(s)}{\tau(s)} = \left(\frac{-2.38}{s^2 - 34.3} \right) \left(\frac{-0.17s^2 + 3.4}{s} \right).$$

Design a controller to regulate the robot's speed while stabilizing the body.