

# TTK4225 System theory, Autumn 2023

## Assignment 5

The expected output is a .pdf written in  $\text{\LaTeX}$  or a Python notebook exported to .pdf, even if photos of your handwritten notes or drawings will work. Every person shall hand in her/his assignment, independently of whether it has been done together with others. When dealing with mathematical derivations, unless otherwise stated, explain how you got your answer (tips: use programming aids like Python, Matlab, Maple, or compendia like Rottmann's to check if you have obtained the right answer).

### Question 1

#### Content units indexing this question:

- BIBO stability
- LTI systems

Explain from **both** graphical and mathematical perspectives why an harmonic oscillator ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harmonic\\_oscillator](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harmonic_oscillator)) is not a BIBO stable system.

### Solution 1:

#### Content units indexing this solution:

- BIBO stability
- LTI systems

From a graphical point of view: an harmonic oscillator has an impulse response that is made of non-vanishing oscillations. One knows that the to get the forced response at time  $T$  one takes the impulse response of the system, flips it, puts it on top of the input up to time  $T$ , point-wise multiply, and then integrates (if this is not clear then one should definitely re-study how to use impulse responses for computing forced responses of LTIs). Choosing an input that is the same persisting oscillation as the impulse response and choosing  $T$  opportunely so that the two signals constructively interfere then leads to a point-wise multiplication between input and impulse response that is the oscillation squared (and thus always positive). The more time passes, the more this oscillation squared lasts, thus as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  we have the crests of the output oscillation that grows unbounded.

From a mathematical point of view: since the impulse response is non-vanishing, it is not absolutely integrable, that is the condition for BIBO stability for LTI systems.

## Question 2

### Content units indexing this question:

- linearization
- marginally stable equilibrium

Find two first-order autonomous nonlinear dynamical systems (say, system  $S_1$  and system  $S_2$ ) that have both 0 as an equilibrium, and that for  $S_1$  the origin is unstable, while for  $S_2$  it is asymptotically stable, and for which when linearizing that two systems around 0 the origin becomes marginally stable for both the linearized versions of these systems.

### Solution 1:

An example is  $\pm x^3$ .

## Question 3

### Content units indexing this question:

- linearization
- marginally stable equilibrium

Assume that certain linear system has actually been obtained by linearizing an unknown nonlinear system around a given equilibrium. Assume the equilibrium for the linearized system to be marginally stable. Explain from **both** graphical and mathematical perspectives why given this information it is not possible to know which type of stability properties that equilibrium point has for the original nonlinear system.

### Solution 1:

From a graphical point of view: think at  $x^3$  and  $-x^3$ , for which both they have zero derivative at  $x_{eq} = 0$ . The fact is that the derivative does not capture whether the  $f(x)$  is “positive before the equilibrium and negative after” or viceversa, that eventually is what drives the equilibrium to be asymptotically stable or unstable.

From a mathematical point of view: the derivative is not capturing higher order details of  $f(x)$ . In a sense, considering a Taylor approximation means losing information that is still important for characterizing the stability properties of the points.

## Question 4

### Content units indexing this question:

- linear systems of equations

1. Consider the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -3 & 3 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Has the system a solution? If so, which one? If not, why?

2. Consider the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -3 & 3 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Has the system a solution? If so, which one? If not, why?

#### Solution 1:

##### Content units indexing this solution:

- systems of linear equations

The systems have solutions as soon as  $\mathbf{b}$  is in  $\text{range}(A)$ . If this happens, then the solution  $\mathbf{x}$  is that linear combination of the columns of  $A$  that gives  $\mathbf{b}$

#### Question 5

##### Content units indexing this question:

- equilibria
- autonomous system

Compute the equilibria of the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x}$  with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} J_{\lambda_1}^{(n_{1,1})} & & & & \\ & J_{\lambda_1}^{(n_{1,2})} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & J_{\lambda_2}^{(n_{2,1})} & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

i.e.,  $A$  block-diagonal with the various blocks being of the type

$$J_{\lambda_*}^{(n_*)} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_* & 1 & & & \\ & \lambda_* & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda_* & 1 \\ & & & & \lambda_* \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_* \times n_*}$$

**Solution 1:****Content units indexing this solution:**

- equilibria

The problem of computing the equilibria is the problem of computing the kernel. To make some examples of the miniblocks above,

$$J_1^{(3)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

while

$$J_2^{(5)} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Now each of these mini-blocks have a trivial kernel as soon as  $\lambda_* \neq 0$ . If though  $\lambda_* = 0$  then the block looks like

$$J_0^{(5)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and its kernel is spanned by  $[0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1]^T$ . I.e., the kernel of each of such miniblocks is given by a vector that has the same side-size of the miniblock, and all zeros but 1 on the bottom position. Then the kernel of  $A$  is the union of all such kernels. E.g.,

$$\ker \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \text{span} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

## Index of the Content Units

autonomous system, 3

BIBO stability, 1

equilibria, 3, 4

linear systems of equations, 2

linearization, 2

LTI systems, 1

marginally stable equilibrium, 2

systems of linear equations, 3