

Fall 2021 ME424 Modern Control and Estimation

Lecture Note 4
Stability, Controllability, and Observability

Prof. Wei Zhang
Department of Mechanical and Energy Engineering
SUSTech Institute of Robotics
Southern University of Science and Technology

zhangw3@sustech.edu.cn
<https://www.wzhanglab.site/>

- **So far, we have learned:**
 - What is a state space model
 - How to derive state space model from physical systems, nonlinear model, continuous time model, and transfer function model
 - How to identify state space model from input-out data pairs
- **Question: how to use a state-space model?**
 - Predict system output: solution to a state space model
 - Analysis of behavior: stability/controllability/observability
 - Design controller
- **The goal of this lecture note: Given a state space model**
 - Derive its solution analytically
 - Stability
 - Controllability
 - Observability

Outline

- **State Space Solutions**
- Internal Stability
- Controllability
- Observability
- Invariance under Similarity Transformation

- General state space model:

$$\begin{aligned}x(k + 1) &= A(k)x(k) + B(k)u(k), \\y(k) &= C(k)x(k) + D(k)u(k)\end{aligned}$$

- If system matrices $(A(k), B(k), C(k), D(k))$ change over time k , then system is called **Linear Time Varying (LTV)** system
- If system matrices are constant w.r.t. to time, then the system is called a **Linear Time Invariant (LTI)** System

$$\begin{aligned}x(k + 1) &= Ax(k) + Bu(k), \\y(k) &= Cx(k) + Du(k)\end{aligned}$$

- Derivation of Solution to LTI state space system:

$$\begin{aligned}x(k+1) &= Ax(k) + Bu(k), \\y(k) &= Cx(k) + Du(k)\end{aligned}$$

- given initial state $x(0) = \hat{x}$, and control sequence $u(0), \dots, u(k), k \geq 0$, we have $\mathbf{x}(k) = A^k \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A^{k-j-1} B \mathbf{u}(j)$

- A large portion of control applications can be transformed into a *regulation problem*
- Regulation problem: keep certain function of the state $x(k)$ or output $y(k)$ close to a **known constant reference value** under disturbances and model uncertainties

For example:

- Keep inverted pendulum at upright position ($\theta = 0$)
- Maintain a desired attitude of spacecraft or aircraft
- Air conditioner regulate temperature close to setpoint (e.g. 75F)
- Cruise control maintain a constant speed despite uncertain road conditions
- Converter maintains a desired voltage level for different loads

- If reference $y_{\text{ref}}(t)$ is changing, this is no longer a regulation problem (becomes a **tracking problem**, which will be discussed later in this class)

Outline

- State Space Solutions
- **Internal Stability**
- Controllability
- Observability
- Invariance under Similarity Transformation

- **Internal Stability** (with $u(k) \equiv 0$, i.e. concerned with zero-input state response)

$$\begin{aligned}x(k+1) &= Ax(k) + Bu(k), \\y(k) &= Cx(k) + Du(k)\end{aligned}$$

- Asymptotic stable: $\|x(k)\| \rightarrow 0$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, for all initial state \hat{x}
- Marginal stable: $\|x(k)\| \leq M$, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$
- Recall state space solution for linear systems:
$$x(k) = A^k \hat{x} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A^{k-j-1} B u(j)$$
- Therefore, for linear system, the key for stability analysis is to understand how A^k behave as $k \rightarrow \infty$

- **Case 1:** diagonal matrix: e.g. $A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix}$

- **Case 2:** diagonalizable matrix, i.e. $\exists T$ such that $A = TDT^{-1}$

- **Case 3:** Unfortunately, *not all* square matrices are diagonalizable
 - e.g.: $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ is **not diagonalizable**

- **Theorem (Internal stability):** LTI (A, B) is **asymptotically stable** if all eigs of A satisfies $|\lambda_i| < 1$

Outline

- State Space Solutions
- Internal Stability
- **Controllability**
- Observability
- Invariance under Similarity Transformation

Nontrivial Fact (by Cayley Hamilton theorem): For a square matrix $A \in R^{n \times n}$, A^k for arbitrary k can be written as a linear combination of $\{I, A, A^2, \dots, A^{n-1}\}$

$$A^k = \alpha_k A^n + \alpha_{k-1} A^{n-1} + \dots + \alpha_1 A + \alpha_0 I$$

- E.g.: $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -2 \end{bmatrix}$, $A^{10} = \begin{bmatrix} 365 & 1159 \\ 1159 & 3842 \end{bmatrix}$

We can write $A^{10} = \alpha_0 I + \alpha_1 A$

- **k -step reachability:**

- Given a system (A, B) , a final state x_f is called k -step reachable from an initial state x_0 if there exists an input sequence $u(0), \dots, u(k-1)$ such that $x(k) = x_f$

- $$x(k) = A^k x_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A^{k-j-1} B u(j)$$
$$= A^k x_0 + B u(k-1) + A B u(k-2) + \dots + A^{k-1} B u(0)$$

- Matrix form:

- **Reachability Lemma:** a final state x_f is k -step reachable from x_0 if

$$x_f - A^k x_0 \in \text{range}([B, AB, \dots, A^{k-1}B])$$

- Reachability Examples:

- $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$, with $x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Find out what state is reachable in 1 step, 2 steps, 10 steps?

- What if $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$?

■ Controllability

- A system matrix pair (A, B) is called **controllable** if any state $x_f \in R^n$ is reachable from any initial state $x_0 \in R^n$ in **finite** time steps
 - In other words, for any initial state $x_0 \in R^n$ and final state $x_f \in R^n$, we can find a control input $u(\cdot)$ to steer the system from x_0 to x_f in finite time steps

- According to Reachability lemma, this requires:

$$x_f - A^k x_0 \in \text{range}([B, AB, \dots, A^{k-1}B]), \forall x_f, x_0$$

- So system is controllable if and only if

$$\text{rank}([B, AB, \dots, A^{k-1}B]) = n \text{ for some finite } k$$

- One way to check controllability is to keep increasing k to see whether $[B, AB, \dots, A^{k-1}B]$ is n or not
- Cayley Hamilton Theorem indicates that there is no need to check the case for $k > n$

- **Controllability Test:** (A, B) is controllable if and only if the controllability matrix $M_c \triangleq [B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{n-1}B]$, is full rank
- Cayley-Hamilton theorem implies: $\text{rank}([B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{k-1}B]) = \text{rank}([B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{n-1}B])$, for all $k \geq n$

- Examples:

- $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

- $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$

- $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

Outline

- State Space Solutions
- Internal Stability
- Controllability
- **Observability**
- Invariance under Similarity Transformation

Observability:

- A system (A, B, C) is called **observable** if any initial state $x_0 \in R^n$ can be uniquely determined given the system input trajectory $u(0), u(1), \dots, u(k-1)$ and output trajectory $y(0), y(1), \dots, y(k)$ for some finite k
- What is the relation between output and initial state?
 - Note $x(k) = A^k x_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A^{k-j-1} B u(j)$
 $= A^k x_0 + B u(k-1) + A B u(k-2) + \dots + A^{k-1} B u(0)$

- Continue derivation for relation between $y(\cdot)$ and x_0

- In vector form, we have: $Y_k = O_k x_0 + T_k U_k \Rightarrow O_k x_0 = Y_k - T_k U_k$
 - O_k maps initial state x_0 to output over time $[0, k - 1]$
 - T_k maps input to output over time $[0, k - 1]$
- $Null(O_k)$ gives ambiguity in determining x_0
- x_0 can be uniquely determined if $Null(O_k) = \{0\}$, i.e. $rank(O_k) = n$, for some finite k
- Input u does not affect **ability** to determine x_0
 - its effect can be subtracted out
 - So we often say system (A, C) is observable or not (No need to mention B)

- **Observability Test:** (A,C) is observable if and only if observability matrix M_o is full rank, where $M_o = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$
 - Note: (A,C) observable \Leftrightarrow Any x_0 can be uniquely determined by $u(0), \dots, u(k-1), y(0), \dots, y(k-1)$, for a finite k

- Observability example:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, C = [1 \quad 0], y(k) \equiv 2, u(k) \equiv 0, k = 0, 1, 2$$

Outline

- State Space Solutions
- Internal Stability
- Controllability
- Observability
- **Invariance under Similarity Transformation**

- Change of basis vectors for equivalent system representation
 - Canonical coordinate system:
 - New coordinate system: basis vectors
 - Relation: $x = Pz$

- Dynamics in new coordinate systems:

- $x(k) = Pz(k) \Rightarrow z(k) = P^{-1}x(k)$

- Dynamics in original coordinate:

$$x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k), \quad y(k) = Cx(k) + Du(k),$$

- Dynamics in the new coordinate

$$z(k+1) = \hat{A}z(k) + \hat{B}u(k), \quad y(k) = \hat{C}z(k) + \hat{D}u(k)$$

- Derive $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$

- System $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ is called **equivalent** to original system (A, B, C, D)

- Similarity transformation does not change system stability, controllability and observability
 - A and PAP^{-1} have the same Jordan form, so similarity transformation does not change stability, i.e., **A is (asymptotically) stable iff \hat{A} is (asymptotically) stable**

- $\widehat{M}_c = P^{-1}M_c$, with this it can be shown that M_c full rank iff \widehat{M}_c full rank

therefore, **(A, B) controllable iff $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B})$ controllable**

$\widehat{M}_o = M_o P$, similarly, this implies **(A, C) observable iff $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{C})$ observable**

