

## On the right-inversion of partially minimum-phase systems: case study

Mohamed Elobaid, Mattia Mattioni, Salvatore Monaco, Dorothée Normand-Cyrot

### ▶ To cite this version:

Mohamed Elobaid, Mattia Mattioni, Salvatore Monaco, Dorothée Normand-Cyrot. On the right-inversion of partially minimum-phase systems: case study. 2020. hal-02526676v2

## HAL Id: hal-02526676 https://hal.science/hal-02526676v2

Submitted on 7 Apr 2020 (v2), last revised 14 Feb 2022 (v3)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### REPORT

# On the right-inversion of partially minimum-phase systems: case study

Mohamed Elobaid, Mattia Mattioni, Salvatore Monaco, Dorothee Normand Cyrot

#### ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled April 6, 2020

#### ABSTRACT

This technical manuscript reports the detailed calculations, and simulations carried on the case study of the 4-tanks system based on the control procedure proposed in [2]. The case study illustrates how, starting from a nonminimum phase nonlinear system with a linear output, one goes about identifying the minimum phase zeros of the LTM model of the system, calculating a related dummy output, with respect to which the original nonlinear system is minimum phase. Regulation of the original output is thus possible using standard static feedback controls.

#### KEYWORDS

#### Contents

1 Case study: The bench-marking 4-tanks system		
1.0.1	Analysis of the zero-dynamics	2
1.0.2	The new dummy output	3
1.0.3	Asymptotic tracking with stability	4
1.0.4	Simulations	5
	Case study 1.0.1 1.0.2 1.0.3 1.0.4	Case study: The bench-marking 4-tanks system1.0.1Analysis of the zero-dynamics1.0.2The new dummy output1.0.3Asymptotic tracking with stability1.0.4Simulations

#### 1. Case study: The bench-marking 4-tanks system

Consider the case of a 4-tanks system given by

$$\dot{h} = f(h) + Bu \tag{1a}$$
$$u = Ch \tag{1b}$$

with  $h = col\{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\}, f(h) = 2F(h)h$ 

$$F(h) = \begin{pmatrix} -p_1(h_1) & 0 & \frac{A_3}{A_1}p_3(h_3) & 0\\ 0 & -p_2(h_2) & 0 & \frac{A_4}{A_2}p_4(h_4)\\ 0 & 0 & -p_3(h_3) & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -p_4(h_4) \end{pmatrix}$$
$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\gamma_1 k_1}{A_1} & 0\\ 0 & \frac{\gamma_2 k_2}{A_2}\\ 0 & \frac{(1-\gamma_2)k_2}{A_3}\\ \frac{(1-\gamma_1)k_1}{A_4} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \kappa_t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & 1\\ 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\top}$$

 $p_i(h_i) = \frac{c_i \sqrt{2gh_i}}{2A_i h_i}$ . For the sake of compactness, let  $b_{ij}$  correspond to the element in position (i, j) of the input-state matrix B. In particular,  $h_i$ ,  $A_i$  and  $c_i$  are, respectively, the level of water in the  $i^{\text{th}}$ -tank, its cross-section area and the cross-section of the outlet hole for i = 1, 2, 3, 4. The control signals  $u_j$  with j = 1, 2 correspond to the voltage applied to  $j^{\text{th}}$ -pump with  $k_j u_j$  being the corresponding flow. We consider the problem of locally asymptotically tracking the output of (1) to a desired  $y_{\star} = (h_1^{\star}, h_2^{\star})^{\top}$  with

$$h_{3}^{\star} = \frac{(c_{1}\gamma_{2}\sqrt{h_{1}^{\star}} - c_{2}(1-\gamma_{2})\sqrt{h_{2}^{\star}})^{2}}{c_{3}^{2}a_{3}^{2}\gamma_{2}^{2}}$$
$$h_{4}^{\star} = \frac{(c_{2}\gamma_{1}\sqrt{h_{2}^{\star}} - c_{1}(1-\gamma_{1})\sqrt{h_{1}^{\star}})^{2}}{c_{4}^{2}a_{4}^{2}\gamma_{1}^{2}}$$

for  $a_3 = \frac{\gamma_2}{1-\gamma_2} - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\gamma_1}$  and  $a_4 = \frac{\gamma_1}{1-\gamma_1} - \frac{1-\gamma_2}{\gamma_2}$  a locally asymptotically stable equilibrium for the closed-loop system under nonlinear feedback.

#### 1.0.1. Analysis of the zero-dynamics

The vector relative degree of (1) is well defined and given by  $r = (1 \ 1)$  so that it exhibits a two-dimensional zero-dynamics. Accordingly, for investigating minimum-phaseness of (1), one computes the linear tangent model (LTM) at  $h^*$  of the form

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad y = Cx \tag{2}$$

with  $x = h - h^*$  and  $A = 2F(h^*)$  with corresponding transfer function matrix

$$P(s) = \kappa_t \begin{pmatrix} \frac{b_{11}}{s+p_1} & \frac{b_{32} p_3}{(s+p_1) (s+p_3)} \\ \frac{b_{41} p_4}{(s+p_2) (s+p_4)} & \frac{b_{22}}{s+p_2} \end{pmatrix}$$
(3)

with  $p_i = p_i(h_i^{\star}) > 0$  for i = 1, 2, 3, 4 with Smith form as  $M(s) = \text{diag}\{\frac{1}{d(s)}, z(s)\}$ with pole-polynomial  $d(s) = (s + p_1)(s + p_2)(s + p_3)(s + p_4)$  and zero-polynomial  $z(s) = s^2 + (p_3 + p_4)s + \frac{p_3p_4}{b_{11}b_{22}}(b_{11}b_{22} - b_{32}b_{41})$ . Thus, (1) is nonminimum-phase if  $b_{11}b_{22} - b_{32}b_{41} < 0$  so that one can factorize  $z(s) = (s - z_u)(s - z_s)$  for  $z_u \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $z_s \in \mathbb{R}^-$ . As a consequence, if  $b_{11}b_{22} - b_{32}b_{41} < 0$ , output regulation to  $y_{\star}$  cannot be achieved through classical right-inversion even if the relative degree is well-defined.

In the following we show how the procedure detailed in Section III of [2] allows to deduce a new output  $y_s = C_s h$  and a nonlinear feedback locally solving the regulation problem with stability for (1).

#### 1.0.2. The new dummy output

By virtue of Remark 3.1 in [2], because (A, B, C) possesses three distinct poles in general, one gets that the matrix  $P_s(s) = \text{diag}\{1, s - z_s\}\text{diag}\{d(s), 1\}R(s)$  is improper for all choices of (L(s), R(s)). However, for the pair (The terms  $\psi_i(s)$  are reported at the end of the manuscript for space reasons).

$$\begin{split} L(s) &= \left( \begin{array}{c} -\frac{\psi_1(s)}{b_{32}b_{41}{}^2 p_3 p_4{}^2 (p_2 - p_3) (p_3 - p_4)} & -\frac{p_2 - p_1 + p_4 + s}{(p_1 - p_2) (p_1 - p_4)} \\ -\frac{\psi_2(s)}{b_{32}b_{41} p_3 p_4 (p_2 - p_3) (p_3 - p_4)} & -\frac{b_{41} p_4}{b_{11} (p_1 - p_2) (p_1 - p_4)} \end{array} \right) \\ R(s) &= \left( \begin{array}{c} b_{41} p_4 (p_3 + s) & -\frac{\psi_3(s)}{b_{11} (p_1 - p_2) (p_1 - p_4)} \\ -\frac{b_{11}{}^2 b_{22} (p_1 - p_2) (p_1 - p_4)}{b_{32} b_{41} p_3 p_4 (p_2 - p_3) (p_3 - p_4)} & \frac{\psi_4(s)}{b_{32} b_{41}^2 p_3 p_4^2 (p_2 - p_3) (p_3 - p_4)} \end{array} \right) \end{split}$$

One can obtain a matrix K(s) such that  $P_s(s) = (K(s))^{-1}P_s(s)$  is strictly proper transfer function matrix having as poles the original system poles and as zeros  $z_s(s)$ . Namely

$$K(s) = \begin{pmatrix} K_{1,1}(s) & K_{1,2}(s) \\ K_{2,1}(s) & K_{2,2}(s) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{split} K_{1,1}(s) &= \frac{b_{41} p_4}{b_{11} \ (p_1 - p_2) \ (p_1 - p_4)} - \\ \frac{b_{22} b_{41} p_4 \ (p_2 - p_1 + p_4 + s) \ (\gamma p_1 - \gamma p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_3^2 - b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_4 - b_{11} b_{22} p_3 p_4 + 2 b_{32} b_{41} p_3 p_4)}{\psi_5(s)} \\ K_{1,2}(s) &= \frac{(p_2 - p_1 + p_4 + s)}{(p_1 - p_2) \ (p_1 - p_4)} \times \\ \left(\frac{2 \gamma s}{b_{32} \ (p_2 - p_1 + p_4 + s) \ (\gamma p_1 - \gamma p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_3^2 - b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_4 - b_{11} b_{22} p_3 p_4 + 2 b_{32} b_{41} p_3 p_4)}{\psi_6(s)} + \\ \frac{\gamma p_3 \ (\gamma - b_{11} b_{22} p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_4 - 2 b_{32} b_{41} p_4)}{\psi_6(s)} \right) \\ K_{1,3}(s) &= \frac{\psi_7(s)}{\psi_8(s)} - \frac{\psi_7(s)}{b_{32} b_{41} p_3 p_4 \ (p_2 - p_3) \ (p_3 - p_4) \ (b_{11} b_{22} p_3 - \gamma + b_{11} b_{22} p_4 + 2 b_{11} b_{22} s)} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} & K_{1,4} = \frac{1}{b_{32} b_{41}^{\ 2} p_3 p_4^{\ 2} (p_2 - p_3) (p_3 - p_4) (b_{11} b_{22} p_3 - \gamma + b_{11} b_{22} p_4 + 2 b_{11} b_{22} s)} \times \\ & \left( \frac{-4 \gamma s b_{11}^{\ 2} b_{22} (p_2 + s) (p_4 + s)}{b_{32} (\gamma p_2 - \gamma p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_3^{\ 2} - b_{11} b_{22} p_2 p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_2 p_4 - b_{11} b_{22} p_3 p_4 + 2 b_{32} b_{41} p_3 p_4)} \\ & + \frac{-2 b_{11}^{\ 2} b_{22} (p_2 + s) (p_4 + s) \gamma p_3 (\gamma - b_{11} b_{22} p_3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_4 - 2 b_{32} b_{41} p_4) \psi_{11}(s)}{\psi_{10}(s)} \right) \end{split}$$

and

$$\gamma = \sqrt{b_{11} b_{22} (b_{11} b_{22} p_3^2 + b_{11} b_{22} p_4^2 - 2 b_{11} b_{22} p_3 p_4 + 4 b_{32} b_{41} p_3 p_4)}$$

From which one obtains

$$P_{s}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{b_{11}}{p_{1}+s} & \frac{b_{32} p_{3}}{(p_{1}+s)(p_{3}+s)} \\ P_{s,3}(s) & P_{s,4}(s) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{split} P_{s,3}(s) &= \frac{b_{32} \, b_{41} \, p_4 \, \left(\gamma + 2 \, b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_2 - b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_3 + b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_4 + 2 \, b_{11} \, b_{22} \, s\right)}{2 \, \gamma \, \left(p_2 + s\right) \, \left(p_4 + s\right)} - \frac{b_{11} \, b_{22} \, b_{32} \, b_{41} \, p_4}{\gamma \, \left(p_1 + s\right)} \\ P_{s,4}(s) &= \frac{b_{22} \, b_{32} \, \left(\gamma - b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_3 + b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_4\right)}{2 \, \gamma \, \left(p_2 + s\right)} \\ &- \left(\frac{b_{32} \gamma (p_1 + s) b_{22} \, \left(\gamma - b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_3 + b_{11} \, b_{22} \, p_4\right) - 2 b_{32} b_{22} \, b_{32} \, b_{41} \, p_3 \, p_4}{2 \, \gamma \, \left(p_1 + s\right) \left(p_3 + s\right)}\right) \end{split}$$

Consequently, utilizing Remark 3.2 of [2], One obtains

$$y_s = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{b_{32}b_{41}p_4}{2b_{11}\beta} & \frac{b_{32}}{2} - \frac{b_{32}(p_3 + p_4)}{2\beta} & -\frac{b_{22}}{2} - \frac{b_{22}(p_3 + p_4)}{2\beta} & \frac{b_{32}p_4}{2\beta} \end{pmatrix} h$$
(4)

with  $\beta = \sqrt{(p_3 + p_4)^2 - 4\frac{p_3p_4}{b_{11}b_{22}}(b_{11}b_{22} - b_{32}b_{41})}$  making the LTM model of (1) minimum-phase.

#### 1.0.3. Asymptotic tracking with stability

It is easily checked that, the nonlinear dynamics (1a) with output as in (4) possesses a well-defined relative degree  $r_s = (1, 2)$  at  $h^*$ . Also, it is a matter of computations to verify that (1a) with output as in (4) is locally minimum-phase with zero-dynamics  $\dot{\eta}^s = q_s(0, \eta^s)$  verifying  $\frac{\partial q_s}{\partial \eta_s}(0, \eta^s_\star) = z_s < 0$ . At this point, along the lines of Remark 4.3 in [2] and by exploiting the results in [1, Chapter 5], one gets that output tracking of (1) can be solved over the dummy output (4) by setting the constant  $y^s_\star = (y^s_{1,\star}, y^s_{2,\star})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$ as solution to  $y_\star = Z_u(d)y^s_\star$  which is given by construction as  $y^s_\star = C_s h^\star$ . Accordingly, for all  $k_0, k_1 > 0$  the feedback

$$u = -M_s^{-1}(h) \begin{pmatrix} c_1^s f(h) + y_1^s - y_{1,\star}^s \\ L_f c_2^s f(h) + k_1 c_2^s f(h) + k_0 (y_2^s - y_{2,\star}^s) \end{pmatrix}$$
(5)

with decoupling matrix

$$M_s^{-1}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} c_1^s B \\ \mathcal{L}_f^2 c_2^s f(h) B \end{pmatrix}$$

ensures local asymptotic tracking of y(t) to the desired  $y^*$  while preserving internal stability.

#### 1.0.4. Simulations

For completeness, simulations are reported in Figure 1 for the closed-loop system under the stabilizing feedback designed over the new dummy output highlighting the locally minimum-phase components of (1). Simulations are performed for the parameters fixed as in the Table below

$A_1 \ [cm^2]$	28	$A_3 \ [cm^2]$	28
$A_2 \ [cm^2]$	32	$A_4 \ [cm^2]$	32
$c_1 \ [cm^2]$	0.071	$c_3 \ [cm^2]$	0.071
$c_2 \ [cm^2]$	0.057	$c_4 \ [cm^2]$	0.057
$k_t \ [V/cm]$	1	$g \ [cm/s^2]$	981
$\gamma_1$	0.43	$\gamma_2$	0.34
$k_1$	65.12	$k_2$	94.12

and with  $y_{\star} = (7.1, 6.2)^{\top}$  corresponding to  $h^{\star} = (7.1, 6.2, 3.58, 1.632)^{\top}$ . In particular, with this choice of parameters, the plant is nonminum-phase with the zeros of LTM model at the desired equilibrium provided by  $z_u = 0.018$  and  $z_s = -0.0789$ . The gains of the controller (5) are fixed as  $(k_0, k_1) = (1, 2)$ . Simulations report the story of the original and dummy outputs plus the internal dynamics (that is the water levels of the third and fourth tank) while proving the effectiveness of the proposed control design approach.

## Appendix

The terms  $\psi_i(s)$  used to simplify the expressions of L(s), R(s) and K(s) are

$$\begin{split} \psi_1(s) &= b_{11} \left(p_2 + s\right) \left(p_1 + s\right) \left(b_{11} b_{22} s^1 + b_{22} b_{11} p_3^2 p_4 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_3 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_3 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_4 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_3 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_4 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_3 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_4 s^2 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_4 s^3 + b_{11} b_{22} p_1 p_2$$

$$\begin{split} \psi_9(s) &= 2\,b_{11}\,b_{22}\,\,(p_1+s)\,\,(p_3+s)\,\,(b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3^{\,2}\,p_4-b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3\,p_4^{\,2}-b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3\,p_4\,s\\ &-b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_2\,p_3\,p_4+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_4^{\,2}\,s+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_2\,p_4^{\,2}+2\,b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_2\,p_4\,s+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,s^3+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_2\,s^2)\\ \psi_{10} &= b_{32}\,(b_{11}^{\,2}\,b_{22}^{\,2}\,p_2\,p_3^{\,2}-b_{11}^{\,2}\,b_{22}^{\,2}\,p_3^{\,3}+b_{11}^{\,2}\,b_{22}^{\,2}\,p_2\,p_4^{\,2}-b_{11}^{\,2}\,b_{22}^{\,2}\,p_3\,p_4^{\,2}+2\,b_{11}^{\,2}\,b_{22}^{\,2}\,p_3^{\,2}\,p_4+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,\gamma\,p_3^{\,2}\\ &-2\,b_{11}^{\,2}\,b_{22}^{\,2}\,p_2\,p_3\,p_4-b_{11}\,b_{22}\,\gamma\,p_2\,p_3+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,\gamma\,p_2\,p_4-b_{11}\,b_{22}\,\gamma\,p_3\,p_4+b_{32}\,b_{41}\,\gamma\,p_3\,p_4+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3\,p_4^{\,2}\\ &-3\,b_{11}\,b_{22}\,b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3^{\,2}\,p_4+2\,b_{11}\,b_{22}\,b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_2\,p_3\,p_4)\\ \psi_{11}(s) &= (b_{11}\,b_{22}\,s^4+b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3^{\,3}\,p_4+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_2\,s^3+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_3\,s^3+2\,b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_4\,s^3-b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_3^{\,2}\,p_4^{\,2}-b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1^{\,2}\,s^2\\ &+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_4^{\,2}\,s^2+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1\,p_3\,p_4^{\,2}-b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1^{\,2}\,p_3\,p_4-b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_1\,p_3\,p_4^{\,2}+b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_1^{\,2}\,p_3\,p_4+b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_2\,p_3\,p_4^{\,2}\\ &-b_{32}\,b_{41}\,p_2\,p_3^{\,2}\,p_4+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1\,p_2\,s^2-b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1^{\,2}\,p_3\,s+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1\,p_4\,s^2+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1\,p_4\,s^2+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_2\,p_3\,s^2\\ &-b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1^{\,2}\,p_4\,s+b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_2\,p_4\,s^2+2\,b_{11}\,b_{22}\,p_1\,p_2\,p_3\,s+b_{11$$

#### References

- [1] Alberto Isidori, Nonlinear Control Systems, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [2] M. Elobaid, M. Mattioni, S. Monaco and D. Normand-Cyrot, On the right-inversion of partially minimum phase systems, submitted for review to the CDC 2020.



Figure 1.: The four tank model under stable dynamic inversion.