Recap: control theory

Study of linear systems of ODEs with control functions u(t)

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

 $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}.$

Goal: choose a feedback control u(t) = Fx(t) such that the closed-loop system $\dot{x}(t) = (A + BF)x(t)$ is stable, i.e., $eig(A + BF) \subseteq LHP$. Always solvable? No: counterexample:

$$\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

May be hidden behind a change of basis for the state variable, My = x,

$$A = M\hat{A}M^{-1}, \quad B = M\hat{B}.$$

Controllability

The pair (A, B) is called controllable if one of the following (equivalent) conditions holds:

▶ No invertible *M* gives $M^{-1}AM = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, $M^{-1}B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

• $K(A,B) = \operatorname{span}(B,AB,\ldots,A^{n-1}B) = \mathbb{R}^n$

The Lyapunov equation $AX + XA^* + BB^* = 0$ has solution $X \succ 0.$ (see eig(A) $\subseteq LHS$) $\chi_{=} \int_{D}^{\infty} exp(At) BB^* exp(A^*t) dt$

×>0 ×>0

► rouk [sI-A,B]=n per opri se C

Controllability: further conditions

Further equivalent conditions: $\left[\begin{array}{cc} A - sI & B \end{array} \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+1)} \text{ has full rank } n \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{C}. \\ Proof: only nontrivial case when s is an eigenvalue of A. \\ Controllable iff <math>u^*B \neq 0$ for each left eigenvector u of A. \\

And the following ones which we don't prove here.

For any t > 0 and $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, one can choose the control function \underline{u} so that $x(t) = \hat{x}$.

• One can choose F so that eig(A + BF) is any prescribed set of n eigenvalues.

Bass algorithm

We just show an easier trick: if (A, B) is controllable, compute a stabilizing control.

Let $\alpha > \rho(A)$; then $A + \alpha I$ has eigenvalues in the RHP, and the Lyapunov equation

$$(A + \alpha I)X + X(A + \alpha I)^* = 2BB^*$$

has a solution $X \succeq 0$.

By the previous lemma, $X \succ 0$ (note $K(A + \alpha I, B) = K(A, B)$). Then,

$$(A - BB^*X^{-1})X + X(A - BB^*X^{-1})^* = -2\alpha X,$$

which proves that $A - B(B^*X^{-1})$ has eigenvalues in the LHP.

Kalman decomposition

Kalman decomposition

For every matrix pair $(A, B) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, there is a change of basis M such that

$$M^{-1}AM = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad M^{-1}B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

with (A_{11}, B_1) controllable.

Proof: as above: take M_1 such that its columns are a basis of the 'controllable space' K(A, B), then complete it to a basis of \mathbb{R}^n .

Stabilizability

Weaker condition: sometimes even if a system is not controllable we can still ensure it's stable via a feedback control.

Definition

(A, B) is stabilizable if in its Kalman decomposition A_{22} is stable (i.e., $\Lambda(A_{22}) \subseteq LHP$).

Note that this definition is well-posed even if M is non-unique: the eigenvalues of A_{11} are the eigenvalues of $A|_{K(A,B)}$, and those of A_{22} are the remaining eigenvalues of A (counting with their algebraic multiplicity).

(A, B) stabilizable iff rank $\begin{bmatrix} A - sI & B \end{bmatrix} = n$ for all $s \notin LHP$.