

Automatic Control Laboratory  
ETH Zurich  
Prof. J. Lygeros

D-ITET  
Winter 2010  
11.02.2010

# Signal and System Theory II

## 4. Semester, BSc

# Solutions

# 1 Exercise 1

|   |   |    |   |           |
|---|---|----|---|-----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | Aufgabe   |
| 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 25 Punkte |

1. Controllability matrix:

$$\mathcal{C} = [B \quad AB] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \alpha \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\det \mathcal{C} = -\alpha$$

If system is controllable, we need to have

$$\det(\mathcal{C}) \neq 0 \rightarrow \alpha \neq 0$$

The system is controllable for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus 0$ .

2. Observability matrix:

$$\mathcal{O} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\det \mathcal{O} = \alpha - 1$$

If system is observable, we need to have

$$\det(\mathcal{O}) \neq 0 \rightarrow \alpha \neq 1$$

The system is observable for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus 1$ .

3. Compute characteristic polynomial for poles at -1 and -7:

$$(\lambda + 1)(\lambda + 7) = \lambda^2 + 8\lambda + 7$$

With the feedback controller the resulting closed loop system is

$$A^* = (A + BK) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} [k_1 \quad k_2] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ k_1 & 2 + k_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\det(A^*) = (1 - \lambda)(2 + k_2 - \lambda) - 5k_1$$

$$= \lambda^2 + (-3 - k_2)\lambda + 2 + k_2 - 5k_1$$

Comparison of coefficients:

$$\begin{aligned} -3 - k_2 &= 8 \\ \wedge \quad +2 + k_2 - 5k_1 &= 7 \\ \Rightarrow k_1 &= -\frac{16}{5}, \quad k_2 = -11 \end{aligned}$$

4. The closed loop system is stable since we designed it to have the poles in the left half-plane.

## 2 Exercise 2

|          |          |          |          |                  |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>Exercise</b>  |
| <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>25 Points</b> |

1. In state space form, the discrete time system can be expressed:

$$x_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \frac{\nu+1}{m} & -\frac{d}{m} \end{bmatrix} x_k + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{b}{m} \end{bmatrix} u_k.$$

2. The dimension of the system is 2. The system is not autonomous since it has an input. The system is linear.
3. For  $\nu = -1$ , the state matrix is

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues are  $\lambda = 0, -0.5$  and therefore the system is stable.

For  $\nu = 0$ , the state matrix is

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0.5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues are  $\lambda = 0.5, -1$  and therefore the system is marginally stable.

For  $\nu = 2$ , the state matrix is

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1.5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues are  $\lambda = 1, -1.5$  and therefore the system is unstable.

4. Setting  $u_k = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & \frac{1}{3} \end{bmatrix} x_k$ , the system becomes:

$$x_{k+1} = \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1.5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1.5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & \frac{1}{3} \end{bmatrix} \right) x_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x_k.$$

The system matrix is nilpotent and thus  $x_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$  for all  $k \geq 2$ .

### 3 Exercise 3

|           |          |          |                  |
|-----------|----------|----------|------------------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>Exercise</b>  |
| <b>10</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>25 Points</b> |

1. Based on Kirchhoff's laws, we have that

$$V_i = V_{L_1} + V_{L_2} \quad (1)$$

$$= L_1 \frac{di_{L_1}}{dt} + L_2 \frac{di_{L_2}}{dt}. \quad (2)$$

We also have that

$$i_{R_1} + i_{L_1} = i_{R_2} + i_{L_2}.$$

Hence

$$\frac{L_1}{R_1} \frac{di_{L_1}}{dt} + i_{L_1} = \frac{L_2}{R_2} \frac{di_{L_2}}{dt} + i_{L_2}.$$

From the above two equations we conclude that the state space representation of the system is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} i_{L_1} \\ i_{L_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{R_1 R_2}{L_1(R_1+R_2)} & \frac{R_1 R_2}{L_1(R_1+R_2)} \\ \frac{R_1 R_2}{L_2(R_1+R_2)} & -\frac{R_1 R_2}{L_2(R_1+R_2)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_{L_1} \\ i_{L_2} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{R_1}{L_1(R_1+R_2)} \\ \frac{R_2}{L_2(R_1+R_2)} \end{bmatrix} V_i.$$

From the output of the system we have that  $V_0 = V_{L_2} = L_2 \frac{di_{L_2}}{dt}$ , which is

$$V_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{R_1 R_2}{R_1+R_2} & -\frac{R_1 R_2}{R_1+R_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_{L_1} \\ i_{L_2} \end{bmatrix} + \frac{R_2}{R_1+R_2} V_i.$$

2. Consider the controllability matrix  $P = [B \ AB]$ . For  $R_1 = R_2 = 1\Omega$ , and  $L_1 = L_2 = 0.5H$  we have that

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

Then the controllability matrix is

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We obtain that  $\text{rank}(P) = 1$ , since the rows of  $P$  are linearly dependent, and hence the system is uncontrollable.

Similarly, by checking the observability matrix  $Q = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \end{bmatrix}$ , we have that

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We obtain that  $\text{rank}(Q) = 1$ , and hence the system is unobservable.

3. For the case where  $V_i = 0$  the system is reduced to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} i_{L_1} \\ i_{L_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_{L_1} \\ i_{L_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The response of the system is given by  $x(t) = \Phi(t)x(0)$ , where  $\Phi(t) = e^{At}$  is the state transition matrix. From  $\det(\lambda I - A) = 0$ , the eigenvalues of  $A$  are calculated as  $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = -2$ . Denote as  $w_1, w_2$  the eigenvectors that correspond to the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  respectively. Since  $\tilde{A}w_i = \lambda_i w_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , the eigenvectors are calculated as

$$w_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, w_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence the eigenvectors matrix is  $W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ . The response of the system is

given by  $x(t) = \Phi(t)x(0)$ , where  $\Phi(t) = e^{At} = W e^{\Lambda t} W^{-1}$ , and  $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix}$ .

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} i_{L_1} \\ i_{L_2} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2t} \end{bmatrix} \frac{1}{-2} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} e^{-2t} \\ -e^{-2t} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

## 4 Exercise 4

|          |          |          |                  |
|----------|----------|----------|------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>Exercise</b>  |
| <b>8</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>25 Points</b> |

- Since both systems are controllable, the controllability matrices  $\mathcal{C}_1 = [B \ A_1B]$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2 = [B \ A_2B]$  are both full rank. This, though, cannot indicate anything for  $\mathcal{C}_3 = [B \ (A_1 + A_2)B]$ . One can see that easily by considering the two cases where  $A_2 = A_1$  and  $A_2 = -A_1$ . In the former, we have  $\mathcal{C}_3 = [B \ 2A_1B] \Rightarrow \det \mathcal{C}_3 = 2 \det \mathcal{C}_1 \neq 0$ , i.e. system (3) is controllable and in the latter,  $\mathcal{C}_3 = [B \ \mathbb{0}B] \Rightarrow \det \mathcal{C}_3 = 0$ , i.e. system (3) is uncontrollable.
- Let  $A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} a_1^1 & a_2^1 \\ a_3^1 & a_4^1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} a_1^2 & a_2^2 \\ a_3^2 & a_4^2 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $B = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix}$ . We know that  $\det \mathcal{C}_2 = 0$ , i.e.:

$$\begin{vmatrix} b_1 & a_1^2 b_1 + a_2^2 b_2 \\ b_2 & a_3^2 b_1 + a_4^2 b_2 \end{vmatrix} = b_1(a_3^2 b_1 + a_4^2 b_2) - b_2(a_1^2 b_1 + a_2^2 b_2) = 0.$$

Now, calculating  $\det \mathcal{C}_3$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathcal{C}_3 &= \begin{vmatrix} b_1 & (a_1^1 + a_1^2)b_1 + (a_2^1 + a_2^2)b_2 \\ b_2 & (a_3^1 + a_3^2)b_1 + (a_4^1 + a_4^2)b_2 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= b_1[(a_3^1 + a_3^2)b_1 + (a_4^1 + a_4^2)b_2] - b_2[(a_1^1 + a_1^2)b_1 + (a_2^1 + a_2^2)b_2] \\ &= b_1(a_3^1 b_1 + a_4^1 b_2) - b_2(a_1^1 b_1 + a_2^1 b_2) + b_1(a_3^2 b_1 + a_4^2 b_2) - b_2(a_1^2 b_1 + a_2^2 b_2) \\ &= \det \mathcal{C}_1 + \det \mathcal{C}_2 = \det \mathcal{C}_1 \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, system (3) in this case is controllable.

- Nothing can be said for system (4). Take for instance any invertible matrix  $A_1$  such that system (1) is controllable. Then, taking  $A_2 = A_1^{-1}$ , one always gets an uncontrollable system (4). On the contrary, one can easily find a matrix  $A_2$  that makes system (2) controllable, as well as system (4).