Systems Engineering/Process control L7

Feedback systems, cont'd

- Analysis of stationary errors
- Feedback linearization
- Sensitivity analysis

Reading: Systems Engineering and Process Control: 7.1-7.2

Analysis of stationary errors

- Standard loop with controller $G_c(s)$, process $G_p(s)$
- Suppose closed-loop system is stable



What is stationary error $e(\infty)$ for given

- reference r (servo problem)?
- Ioad disturbances v (control problem)?

Signal models



Control error is given by

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{1 + G_p(s)G_c(s)}R(s) - \frac{G_p(s)}{1 + G_p(s)G_c(s)}V(s)$$

The stationary error can be computed using end-value theorem:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} e(t) = \lim_{s \to 0} sE(s)$$

• Let V(s) = 0 and suppose

$$G_p(s)G_c(s) = rac{KQ(s)}{s^n P(s)}, \quad Q(0) = P(0) = 1$$

(n = is total number of integrators in controller and process)
Then:

$$E(s) = \frac{s^n P(s)}{s^n P(s) + KQ(s)} R(s)$$

Stationary error with step reference, R(s) = a/s:

$$e(\infty) = \lim_{s \to 0} \frac{s^n P(s)a}{s^n P(s) + KQ(s)} = \begin{cases} a/(1+K) & n = 0\\ 0 & n \ge 1 \end{cases}$$

Stationary error with ramp reference, $R(s) = b/s^2$:

$$e(\infty) = \lim_{s \to 0} \frac{s^n P(s)}{s^n P(s) + KQ(s)} \cdot \frac{b}{s} = \begin{cases} \infty & n = 0\\ b/K & n = 1\\ 0 & n \ge 2 \end{cases}$$

Stationary error – Servo problem



Stationary error – Control problem

Let R(s) = 0 and suppose $K = K_1 K_2$, $Q = Q_1 Q_2$, $P = P_1 P_2$ so that

$$G_c(s) = \frac{K_1 Q_1(s)}{s^m P_1(s)}, \quad Q_1(0) = P_1(0) = 1$$
$$G_p(s) = \frac{K_2 Q_2(s)}{s^{n-m} P_2(s)}, \quad Q_2(0) = P_2(0) = 1$$

m = number of integrators in controller

• n = total number of integrators in controller and process

Then:

$$E(s) = -\frac{s^{m}K_{2}P_{1}(s)Q_{2}(s)}{s^{n}P(s) + KQ(s)}V(s)$$

Stationary error – Control problem

Stationary error with impulse disturbance, V(s) = 1:

 $e(\infty)=0$

Stationary error with step disturbance, V(s) = a/s:

$$e(\infty) = \lim_{s \to 0} -\frac{s^m K_2 P_1(s) Q_2(s) a}{s^n P(s) + K Q(s)} = \begin{cases} -a K_2 / (1+K) & m = 0, n = 0\\ -a / K_1 & m = 0, n \ge 1\\ 0 & m \ge 1 \end{cases}$$

Stationary error with ramp disturbance, $V(s) = b/s^2$:

$$e(\infty) = \lim_{s \to 0} -\frac{s^m K_2 P_1(s) Q_2(s)}{s^n P(s) + K Q(s)} \cdot \frac{b}{s} = \begin{cases} -\infty & m = 0\\ -b/K_1 & m = 1\\ 0 & m \ge 2 \end{cases}$$

Stationary error – Conclusions

Servo problem: Follow ...

- step reference requires 1 integrator in controller/process
- ramp reference requires 2 integrators in controller/process
- parabola reference requires 3 integrators in controller/process
 ...

Control problem: Eliminate ...

...

- impulse disturbance requires as. stable closed-loop system
- step disturbance requires 1 integrator in controller
- ramp disturbance requires 2 integrators in controller

Feedback linearization

Sensor (valves, pumps,...) nonlinearities complicate control and analysis

$$u(t)$$
 $f(u(t))$

Two methods to linearize static nonlinearity f(u):

- Pre-multiply with inverse nonlinearity
- Use (inner) feedback (often P control)



Transfer function from u to y: $G_p(s) = \frac{2}{(s+1)^3}$ PI controller: $G_c(s) = \frac{s+1}{8s}$ Block diagram: G_c



Singularity diagram for closed-loop system:



Step response for feedback system:



- Suppose inflow through fast opening valve
- ► Valve nonlinear characteristics: $f(u) = \sqrt{u}$, $0 \le u \le 1$:



How is step response affected by nonlinearity?

Step response for closed-loop system, r(t) = 1:



Step response for closed-loop system, r(t) = 0.15:



Nonlinearity gives different step responses for different step sizes!

Linearization using inverse nonlinearity

• Pre-multiply signal to valve with $g(v) = v^2$:



Sensitivity to parameter variations

If valve true characteristic is (left figure)

$$z = f(u) = u^{\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 0.3, \, 0.5, \, 0.7$$



• the following compensation with $g(v) = v^2$ is achieved (right figure):

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= 0.3: \quad f(g(v)) = f(v^2) = v^{0.6} \\ \alpha &= 0.5: \quad f(g(v)) = f(v^2) = v \\ \alpha &= 0.7: \quad f(g(v)) = f(v^2) = v^{1.4} \end{aligned}$$

Static compensation of nonlinearity

• Static compensation $g(v) = v^2$



Step response for closed-loop system, r(t) = 0.15:



Feedback linearization of static nonlinearity

Measure flow and introduce P control around valve:



• If K big we get $z \approx v$

Feedback linearization of static nonlinearity

► Relation between *v* and *z* for K = 10 and different $f(u) = u^{\alpha}$:



- Close to linear and insensitive to parameter variations!
- Many (static) nonlinearities can be linearized the same way

Triple tank: Compensation of nonlinearity

Compensate nonlinearity with inner feedback loop:



This gives:



Step response for compensated system

- Step response for closed-loop system
 - reference r(t) = 0.15
 - true nonlinearity $f(u) = u^{\alpha}$ with $\alpha = 0.3, 0.5, 0.7$:



Almost completely insensitive to parameter variations

Example: Feedback amplifier

- Long distance phone calls: Many amplifiers needed
- Historic amplifiers A_{OL} distorted sound (nonlinear amplification)
- Feedback amplifier invented by H. Black 1927



Example: Feedback amplifier

Feedback can eliminate frequency variations in amplification



Figure 3.3 Gain frequency characteristics with and without feedback

Reproduced (with partial redrawing) by permission of H.S. Black, from Bell System Technical Journal, 1934, 13, p. 12

Sensitivity analysis



- ► G_o = open-loop system (often controller and process)
- ▶ G_f = feedforward
- ► G_y = feedback (often -1)

Transfer function of closed-loop system from r to y:

$$G_c(s) = rac{G_f(s)G_o(s)}{1+G_o(s)G_y(s)}$$

How is G_c affected by variations in components G_f , G_o , G_y ?

Sensitivity analysis

► Define the **relative sensitivity** of a transfer function *G* w.r.t. component *H* as

$$S_H = \frac{dG}{dH} \cdot \frac{H}{G} = \frac{dG}{G} \Big/ \frac{dH}{H}$$

▶ For *G_c* we have:

$$S_{G_f} = 1$$

$$S_{G_o} = rac{1}{1+G_oG_y}$$

$$S_{G_y} = -\frac{G_o G_y}{1 + G_o G_y}$$

Sensitivity analysis

- Relative sensitivity S_{G_o} small if gain $G_o G_y$ big
- Too high feedback gain may cause:
 - much measurement noise to be fed back to system
 - instability
- ► Typical design compromise: Want *G*₀ big at low frequencies (integral action), small at higher frequencies

Feedback system – Summary

Pros:

- Changed dynamics
 - Faster, more well damped, etc
 - Closed-loop poles decided by controller parameters pole placement
- Elimination of disturbances
 - Elimination of stationary error requires integral action in controller
- Reduced sensitivity to process variation and nonlinearities

Cons:

- Measurement noise is fed back to process
- Can lead to instability