

ELSEVIER  
**IFAC**  
PUBLICATIONS

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
15th IFAC WORLD CONGRESS**

International Federation of Automatic Control

*Barcelona, Spain, 21 - 26 July 2002*

**Edited by**

**E.F. CAMACHO, L. BASAÑEZ and J.A. de la PUENTE**

**Volume C**

**STABILITY AND NONLINEAR SYSTEMS**



Pergamon

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
15th IFAC WORLD CONGRESS  
International Federation of Automatic Control

*Barcelona, Spain, 21 – 26 July 2002*

*(in 21 volumes)*

Edited by

**E.F. CAMACHO**  
*University of Seville, Spain*

**L. BASAÑEZ**  
*Technical University of Catalonia (UPC), Spain*

**J.A. de la PUENTE**  
*Technical University of Madrid (UPM), Spain*

**VOLUME C**  
**STABILITY AND NONLINEAR SYSTEMS**

Published for the

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF AUTOMATIC CONTROL

by

**PERGAMON**  
An Imprint of Elsevier Science

ELSEVIER SCIENCE Ltd  
The Boulevard, Langford Lane  
Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK

Elsevier Science Internet Homepage  
<http://www.elsevier.com>

Consult the Elsevier Homepage for full catalogue information on all books, journals and electronic products and services.

IFAC Publications Internet Homepage  
<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ifac>

Consult the IFAC Publications Homepage for full details on the preparation of IFAC meeting papers, published/forthcoming IFAC books, and information about the IFAC Journals and affiliated journals.

---

Copyright © 2003 IFAC

*All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the copyright holders.*

First edition 2003

#### **Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

#### **British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0-08-044218-8

ISBN (Set) 0 -08-044184-X

ISSN 1474-6670

*These proceedings were reproduced from manuscripts supplied by the authors, therefore the reproduction is not completely uniform but neither the format nor the language have been changed in the interests of rapid publication. Whilst every effort is made by the publishers to see that no inaccurate or misleading data, opinion or statement appears in this publication, they wish to make it clear that the data and opinions appearing in the articles herein are the sole responsibility of the contributor concerned. Accordingly, the publisher, editors and their respective employers, officers and agents accept no responsibility or liability whatsoever for the onsequences of any such inaccurate or misleading data, opinion or statement.*

*Printed in Great Britain*

---

General enquiries, including placing orders, should be directed to Elsevier's Regional Sales Offices – please access the Elsevier homepage for full contact details (homepage details at the top of this page).

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE 15th IFAC WORLD CONGRESS

## International Federation of Automatic Control

### **Sponsors:**

IBM  
Repsol YPF  
Telefonica

### **Co-sponsors:**

- European Community (ist)
- Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología
- Generalitat de Catalunya, DURSI (secretaria de telecomunicacions i societat de la informació)
- Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

### **Supporters:**

- Automática & Instrumentación
- Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
- Fagor Automation, S. Coop.
- Iberdrola Redes
- La Caixa
- Samsung Electronics Iberia

### **National Organising Committee**

Gabriel Ferraté, Chairman  
Jordi Ayza, Executive Manager  
Joseba-Jokin Quevedo, Conference Chairman  
Eduardo F. Camacho, Publications Chairman  
Jaume Pagès, Financial Chairman

Josep Amat  
Rafael Aracil  
Pere Caminal  
Alicia Casals  
Alfons Crespo

Sebastián Dormido  
Teresa Escobet  
Josep M. Fuertes  
Antoni Grau  
Antoni Guasch

Rafael Huber  
Marga Marcos  
Manuel Silva

### **International Program Committee**

Luis Basañez (ES), Co-Chairman  
Juan Antonio de la Puente (ES), Co-Chairman  
Han-Fu Chen (CN), Vice-Chairman  
Petr Horacek (CZ), Vice-Chairman

Pedro Albertos (ES)  
Alejandro Alonso (ES)  
Jozsef Bokor (HU)  
Ian K. Craig (ZA)  
Robert Griño (ES)  
Yasushi Hashimoto (JP)  
Rolf Isermann (DE)  
Alberto Isidori (IT)

Agustín Jiménez (ES)  
Uwe Kiencke (DE)  
Vladimir Kučera (CZ)  
Lena Mårtensson (SE)  
Michael Masten (US)  
Thomas J. McAvoy (US)  
Anibal Ollero (ES)  
Romeo Ortega (FR)

José R. Perán (ES)  
César de Prada (ES)  
Raúl Suárez (ES)  
Josep Tornero (ES)  
Henk B. Verbruggen (NL)  
Marek B. Zaremba (CA)

### **IFAC President (1999–2002)**

Pedro Albertos (ES)

### **Comité Español de Automática (CEA-IFAC) President**

Sebastián Dormido (ES)

## CONTENTS OF VOLUMES

<b>VOLUME A:</b>	MANUFACTURING SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME B:</b>	CONTROL DESIGN
<b>VOLUME C:</b>	STABILITY AND NONLINEAR SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME D:</b>	OPTIMAL CONTROL
<b>VOLUME E:</b>	ROBUST CONTROL
<b>VOLUME F:</b>	IDENTIFICATION
<b>VOLUME G:</b>	HYBRID SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME H:</b>	PROCESS CONTROL
<b>VOLUME I:</b>	FUZZY, NEURAL AND GENETIC SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME J:</b>	FAULT DETECTION AND SUPERVISION
<b>VOLUME K:</b>	ROBOTICS
<b>VOLUME L:</b>	COMPUTERS FOR CONTROL
<b>VOLUME M:</b>	ADAPTATION AND LEARNING
<b>VOLUME N:</b>	SLIDING CONTROL, NONLINEAR DISCRETE AND STOCHASTIC SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME O:</b>	CONTROL CONCEPTS FOR POWER SYSTEMS AND MINING
<b>VOLUME P:</b>	AERONAUTICS AND MARINE SYSTEMS CONTROL
<b>VOLUME Q:</b>	MODELING AND CONTROL OF AGRICULTURAL, BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME R:</b>	CONTROL CONCEPTS FOR SOCIOECONOMIC SYSTEMS
<b>VOLUME S:</b>	MECHATRONIC SYSTEMS AND AUTOMOTIVE CONTROL
<b>VOLUME T:</b>	NOVEL CONTROL METHODOLOGY AND APPLICATIONS
<b>PLENARY, SURVEY and MILESTONE VOLUME:</b>	(Includes comprehensive Table of Contents for all volumes and Cumulative Author and Keyword indexes)

## PREFACE

These proceedings distributed in 21 volumes contain the technical material accepted and presented at the 15<sup>th</sup> World Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control held in Barcelona between 21<sup>st</sup> - 26<sup>th</sup> July 2002. As the first triennial IFAC World Congress of this millennium, it has been recognized as an outstanding event for the worldwide community of control systems science and engineering. It was a great pleasure and honour for Spanish control researchers and engineers to host the Congress in Spain.

The response from the international control community to the call for papers was strong. The International Program Committee (IPC) received 2509 full draft papers, 72 invited session proposals and 11 panel discussion proposals from 68 countries. We were impressed by the high quality of the submissions. Reviews were conducted by all of the IFAC Technical Committees, with the help of 1788 experts from all over the world. By this rigorous review procedure 1755 papers, 7 plenary lectures, 51 invited sessions and 7 panel discussions were selected. Delegates came from 63 countries. The technical program for the Congress covered a broad range of topics, with sessions arranged in 9 clusters and subdivided into 47 technical areas. We believe that these proceedings provide significant contributions to each of the subject areas of the congress tracks.

The plenary speakers included some of the world's most outstanding authorities in various control fields. The topics of the plenary lectures included surveys, prospects and introductions to advanced control theory and applications. Following the plenary addresses, the congress program was composed of 1755 regular papers, presented in 240 lecture-type sessions and 12 poster-type sessions. The paper sessions were complemented by 6 milestone sessions. No distinction is made between poster papers and lecture papers in the Proceedings. The technical material has been organized in 21 volumes: 20 subject volumes containing the regular papers presented at the Congress and a volume containing the keynote speech, plenary papers, milestone papers and a selection of the survey papers. The regular papers appearing in the proceedings have been classified by the editors in 20 volumes homogeneous both in size and in the topics addressed.

We expect that the reader, whether a participant in the Congress, a researcher or a practising engineer, will find this Congress publication useful, informative and helpful to their work.

Finally, we would like to thank all IPC members, all IFAC Technical Committee chairs and all reviewers for their valuable contribution to the Congress. We are also indebted to all our friends from different parts of the world for their support, help and useful suggestions.

Eduardo F. Camacho

Luis Basañez

Juan A. de la Puente

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME C

### STABILITY AND NONLINEAR SYSTEMS

#### *NEW ACHIEVEMENTS IN POLYNOMIAL METHODS FOR SYSTEM CONTROL THEORY*

Relations Between Stable Predictive Control and Pole Placement M. FIKAR, H. UNBEHAUEN, J. MIKLEŠ	1
Stability of Two-Variable Interval Polynomials Via Positivity D.D. ŠILJAK, D.M. STIPANOVIĆ	7
Polynomial Spectral Factorization with Complex Coefficients M. HROMČÍK, J. JEŽEK, M. ŠEBEK, Z. HURÁK	13
An Algorithm for Static Output Feedback Simultaneous Stabilization of Scalar Plants D. HENRION, M. ŠEBEK, V. KUČERA	19
Simple Robust Controllers: Design, Tuning and Analysis R. PROKOP, P. HUSTÁK, Z. PROKOPOVÁ	23
Notions of Equivalence for Discrete Time AR-Representations N. KARAMPETAKIS, S. VOLOGIANNIDIS, A.I. VARDULAKIS	29

#### *POSITIVE LINEAR SYSTEMS*

Recent Developments in Reachability and Controllability of Positive Linear Systems R. BRU, L. CACCETTA, S. ROMERO, V. RUMCHEV, E. SÁNCHEZ	35
On the Positive Realization of Controllable Behaviors M.E. VALCHER	47
Positivity of Multi-Exponential Models L. FARINA, P. RUISI	53
Externally and Internally Positive Time-Varying Linear Systems T. KACZOREK	59
On Feedbacks for Positive Discrete-Time Singular Systems B. CANTÓ, C. COLL, E. SÁNCHEZ	65

#### *DESCRIPTOR AND IMPLICIT SYSTEMS*

Stability Robustness Analysis of Uncertain Discrete-Time Descriptor Systems C.-H. FANG, L. LEE	71
An LMI Approach Towards Stabilization of Discrete-Time Descriptor Systems A. REHM, F. ALLGÖWER	77
On the Control of Linear Systems Having Internal Variations, Part I-Reachability M.B. ESTRADA, M. MALABRE	83
On the Control of Linear Systems Having Internal Variations, Part II-Control M.B. ESTRADA, M. MALABRE	89
Stability Analysis of Interconnected Implicit Systems Based on Passivity K. TAKABA	95
Regional Pole Placement by Output Feedback for a Class of Descriptor Systems E.B. CASTELAN, A.S. SILVA, E.R. LLANOS VILLARREAL, S. TARBOURIECH	101

## **CONTROLLER REDUCTION AND DESIGN**

Design of Reduced Order $H_\infty$ Filters for Discrete Time Systems P. HIPPE, J. DEUTSCHER	107
Frequency-Weighted Balancing Related Controller Reduction A. VARGA, B.D.O. ANDERSON	113
On Model Order Reduction Via Projection Y. HALEVI	119
Participation Factors and Their Connections to Residues and Relative Gain Array F. GAROFALO, L. IANNELLI, F. VASCA	125
Approximation, Reduction and Realization of Passive Delay Systems N. GUIJARRO, L. LEFÈVRE, G. DAUPHIN-TANGUY	131
Plant and Control Design Using Convexifying LMI Methods J.F. CAMINO, M.C. de OLIVEIRA, R.E. SKELTON	137

## **DISCRETE TIME LINEAR SYSTEMS**

An Approach to Stable Controller Design of Piecewise Discrete Time Linear Systems G. FENG, D. SUN, S.S. ZHOU	143
Design of Discrete Variable Structure Controller for Perturbed MIMO Systems R.-C. LAI, C.-C. CHENG	149
Minimality, Canonical Forms and Storage of Finite-Horizon Discrete-Time Compensators L.G. VAN WILLIGENBURG, W.L. DE KONING	155
On the Determination of the Dimension of the Solution Space of Discrete Time AR-Representations N.P. KARAMPETAKIS	161
On the Construction of the Forward and Backward Solution Space of a Discrete Time AR-Representation N.P. KARAMPETAKIS	167
Design of Receding-Horizon Filters for Discrete-Time Linear Systems Using Quadratic Boundedness A. ALESSANDRI, M. BAGLIETTO, G. BATTISTELLI	173

## **STABILITY AND STABILIZATION (LINEAR SYSTEMS)**

A Discretized Lyapunov Functional Approach to Stability of Linear Delay-Differential Systems of Neutral Type Q.-L. HAN, X. YU	179
Stabilization and Robust Control of Metal Rolling Modeled as a 2D Linear System K. GALKOWSKI, W. PASZKE, E. ROGERS, D.H. OWENS	185
A Generalized Markov Stability Criterion for Linear Systems D. WANG, T. DILLON	191
A Toeplitz Characterization of the Static Output Feedback Stabilization Problem for Linear Discrete-Time Systems A. ASTOLFI, P. COLANERI	195
Ellipsoidal Sets for Static Output Feedback D. PEAUCELLE, D. ARZELIER, R. BERTRAND	201
Output Feedback Design by Coupled Lyapunov-Like Equations E.B. CASTELAN, E.R. LLANOS VILLARREAL, J.-C. HENNET	207

## **LINEAR SYSTEMS THEORY**

Duality Theory in Filtering Problem for Discrete Volterra Equations V.B. KOLMANOVSKII, A.I. MATASOV	213
Positive Realness and the Analysis of a Class of 2D Linear Systems K. GALKOWSKI, W. PASZKE, B. SULIKOWSKI, E. ROGERS, S. XU, J. LAM, Z. LIN, D.H. OWENS	219
Motion Planning for a Linearized Korteweg-de Vries Equation with Boundary Control B. LAROCHE, P. MARTIN	225
Companion Forms and Cyclic Matrices for Discrete-Time Periodic Systems S. BITTANTI, P. COLANERI	231
Discrete Time Dissipativeness on the Dipolynomial Ring O. KANEKO, T. FUJII	237
Floquet Theory for MIMO Sampled-Data Systems B.P. LAMPE, E.N. ROSENWASSER	243

## **TIME-VARYING SYSTEMS AND FACTORIZATION**

Analysis of Time Varying Systems Using Time Varying S-Transforms and Time Varying Z-Transforms A. GARCIA ITURRICHIA, J. SABATIER, A. OUSTALOUP	249
Balanced Model Reduction of Linear Time-Varying Systems H. SANDBERG, A. RANTZER	255
Poles and Zeros of Multivariable Linear Time-Varying Systems K. ZENGER, R. YLINEN	261
$H_\infty$ Loop Shaping for Mixed Continuous/Discrete-Time Time-Varying and Periodic Systems A.-K. CHRISTIANSSON, B. LENNARTSON, H.T. TOIVONEN	267
Explicit Characterization of Decentralized Coprime Factors N. SEBE	273
New Results on the Parametrization of $J$ -Spectral Factors S. WEILAND, A. GOMBANI	279

## **CONTROL DESIGN**

On Parametric State Feedback Design in the Frequency Domain J. DEUTSCHER	285
Polynomial Solution of Predictive Optimal Control Problems for Systems in State-Equation Form M.J. GRIMBLE	291
Relation Between Model Feedback Control Systems and Parameterization of all Stabilizing Controllers K. YAMADA, T. MOKI	297
Convex Optimal Control Design Via Piecewise Linear Approximation S. HBAÏEB, S. FONT, P. BENDOTTI, C.-M. FALINOWER	303
On the Boundary Control of Beam Equation Ö. MORGÜL	309
Model Orientation and Well Conditioning of System Models: System and Control Issues N. KARCANIAS, K.G. VAFIADIS	315

## ***NONLINEAR OBSERVERS***

Nonlinear Observers Applied to the Control of an Overhead Crane E. ARANDA-BRICAIRE, C.P. GONZÁLEZ-INDA, F. PLESTAN, M. VELASCO-VILLA	321
Observer Design for a Three-Tank System M. HOU, Y.S. XIONG, R.J. PATTON	327
Order Extension of Nonlinear Systems for Observer Design Under Reduced Observability A. VARGAS, J. MORENO, M. ZEITZ	333
Observer Design for a Class of Nonlinear Systems - Application to an Induction Motor L. ROSSIGNOL, M. FARZA, M. M'SAAD, J.F. MASSIEU, R. ALVAREZ SALAS	339
Passivity and Unknown Input Observers for Nonlinear Systems E. ROCHA-CÓZATL, J. MORENO	345
Global Observability Analysis of Induction Motors Under Sensorless Conditions J. MORENO, G. ESPINOSA-PÉREZ, S. IBARRA-ROJAS	351

## ***NONLINEAR SYSTEMS***

Comparison of Analysis Methods for Discretized Non-Linear Control Laws with Small Control Delays G. HERRMANN, S.K. SPURGEON, C. EDWARDS	357
Bifurcation Tailoring of Nonlinear Systems X.F. WANG, M. DI BERNARDO, M.H. LOWENBERG, D.P. STOTEN, G. CHARLES	363
Robust Verification of Piecewise Affine Systems J. ROLL	369
Model-Based Nonlinear Control of a Low-Power Gas Turbine P. AILER, G. SZEDERKÉNYI, K.M. HANGOS	375
Polynomial Approximation Approach to Modelling and Control of pH Process K. STEBEL	381
A General Framework for Iterative Learning Control O. MARKUSSON, H. HJALMARSSON, M. NORRLÖF	387
Finite-Valued Control Law Synthesis for Nonlinear Uncertain Systems G. CELENTANO, R. IERVOLINO	393
The Lur'e Model for Neuronal Dynamics T. IWASAKI, M. ZHENG	399
State Dependent Differential Riccati Equation for Nonlinear Estimation and Control D.A. HAESSIG, B. FRIEDLAND	405
Observer-Based Controller for Induction Motors J. DE LEON-MORALES, R. ALVAREZ-SALAS, J.M. DION, L. DUGARD	411
A Framework for Disturbance Attenuation by Discontinuous Control H.W. KNOBLOCH, C. EBENBAUER, F. ALLGÖWER	417
Optimal Mixing by Feedback in Pipe Flow O.M. AAMO, A. BALOGH, M. KRSTIĆ	423
On Dynamic Phenomena in a DC-DC Boost Converter Subject to Variable Structure Control F.B. CUNHA, D.J. PAGANO	429
Global Reconstruction of Nonlinear Systems from Families of Linear Systems D.J. LEITH, W.E. LEITHEAD	435

State-Dependent Parameter Nonlinear Systems: Identification, Estimation and Control P.C. YOUNG, A.P. McCABE, A. CHOTAI	441
Separation Principle for a Class of Nonlinear Systems A.E. GOLUBEV, A.P. KRISHCHENKO, S.B. TKACHEV	447
Classical and Higher Symmetries of Control Systems V.N. CHETVERIKOV, A.N. KANATNIKOV, A.P. KRISHCHENKO	453
Slow Periodic Motions with Internal Sliding Modes in Variable Structure Systems L. FRIDMAN	459
Construction of Singular Surfaces in Multiple Integral Variational Problem A. MELIKYAN	465
Integrator Backstepping Using Contraction Theory: A Brief Methodological Note J. JOUFFROY, J. LOTTIN	471
Global Path-Tracking for a Multi-Steered General $N$ -Trailer R. OROSCO-GUERRERO, E. ARANDA-BRICAIRE, M. VELASCO-VILLA	477
Extremum Seeking Loop for a Class of Performance Functions F. NAJSON, J.L. SPEYER	483
Constant Output Tracking and Disturbance Rejection for Systems with Lipschitz Nonlinearities A.B. AÇIKMEŞE, M. CORLESS	489
Distributed Cooperative Control of Multiple Vehicle Formations Using Structural Potential Functions R. OLFATI-SABER, R.M. MURRAY	495
Output Maneuvering for a Class of Nonlinear Systems R. SKJETNE, T.I. FOSSEN, P. KOKOTOVIĆ	501
Internal Model Based Sensorless Control of a Class of Electrical Machines A. ASTOLFI, R. ORTEGA	507
Adaptive SPR Speed/Position Control of Induction Motor H.-T. LEE, L.-C. FU, S.-H. HSU	513
Observability Bifurcation Versus Observing Bifurcations L. BOUTAT-BADDAS, J.P. BARBOT, D. BOUTAT, R. TAULEIGNE	519
LFT Representations for Nonlinear Mechanical Systems J. LUO, P. TSIOTRAS	525
Author Index	531
Keyword Index	533

## RELATIONS BETWEEN STABLE PREDICTIVE CONTROL AND POLE PLACEMENT

M. Fikar\* H. Unbehauen\*\* J. Mikleš\*

\* *Department of Process Control, CHTF STU, Radlinského 9,  
SK-812 37 Bratislava, Slovakia,  
Tel : +421 2 53 25 366, Fax : +421 2 39 31 98  
E-mail: fikar@cvt.stuba.sk*

\*\* *Control Engineering Laboratory, Faculty of Electrical  
Engineering and Information Sciences, Ruhr-University Bochum,  
D44780 Universitätsstr. 150, Germany,  
Tel: ++49/234 32 28071, Fax: ++49/234 32 14101*

**Abstract:** In this paper, several relations between pole placement (PP) controller and unconstrained predictive controller are investigated. The placement of poles at certain positions leads to various types of time optimal control and has a direct relation to the choice of minimum control and output horizons for stabilising MPC. On the other hand, a predictive control method for linear systems is derived that can be turned into some well known stabilising MPC methods. This MPC method is closely related to the PP design. *Copyright © 2002 IFAC*

**Keywords:** Predictive control, stability, algebraic systems theory.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Generalised Predictive Control (GPC) proposed by (Clarke *et al.*, 1987) is nowadays an accepted control method capable to deal with constraints and difficult processes. To assure stability, a constraint on terminal states is to be imposed (Clarke and Scattolini, 1991; Mosca and Zhang, 1992; Rossiter and Kouvaritakis, 1993). It is well known that in the absence of inequality constraints the method generates a linear time-invariant controller.

The main idea of this paper is to show some relations between the stable predictive control design and pole placement.

Two approaches will be investigated. In the first one, closed-loop expressions for a stable two-degree-of-freedom controller are derived. Then, locations of closed-loop are examined that lead

to time optimal control and the relations to predictive control.

In the second approach, no degrees of freedom for the predictive controller will be assumed. The further assumption is to use an unconstrained controller. These assumptions will lead to a unique predictive control law. In the next step, a pole placement design will be invoked and it will be shown, that many well known predictive control schemes can be obtained for a particular closed-loop pole locations.

Finally, a cost function will be specified, that does not change the properties of the predictive controller when the degrees of freedom for optimisation change. This cost can be used if the performance is to be specified via the closed-loop poles.




Fig. 1. 2DoF control configuration with explicit integral action

## 2. CLOSED-LOOP SYSTEM

Let us consider a discrete-time plant with input-output representation of the form

$$Ay = Bu, \quad (1)$$

where  $y, u$  are the process output and manipulated input sequences, respectively.  $A$  and  $B$  are polynomials in  $z^{-1}$  that describe the input-output properties of the plant and  $(A, B)$  are coprime. It is assumed that  $A(0) \neq 0$  and  $B(0) = 0$  (all delays are included in  $B$ ).

We assume that the reference  $w$  is generated via

$$Fw = G, \quad (2)$$

where  $(F, G)$  are coprime.

The 2DoF controller is another dynamical system described by the equations

$$P\tilde{u} = Rw - Qy, \quad \tilde{u} = Fu, \quad (3)$$

where  $P, Q, R$  are controller polynomials that are coprime and  $P(0)$  is nonzero. In addition, an integrator forms a part of the controller to track the class of references given above. For the purpose of predictive control, the usual class of references – step changes will be assumed. Then  $F = 1 - z^{-1}$ ,  $G = 1$  and the signal  $\tilde{u} = \Delta u$  is a sequence of control increments.

This description of the closed-loop configuration is shown in Fig. 1.

Given a stable closed-loop polynomial  $M$ , the minimum degree controller that internally stabilises the closed-loop system is defined uniquely and is given as follows:

*Theorem 1.* The minimum degree controller  $P, Q, R$  is given as a solution of two Diophantine equations that minimise the degrees  $Q, R$

$$\begin{aligned} AFP + BQ &= M, \\ FS + BR &= M. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

**PROOF.** Kučera (1979).  $\square$

The general controller is uniquely characterised by the choice of the closed-loop polynomial  $M$ . Some choices of  $M$  that are important in time optimal control are given below:

*Theorem 2.* Consider step changes in references and the following closed-loop time optimal control problems for which BIBO stability is to be guaranteed:

- (1) State dead-beat: Minimum number of nonzero steps of control error, finite number of nonzero steps of control increments,
- (2) Control dead-beat: Minimum number of nonzero steps of control increments and stable control error,
- (3) Control error dead-beat: Minimum number of nonzero steps of control error and stable control increments.

The corresponding closed-loop polynomials and minimum degrees of relevant signals with 2DoF controller are

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= 1, \quad \deg(e) = \deg(B) - 1, \\ \deg(\tilde{u}) &= \deg(A), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$M_2 = A^+, \quad \deg(\tilde{u}) = \deg(A^-), \quad (6)$$

$$M_3 = B^+, \quad \deg(e) = \deg(B^-) - 1. \quad (7)$$

where  $A^+, B^+$  denote stable and  $A^-, B^-$  strictly unstable parts of the respective polynomials. The minimum number of nonzero steps of a signal is then given as one plus the respective polynomial degree.

**PROOF.**

- (1) (Kučera, 1979),
- (2) (Fikar and Kučera, 2000),
- (3) (Fikar and Unbehauen, 1999).  $\square$

The optimal pole locations are important for predictive control and have close relation to minimum possible horizons that produce stable closed-loop. It is well known that the predictive controllers have the structure of a 2DoF controller. If  $M = A^+$ , the minimum control horizon is equal to the number of unstable system poles  $\deg(A^-) + 1$  where the additional unstable pole comes from the integrator  $F$ . Correspondingly, the minimum output horizon cannot be smaller than the number of unstable system zeros which corresponds to the case of  $M = B^+$ .




Fig. 2. System decomposition

### 3. PREDICTIVE CONTROLLER

Predictive controllers usually operate on the signals  $\tilde{u}, e = w - y$ . These are given from (1)–(4) as

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{ARG}{M}, \quad e = \frac{SG}{M}. \quad (8)$$

If the predictive controller is to be equivalent to the nominal controller, it has to generate the signals  $\tilde{u}, e$  from its internal signals  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  by filtering through the term  $1/M$ . Moreover, the requirement of closed-loop stability invoked with the concept of state terminal constraints requires that the signals  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  are polynomials of finite length. This suggests the relations

$$\bar{u} = \frac{\bar{u}}{M}, \quad \deg(\bar{u}) = \deg(A), \quad (9)$$

$$e = \frac{\bar{e}}{M}, \quad \deg(\bar{e}) = \deg(B) - 1. \quad (10)$$

Clearly, the degrees of  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  are related here to the state dead-beat controller. However, further reduction of  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  is possible. This can be achieved by decomposing the controlled system to stable and anti-stable parts. Next, state dead-beat is applied to the unstable part. The result is given in Fig. 2 with

$$G_1 = \frac{M}{A^+}, \quad G_2 = \frac{B^-}{FA^-}, \quad G_3 = \frac{B^+}{M}, \quad (11)$$

hence we have the following result:

*Theorem 3.* Let us define the following signals

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{A^+}{M} \bar{u}, \quad \deg(\bar{u}) = N_u, \quad (12)$$

$$y = \frac{B^+}{M} \bar{y}, \quad \bar{e} = \bar{w} - \bar{y}, \quad \deg(\bar{e}) = N. \quad (13)$$

and horizons

$$N_u = \deg(A^-), \quad (14)$$

$$N = \deg(B^-) - 1, \quad (15)$$

$$m = \max(\deg(A^-F), \deg(B^-)). \quad (16)$$

The nominal controller given by the closed-loop polynomial  $M$  is equivalent to the predictive controller with no degrees of freedom given by the set of equality constraints

$$\bar{y}_{t+N+j} = \bar{w}_{t+N}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m \quad (17)$$

$$\bar{u}_{t+N_u+j} = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, N - N_u + m, \quad (18)$$

The internal sequence of control increments  $\bar{u}$  is calculated from

$$\mathbf{G}_1 \bar{\mathbf{u}} = \bar{\mathbf{w}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{f}}_1, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1 = \mathbf{G}_1 \bar{\mathbf{u}} + \bar{\mathbf{f}}_1, \quad (20)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T = (\bar{u}_t \ \bar{u}_{t+1} \ \dots \ \bar{u}_{t+N_u-1}), \quad (21)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1^T = (\bar{y}_{t+N} \ \bar{y}_{t+N+1} \ \dots \ \bar{y}_{t+N+m-1}), \quad (22)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{f}}_1^T = (\bar{f}_{t+N} \ \bar{f}_{t+N+1} \ \dots \ \bar{f}_{t+N+m-1}), \quad (23)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1^T = (1 \ \dots \ 1)M(1)/B^+(1) \quad (24)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} g_N & \dots & g_{N-m+1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_{N+m-1} & \dots & g_N \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

The actual control increment  $\tilde{u}(t)$  is calculated from (12) and applied to the controlled system in the receding horizon manner.

**PROOF.** For the minimum degrees of  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  consider state dead-beat control of the unstable system  $B^-/FA^-$ . From Theorem 2 follow the relations (14), (15). To force this dead-beat strategy in the predictive controller, the sequences  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  are required to be zero in  $(N, \infty)$ ,  $(N_u, \infty)$ , respectively. To assure this, define the state dimension  $m$  by (16). Then, the set of constraints (17), (18) guarantees zero sequences in the whole desired interval.

The unstable part  $B^-/FA^-$  of the system is linear and has the input  $\bar{u}$  and output  $\bar{y}$ . Hence, the equation (20) holds. The corresponding matrix  $\mathbf{G}_1$  and vector  $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_1$  can be calculated as usual from recursive Diophantine equations (Clarke *et al.*, 1987). Alternatively,  $\mathbf{G}_1$  is given from

$$\frac{B^-}{FA^-} = g_0 + g_1 z^{-1} + \dots + g_{N+m} z^{-(N+m)} + \dots \quad (26)$$

and  $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_1$  can be calculated as the unstable system response from given initial conditions considering  $\bar{u}(t+i) = 0, i \geq 0$ .

The sequence of internal future control increments  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  is then obtained from equality constraints (17) and yields (19). The matrix  $\mathbf{G}_1$  can be shown to be always invertible. The filtered reference sequence has to correspond to the filtered output from (13) and must be constant. This yields (24).

Finally, the choice of the closed loop poles is respected by the filtration of the internal signals by  $1/M$  and  $\tilde{u}, y$  are given by (12), (13).  $\square$

Table 1. Stabilising predictive strategies and the closed-loop poles

Authors	$G_1 \times G_2 \times G_3$	$M$
(Clarke and Scatoloni, 1991; Mosca and Zhang, 1992)	$1 \times \frac{B}{AF} \times 1$	1
(Rossiter and Kouvaritakis, 1993)	$\frac{1}{AF} \times 1 \times B$	1
(Rawlings and Muske, 1993)	$1 \times \frac{B}{FA^-} \times \frac{1}{A^+}$	$A^+$
(Rossiter <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	$\frac{B^+}{FA^-} \times 1 \times \frac{B^-}{A^+}$	$(AB)^+$
(Fikar and Unbehauen, 2000)	$\frac{B^+}{A^+} \times \frac{B^-}{FA^-} \times 1$	$B^+$
This approach	$\frac{M}{A^+} \times \frac{B^-}{FA^-} \times \frac{B^+}{M}$	$M$

### 3.1 Relation to other stabilising predictive strategies

A comparison of stable predictive control methods can be performed for the same conditions. One useful way is to consider all methods without any degrees of freedom. The incorporation of the cost function and its minimisation changes only the properties of such nominal controller.

We have the following results: The proposed controller can be turned into any other stable predictive controller given in Table 1 by a suitable choice of the closed-loop poles  $M$  shown in Table 1 and given in the next theorem.

*Theorem 4.* Consider the scheme in Fig. 2 where

$$G_1 = \frac{G_{1N}}{G_{1D}}, \quad G_2 = \frac{G_{2N}}{G_{2D}}, \quad G_3 = \frac{G_{3N}}{G_{3D}}. \quad (27)$$

Assume that  $\gcd(G_{1N}, G_{3D}) = M_0$ , thus

$$G_{1N} = M_0 \bar{G}_{1N}, \quad G_{3D} = M_0 \bar{G}_{3D}. \quad (28)$$

Then any predictive controller with no degrees of freedom and constraints (17), (18) is equivalent to the pole placement controller with poles

$$M = M_0 \bar{G}_{1N} \bar{G}_{3D}. \quad (29)$$

The predictive controller is stable if and only if  $M$  is stable.

**PROOF.** The predictive controller is stable if  $y, \tilde{u}$  are stable sequences (assuming regulation only for simplicity). The predictions are given as

$$y = \frac{G_{3N}}{G_{3D}} \bar{y}, \quad \tilde{u} = \frac{G_{1D}}{G_{1N}} \bar{u}. \quad (30)$$

Stability is then assured if  $G_{1N}, G_{3D}$  are both stable and if  $\bar{y}, \bar{u}$  are stable sequences. The second requirement is automatically satisfied as  $\bar{y}, \bar{u}$  are polynomials by assumption.

To derive the closed-loop poles we transform the predictions to have the same denominator

$$y = \frac{G_{3N} \bar{G}_{1N} M_0}{G_{3D} \bar{G}_{1N} M_0} \bar{y} = \frac{G_{3N} \bar{G}_{1N}}{M} \bar{y}, \quad (31)$$

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{G_{1D} \bar{G}_{3D} M_0}{G_{1N} \bar{G}_{3D} M_0} \bar{u} = \frac{G_{1D} \bar{G}_{3D}}{M} \bar{u}. \quad (32)$$

In order to arrive to the scheme in equation (11), the transfer function  $G_2$  is fixed as  $G_2 = B^-/FA^-$ . The transfer functions are constrained by the relation

$$\frac{B}{FA} = \frac{M}{G_{1D} \bar{G}_{3D}} \frac{B^-}{FA^-} \frac{G_{3N} \bar{G}_{1N}}{M} \quad (33)$$

or

$$\frac{B^+}{A^+} = \frac{G_{3N} \bar{G}_{1N}}{G_{1D} \bar{G}_{3D}}. \quad (34)$$

Taking into account possible common factor  $T$  in this fraction it finally yields

$$G_1 = \frac{M}{TA^+}, \quad G_3 = \frac{TB^+}{M}. \quad (35)$$

Conversely, one may start from a stable  $M$  and derive the condition that predictions are stable because  $G_{1N}, G_{3D}$  are stable.  $\square$

## 4. COST MINIMISATION

The natural way of obtaining the necessary degrees of freedom to minimise a cost function and to handle constraints is an assumption that the controller can act in more than  $N_u$  steps given by (14).

Let us define the following vectors and matrices

$$\bar{e} = \bar{w} - \bar{y}, \quad (36)$$

$$\bar{y}^T = (\bar{y}_{t+1} \ \bar{y}_{t+2} \ \dots \ \bar{y}_{t+N-1}), \quad (37)$$

$$\bar{f}^T = (\bar{f}_{t+1} \ \bar{f}_{t+2} \ \dots \ \bar{f}_{t+N-1}), \quad (38)$$

$$\bar{w}^T = (\bar{w}_{t+1} \ \bar{w}_{t+2} \ \dots \ \bar{w}_{t+N-1}), \quad (39)$$

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_{N-1} & \dots & g_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

with

$$\bar{y} = G\bar{u} + \bar{f}. \quad (41)$$

*Theorem 5.* Consider the predictive controller described in the Theorem 3. Introduce the number of degrees of freedom  $n > 0$  and define the horizons

$$\bar{N}_u = N_u + n, \quad \bar{N} = N + n. \quad (42)$$

Let us minimise the following cost function with  $W_e > 0$  and/or  $W_u > 0$

$$J = \bar{e}^T W_e \bar{e} + \bar{u}^T W_u \bar{u} \quad (43)$$

subject to the equality constraints (17), (18) and possible inequality constraints

$$A\bar{u} \geq b. \quad (44)$$

If the optimisation problem is feasible then the predictive controller is stabilising for any  $n$ .

**PROOF.** Provided the signals  $\bar{u}, \bar{e}$  are polynomials, the cost function  $J$  forms the standard Lyapunov function for which stability proofs are available.  $\square$

Let us now consider the “nominal” predictive controller, e.g. the task is to construct a controller with  $n > 0$  such that in the unconstrained case its control actions are those of the nominal controller with  $n = 0$  if the future setpoint is constant.

It can be shown (Fikar and Unbehauen, 1999) that such a controller is equivalent to the choice of the weights

$$W_e = \langle X_e \rangle, W_u = 0, \quad (45)$$

where  $X_e$  is given by the solution of the spectral factorisation

$$B^* B = M_1^* M_1, \quad (46)$$

and the Diophantine equation

$$\frac{B_+^* B_+}{M_1^* M_1} P_{N+n}^* P_{N+n} = \frac{X_e}{M_1} + \frac{Y_e^*}{M_1^*}, \langle Y_e^* \rangle = 0, \quad (47)$$

where

$$P_{N+n}(z^{-1}) = (1 z^{-1} \dots z^{-(N+n)}). \quad (48)$$

## 5. DISCUSSION

In this section we will show some simulation results related to the topics presented. Control of the following discrete system is considered

$$G = \frac{B^+ B^-}{A^+ A^-} = \frac{[(1 + 0.25z^{-1})][z^{-1}(1 + 4z^{-1})]}{[(1 + 0.2z^{-1})^2](1 + 5z^{-1})}. \quad (49)$$

In the first simulation we show the effect of the three optimal pole locations in pole placement control design as specified in Theorem 2. The results given in Fig. 3 can equivalently be obtained by the proposed predictive controller. In the latter case arbitrary  $n > 0$  can be used with the “nominal” predictive controller and assuming that the future setpoint is constant.

If the future setpoint is known, the actions of the pole placement and predictive controller are no longer the same. Consider for example the case  $M = B^+$  (control error dead-beat) shown in Fig. 4. The solid line corresponds to the previous simulation, the dotted line to the predictive controller with  $n = 8$  degrees of freedom. The predictive controller starts its actions before the actual setpoint change and thus obtains faster output response. Note, that also in this case the requirement of the control error dead-beat is satisfied even if the cost function is minimised.




Fig. 3. Effect of the closed-loop poles, time optimal control




Fig. 4. Effect of the knowledge about the future setpoint

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has discussed some relations between pole placement and predictive control design.

From the PP point of view, the results obtained for three typical time optimal control strategies can be linked to the minimum control and output horizons for stable predictive control. To be more specific, the minimum control horizon has to be greater or equal to the number of unstable poles of the system and the reference, and the minimum output horizon has to be greater or equal to the number of unstable zeros of the system. Although some of these results have been discovered in MPC, here they are obtained from the closed-loop assumptions.

From the MPC point of view, a general formulation has been proposed that links some stable MPC strategies together via the choice of the closed-loop polynomial  $M$ . Again, some of the results have been known before, here they are obtained from different assumptions.

The choice of the cost function, that produces the nominal PP controller in unconstrained case has been given. This holds if assuming unknown future setpoint sequence.

Finally some simulations have been presented to illustrate the ideas of the paper.

#### Acknowledgments

Part of this work has been supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation that has enabled the first author to stay in Bochum. The first and the third author have been supported by VEGA MSSR (grants no. 1/7337/20 and 1/8108/01). This support is very gratefully acknowledged.

#### 7. REFERENCES

- Clarke, D. W. and R. Scattolini (1991). Constrained receding-horizon predictive control. *IEE Proc. D* **138**(4), 347 – 354.
- Clarke, D. W., C. Mohtadi and P. S. Tuffs (1987). Generalized predictive control - part I. The basic algorithm. *Automatica* **23**(2), 137 – 148.
- Fikar, M. and H. Unbehauen (1999). Some new results in linear predictive control. Technical report MF9902. Control Engineering Laboratory, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany.
- Fikar, M. and H. Unbehauen (2000). Polynomial approach to constrained receding horizon predictive control. In: *IFAC Conference CSD 2000, June 18-20, Bratislava, Slovakia*. pp. 247 – 252.
- Fikar, M. and V. Kučera (2000). On minimum finite length control problem. *Int. J. Control* **73**(2), 152 – 158.
- Kučera, V. (1979). *Discrete Linear Control: The Polynomial Equation Approach*. Wiley. Chichester.
- Mosca, E. and J. Zhang (1992). Stable redesign of predictive control. *Automatica* **28**, 1229 – 1233.
- Rawlings, J. B. and K. R. Muske (1993). The stability of constrained receding horizon control. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control* **38**(10), 1512 – 1516.
- Rossiter, J. A. and B. Kouvaritakis (1993). Constrained stable generalised predictive control. *IEE Proc. D* **140**(4), 243 – 254.
- Rossiter, J. A., J. R. Gossner and B. Kouvaritakis (1996). Infinite horizon stable predictive control. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control* **41**(10), 1522 – 1527.