- 1. (3.28)
  - (a) We first derive the model when L is negligible. The derivation is identical as that of the Ex 2.1 in the text up to

$$\dot{\omega} = rac{NK_m}{J_e}i - rac{T_L}{J_e}.$$

Then, we have

$$i=rac{v-K_m\omega_m}{R}=rac{v}{R}-rac{NK_m\omega}{R}$$

So,

$$\dot{\omega} = -rac{N^2 K_m^2}{R J_e} \omega + rac{N K_m}{R J_e} v - rac{T_L}{J_e}.$$

The state equations are

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \theta \\ \omega \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -\frac{N^2 K_m^2}{R J_e} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \theta \\ \omega \end{array} \right] + \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{N K_m}{R J_e} & -\frac{1}{J_e} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} v \\ T_L \end{array} \right]$$

When we have only control input v, then the controllability matrix  $\mathbb{C}$  is

$$\mathbb{C} = \begin{bmatrix} B & AB \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{NK_m}{RJ_e} \\ \frac{NK_m}{RJ_e} & -\frac{N^3K_m^3}{R^2J_e^2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is clear that  $rank(\mathbb{C}) = 2$ , so the system is controllable from input v.

## (b) Assess observability

i. Output is  $\theta$ , then  $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and the observability matrix is

$$\mathbb{O} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

 $rank(\mathbb{O}) = 2$ , so observable.

ii. Output is  $\omega$ , then  $C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  and the observability matrix is

$$\mathbb{O} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -\frac{N^2 K_m^2}{R J_e} \end{bmatrix}$$

 $rank(\mathbb{O}) = 1$ , so unobservable.

In this case vector  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$  is unobservable, this vector is the eigenvector of *A* corresponding to the eigenvalue 0, so mode 0 is unobservable.

2. (3.29) The rank of the controllability matrix is 5, so controllable. With  $\theta_2$  as output, the observability matrix has full rank, so observable. With  $\theta_1$  as output, the observability matrix has full rank too, so observable as well. Clearly, also observable with both  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  as output.

From Problem 3.14, we know the denominators of both transfer functions are identical with order 5. Since the dimension of *A* is 5, this means that the state space models are minimal realization of corresponding transfer functions, so it much be both controllable and observable.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Please email Chunkai at ckgao@engr.ucsb.edu if you find any typos in the solutions. Thanks.

3. (3.55)

(a) Give realizations in controllable canonical form for  $\mathbb{S}_1$ 

$$\dot{x_1} = \left[ egin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \ 1 & 0 \end{array} 
ight] x_1 \ + \ \left[ egin{array}{cc} 0 \ 1 \end{array} 
ight] u \ y = \left[ egin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \end{array} 
ight] x_1 \end{array}$$

for  $\mathbb{S}_2$ 

$$\dot{x_2} = \left[egin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \ -1 & -1 \end{array}
ight] x_1 \ + \ \left[egin{array}{cc} 0 \ 1 \end{array}
ight] u \ y = \left[egin{array}{cc} -2 & 2 \end{array}
ight] x_2$$

(b) A realization for the composite system

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u$$
$$y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -2 & 2 \end{bmatrix} x$$

(c) Not minimal, since  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  cancels (s - 1) term. The observability matrix has rank=3, so unobservable. The mode s = 1 is the unobservable mode.

4. (3.59)

(a) The controllability matrix is

$$\mathbb{C} = \left( \begin{array}{rrr} 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

Since the sum of the columns is zero,  $\mathbb{C}$  is singular, so uncontrollable. The vector  $x^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T$  is an uncontrollable state.  $x^*$  should be an eigenvector of  $A^T$ :

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrr} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}\right)$$

So the uncontrollable mode is s = 1. Since s = 1 > 0 is the mode, the system is not internally stable. (b) Calculate the transfer function y/u

$$sI - A = \begin{pmatrix} s & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & s & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & s \end{pmatrix}$$
  
$$(sI - A)^{-1} = \frac{1}{s^3 - 1} \begin{pmatrix} s^2 & * & 1 \\ 1 & * & s \\ s & * & s^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
  
$$H(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B = \frac{1}{s^3 - 1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -0.5 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s^2 - 1 \\ 1 - s \\ s - s^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
  
$$= \frac{2s^2 - 0.5s - 1.5}{s^3 - 1} = \frac{(s - 1)(2s + 1.5)}{(s - 1)(s^2 + s + 1)} = \frac{2s + 1.5}{s^2 + s + 1}.$$

All LHP poles, so input-output stable.

(c) With  $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T$ ,

$$H(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B = \frac{1}{s^3 - 1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -0.5 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s \\ s^2 & s^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \frac{-s^2 - 0.5s + 1}{(s - 1)(s^2 + s + 1)}.$$

Since we have pole s = 1 on the RHP, the transfer function y/w is not input-output stable.

## 5. (7.10) NEXT PAGE

Phb. 7.10

$$\frac{d}{dr} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -2.214 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 3.65 \end{bmatrix} f$$

$$\Rightarrow I - \theta + \frac{b}{2} \frac{h^{T}}{2} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -1 \\ 0 & 5+2.244 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 3.65 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & k_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -1 \\ +3.65 h & 5+2.144 + 3.65 h \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{dr}{2} = \frac{5^{2}}{4} + \frac{5}{2} (2.214 + 3.65 h) + 3.65 h \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{dr}{2} = \frac{5^{2}}{4} + \frac{1.414}{4} \frac{4}{4} \frac{5}{5} + \frac{10^{2}}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2} = \frac{40^{2}}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{3.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{2.2144}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{2.2144}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{2.2144}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{2.2144}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

$$\frac{k_2}{2.2144}$$

$$\frac{k_1}{2.65}$$

Larger with increasing Wo, since ki, he increase