Iterative learning control for singularly perturbed systems

Konstantin E. Avrachenkov [1] Anatoly A. Pervozvanski [2]

Abstract

The singularly perturbed systems are described by differential equations with a small parameter near higher derivatives. It turns out that most of known iterative learning control algorithms diverge in the presence of singular perturbations. The aim of the present paper is to construct learning control algorithms that are able to overcome this problem. Our approach is based on weak convergence conditions that take into account the whole range of frequency response characteristic in contrast to traditional convergence conditions based on the rough H_∞ norm. The first two proposed methods employ the analog and digital filtering. Whereas the learning operator of the third method approximates the inverse of the regular part of the system and at the same time appears to be a low-pass filter. The simulation of the algorithms for a benchmark model confirms all theoretical considerations.

Key words: iterative learning control, singular perturbations, filtering.

1 Introduction

In this paper we investigate the convergence of learning control algorithms in the presence of singular perturbations. By singular perturbations we mean the perturbations that cause the increase of system dimension. In particular, if a system is described by differential equations, then the singular perturbations are usually represented by some small parameters near higher derivatives. For example, a robotic manipulator with flexible joints which have large stiffness coefficients can be considered as the case of singular perturbations. In this instance the small parameters near higher derivatives are the inverse values of stiffness coefficients. The trajectories of singularly perturbed systems always consist of slow and fast motions. The slow motions correspond to the behaviour of the unperturbed system. Note that in contrast to the singular perturbations, the regular perturbations do not lead to the rise of system dimension and therefore cannot change dramatically the behaviour of the system [16]. Most learning control algorithms (see extensive surveys [3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14]) are designed to overcome regular perturbations but only few of them, if any, are able to cope with singular perturbations. The existent learning control algorithms actually magnify the amplitude of high-frequency oscillations which are generated by the singular part of the system. The purpose of the present paper is to develop the learning control algorithms that are able to handle the challenging case of singular perturbations. Our approach is based on weak convergence conditions which take into account the whole range of frequency response characteristic. Another main point of our research is that we consider the convergence of the error to some domain rather than to the zero level. Indeed, as pointed out by most authors working in the applied field of iterative learning control, we never achieve the convergence to zero in practice. Of course, one can explain this by the presence of stochastic noise in the measurements. The other explanation for this phenomenon can be singular perturbations. It is interesting that both stochastic noise and singular perturbations are represented by high-frequency oscillations. Hence an algorithm which converges in the presence of singular perturbations will also suppress the high-frequency stochastic noise. In the next section we briefly review the standard and weak convergence conditions for the iterative learning control of linear systems.

2 Convergence conditions

Let us consider a linear cyclically working system described in terms of Laplace transform

$$y_k(s) = H_{yu}(s)u_k(s), \quad k = 0, 1, ..., \tag{1}$$

where $H_{yu}(s)$ is a transfer function of the system, k is a cycle number, and $u_k(s), y_k(s)$ are the Laplace transforms of the control and the output of the system at the k-th cycle, respectively. Without loss of generality we can assume zero initial conditions.

The aim of the iterative learning control is to decrease successively the error

$$z_k(t) = y_k(t) - y_d(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad k = 0, 1, ...,$$

where $y^d(t)$ is the desired output of the system and T is the cycle duration. The linear learning control

[1] School of Mathematics, The University of South Australia, The Levels, SA 5095, Australia, e-mail: matkea@zarniwoop.levels.unisa.edu.au

[2] Department of Mechanics and Control Processes, St.Petersburg State Technical University, St.Petersburg, Russia, e-mail: control2@citadel.stu.neva.ru

algorithm is the iterative procedure defined as follows:

$$u_{k+1}(s) = u_k(s) - L(s)z_k(s), \quad k = 0, 1, ..., \tag{2}$$

where $L(s)$ is a linear *learning operator*, and $u_0(s)$ is the Laplace transform of an arbitrary control at the first cycle. It is easy to show that the following recurrent equation takes place.

$$z_{k+1}(s) = [I - H_{yu}(s)L(s)]z_k(s), \quad k = 0, 1, ... \tag{3}$$

Let us denote $A(s) := I - H_{yu}(s)L(s)$. By employing $\mathcal{H}_\infty$- and $\mathcal{L}_2$-norms [4], we obtain

$$||z_{k+1}(t)||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq ||A(s)||_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} ||z_k(t)||_{\mathcal{L}_2}.$$

The above inequality leads to the *standard* convergence conditions for iterative learning procedure (2).

Theorem 1 *Let $A(s) \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$, i.e. $\sup_\omega \sigma_{max}\{A(i\omega)\}$ is bounded ($\sigma_{max}\{M\}$ is a maximal singular eigenvalue of M), and*

$$||A(s)||_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < 1. \tag{4}$$

Then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} ||x_k(t)||^2_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^T ||x_k(t)||^2 dt = 0.$$

In particular, this theorem implies that the learning operator $L(s)$ has to be chosen as close to $H_{yu}^{-1}(s)$ as possible. This fact is referred to as the *inverse operator principle* [13, 14]. Unfortunately, this criterion can not be satisfied in the case of singular perturbations. For example, in SISO case condition (4) can be written as

$$\sup_{\omega\in[0,\infty)} |1 - H_{yu}(i\omega)L(i\omega)| < 1 \tag{5}$$

This condition can be satisfied only if the difference between the degrees of numerator and denominator of $L(s)$ is precisely equal to the difference between the degrees of denominator and numerator of $H_{yu}(s)$. However, if the system is singularly perturbed, then there are some higher power terms in the denominator of $H_{yu}(i\omega)$ that we did not take into account. Hence $H_{yu}(i\omega)L(i\omega) \to 0$ and $|1 - H_{yu}(i\omega)L(i\omega)| \to 1$ as $\omega \to \infty$, and consequently condition (5) is violated. On the other hand, it is obvious that (4) is only *sufficient* condition, so that the learning procedure can converge even if the condition (4) is not satisfied. This prompts us to obtain weaker sufficient conditions for the convergence of learning procedure (2). A variant of such *weak* convergence conditions [15] is stated in the next theorem.

Theorem 2 *Let the following conditions hold:*

(i) $x_0(t) \in \mathcal{L}_2[0, T]$

(ii) $||A(s)||_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \sup_\omega \sigma_{max}\{A(i\omega)\} \leq 1,$

(iii) *$\sigma_{max}\{A(i\omega)\}$ has a countable number of local maxima (including the infinite point).*

Then, the iterative learning procedure converges to zero in $\mathcal{L}_2$-norm, namely

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|x_k(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2} = 0.$$

Moreover, if condition (iii) is satisfied everywhere with the exception of domain $\overline{\Omega}$, where $\sigma_{max}\{A(i\omega)\} = 1$, then the error of learning control algorithm (2) converges to some non-zero level bounded by

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|x_k(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \|X_0(i\omega)\|^2 \, d\omega,$$

where $X_0(s)$ is the Laplace transform of $x_0(t)$.

These conditions except the last statement of the theorem were also studied in [1, 12]. Note that in contrast to Theorem 1 the conditions of Theorem 2 do not guarantee the linear rate of convergence.

Now let us present an illustrative example of learning control algorithm for the benchmark model. This algorithm satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2 but violates the restrictive condition (4). The benchmark model, which we shall use throughout this paper, is described by the following differential equations.

$$\begin{cases} J_1\ddot{q}_{1k} + b(\dot{q}_{1k} - \dot{q}_{2k}) + c(q_{1k} - q_{2k}) = u_k \\ J_2\ddot{q}_{2k} + b(\dot{q}_{2k} - \dot{q}_{1k}) + c(q_{2k} - q_{1k}) = 0 \\ u_k = -k_1\dot{z}_{1k} - k_0 z_{1k} + v_k \\ z_{1k,2k} = q_{1k,2k} - q_d, \quad y_k = q_{2k} \end{cases}$$

The transfer function of this system $H_{yv}(s)$ is given by

$$\frac{bs + c}{J_2s^2[J_1s^2 + k_1s + k_0] + [(J_1 + J_2)s^2 + k_1s + k_0](bs + c)}.$$

Now let us consider the learning control algorithm

$$v_{k+1} = v_k - L(s)z_{2k},$$

with the learning operator in the form

$$L(s) = \frac{k_0}{\omega_*^2}[s^2 + 2\nu s + (\omega_*^2 + \nu^2)],$$

where $\omega_*^2 \approx c/J_2$ and $\nu \approx b$. It is easy to see that $H_{yv}(i\omega)L(i\omega) = O(1/\omega)$, when $\omega \to \infty$, and hence the condition (4) of Theorem 1 is violated. On the other hand one can check (for example, by ploting frequency response for some values of parameters) that the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied, if ω_*^2 and ν are sufficiently close to c/J_2 and b, respectively. The numerical simulations also confirm the convergence of the proposed learning control algorithm. Unfortunately, this algorithm is not very robust in respect to the perturbations of parameter c. Moreover, the algorithm will be divergent if we consider the three-mass model instead of the present two-mass model. Namely, it is not robust in respect to higher order singular perturbations. The latter forces us to seek algorithms which will be robust in respect to the singular perturbations of any order.

3 Learning algorithms with filtration

In this section we construct robust learning control algorithms based on analog and digital filtration. Namely, instead of algorithm (2) let us consider the following modification

$$u_{k+1}(s) = F(s)[u_k(s) - L(s)z_k(s)], \quad k = 0, 1, ..., \tag{6}$$

where $F(s)$ is the transfer function of some filter. Even though the above learning control algorithm has been already analysed in a number of papers [5, 8, 12, 18], only its simplest variant ($F(s) \equiv \gamma$, $0 < \gamma < 1$) [2, 17] was used to construct algorithms that are able to overcome structural uncertainty which leads to the increase of system dimension. One can easily formulate the standard and weak convergence conditions for the learning procedure (6) similar to Theorems 1 and 2. For example, the standard convergence conditions take the form.

Theorem 3 *Let $F(s), L(s) \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ and*

$$||F(s)[I - H_{yu}(s)L(s)]||_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < 1. \tag{7}$$

Then, the error of the iterative learning procedure (6) converges to some non-zero level with transfer function

$$z_*(s) = (I - F(s)[I - H_{yu}(s)L(s)])^{-1}(F(s) - I)y_d(s)$$

In the presence of singular perturbations the frequency response characteristic of the transfer function $I - H_{yu}(s)L(s)$ has one or more picks in high-frequency domain. The magnitude of these picks usually greater than unity level, and hence the conditions of Theorem 1 and 2 are violated. This means that the high-frequency part of the error will increase after each iteration and the learning procedure will inevitably diverge starting from some iteration. On the other hand, using the modified learning procedure (6) with $F(s)$ as a low-pass filter, we can easily satisfy convergence condition (7). Of course, we have to pay a price for that. Namely, the error will converge to the non-zero limiting error $z_*(s)$. The limiting error level depends on the choice of $F(s)$ and $L(s)$. Suppose we take $L(s)$ which approximates well $H_{yu}^{-1}(s)$ in the frequency range $[0, \overline{\omega}]$. Then, the cutoff frequency ω_f of the low-pass filter $F(s)$ has to be chosen so that $\omega_f < \overline{\omega}$. For example, in the case of our benchmark model we chose the cutoff frequency in the interval $(\sqrt{k_0/(J_1+J_2)}, \sqrt{c(J_1+J_2)/J_1J_2})$. We have tested the modified learning control algorithm (6) with two simple low-pass filters. The transfer function of the analog filter has the form

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{s/\omega_f + 1},$$

where w_f is a cutoff frequency of the filter. The digital filter that we have studied is given by the convolution

$$y(t) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^T \frac{\sin(\omega_f(t-\tau))}{t-\tau}x(\tau)d\tau, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Note that the Fourier transform of the function $\sin(\omega_f t)/\pi t$ is the rectangular pulse from $-\omega_f$ to ω_f of height 1. The modified learning control algorithm based on the digital filtration has much better performance than the algorithm based on the analog filtration.

4 Learning operator with properties of low-pass filter

From the results of the previous section we conclude that it is necessary to use low-pass filtering in the presence of singular perturbations. In this section we propose the learning operator that in the same time appears to be a low-pass filter. This learning operator approximates only the system regular part whose principal structure is known. It can be represented by the following convolution

$$u_{k+1}(t) = u_k(t) - \int_0^T f(t-\tau)z_k(\tau)d\tau, \quad t \in [0; T], \tag{8}$$

where the weight function $f(t)$ is given by

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\overline{\omega}}^{+\overline{\omega}} \widehat{H}_{yu}^{-1}(i\omega)e^{i\omega t}d\omega, \quad t \in [-T; +T], \tag{9}$$

The convergence condition of the above algorithm is stated in the next theorem [15].

Theorem 4 *Let $\widehat{H}_{yu}(s)$ be an approximation of the system transfer function $H_{yu}(s)$ in the frequency range $[0, \bar{\omega}]$ and let the following condition hold*

$$\sup_{\omega \in [0, \bar{\omega}]} |1 - H_{yu}(i\omega)\widehat{H}_{yu}(i\omega)| < 1. \tag{10}$$

Then the error of the iterative learning procedure defined by (8) and (9) converges to the limiting error $z_*(t), t \in [0,T]$ bounded by

$$\|z_*(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\bar{\omega}}^{\infty} |Z_0(i\omega)|^2 d\omega$$

The proof of this theorem follows from the last statement of Theorem 2. We would like to emphasize that the weight function $f(t)$ can be computed beforehand and the proposed algorithm does not demand any differentiation. Note that in this case only the high-frequency part of the initial error $z_0(t)$ contributes to the level of the limiting error. Hence the limiting error can be made small by choosing the desired output $y_d(t)$ as a smooth function. The choice of $\bar{\omega}$ is ascertained by condition (10) and the tolerance for the limiting error. Finally we verify the convergence of the proposed algorithm by simulating it on the Benchmark model. In this case we again choose parameter $\bar{\omega}$ from the interval $(\sqrt{k_0/(J_1+J_2)}, \sqrt{c(J_1+J_2)/J_1J_2})$.

References

[1] N. Amann, D.H. Owens, E. Rogers, and A. Wahl, "An H_∞ approach to linear iterative learning control design", *Int. J. Adap. Contr. and Sign. Process.*, v.10, 1996, pp. 767-781.

[2] N. Amann, D.H. Owens and E. Rogers, "Iterative learning control using optimal feedback and feedforward actions", *Int. J. Contr.*, v. 65, no. 2, 1996, pp. 277-293.

[3] S. Arimoto, S. Kawamura, and F. Miyazaki, "Bettering operation of robots by learning", *Journal of Robotic Systems*, v. 1, 1984, pp. 123-140.

[4] B.A. Francis, *A Course in $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ Control Theory*, LNCIS, Springer-Verlag , 1988.

[5] S. Hara, Y. Yamamoto, T. Omata and M. Nakano, "Repetitive control systems: a new type servo system for periodic exogenous signal", *IEEE Trans. Auto. Contr.*, AC-33, pp. 659-668, 1988.

[6] V. Katkovnik and A. Pervozvanski, "Extremum search methods and multivariable control systems", *Journal of Cybernetics*, v. 3, no. 2, 1973, pp. 81-101.

[7] R.W. Longman, "Design methodologies in learning and repetitive control", in *Proceedings of the 2nd Asian Control Conference*, Seoul, Korea, July 1997.

[8] T. Mita and E. Kato, "Iterative control and its application to motion control of robot arm: a direct approach to servo-problems", *Proc. 24th IEEE CDC*, December 1985, pp. 1393-1398.

[9] K.L. Moore, *Iterative learning control for deterministic systems*, London, U.K.: Springer-Verlag, Advances in Industrial Control, 1993.

[10] K.L. Moore, "Iterative learning control – an expository overview", *Technical Report 97/98 002*, September 1997, (to appear in *Applied and Computational Controls, Signal Processing, and Circuits*).

[11] D.H. Owens, N. Amann, and E. Rogers, "Iterative learning control – an overview of recent algorithms", *Applied Mathematics and Computer Science*, v. 5, no.3, 1995, pp. 425-438.

[12] F. Padieu and R. Su, "An H_∞ approach to learning control systems", *Int. J. Adap. Contr. and Sign. Process.*, v.4, pp. 465-474, 1990.

[13] A.A. Pervozvanskii, "Learning control and its applications. Part 1. Elements of general theory", *Avtomatika i telemekhanika*, no. 11, 1995. Engl. transl. in *Automation and Remote Control.*

[14] A.A. Pervozvanskii, "Learning control and its applications. Part 2. Frobenious systems and learning control for robot-manipulators", *Avtomatika i telemekhanika*, no. 12, 1995. Engl. transl. in *Automation and Remote Control.*

[15] A.A. Pervozvanskii and K.E. Avrachenkov, "Learning control algorithms: convergence and robustness", in *Proceedings of the 1997 Australian Control Conference*, pp. 366-371.

[16] A.B. Vasileva and V.F. Butuzov, *Asymptotic expansions for solutions of singularly perturbed systems*, Nauka, Moscow, 1973.

[17] D. Wang, "A simple iterative learning controller for manipulators with flexible joints", *Automatica*, v. 31, no. 9, 1995, pp. 1341-1344.

[18] Y. Yamamoto, "Learning control and related problems in infinite-dimensional systems", in *Essays on Control*, eds. H.L.Trentelman and J.C. Willems, Birkhauser, 1993.