

COMMENT ON THE REMARK BY G.A. KURINA ON THE PAPER (Müller, 1998)

PETER C. MÜLLER*

* Safety Control Engineering, University of Wuppertal
D-42097 Wuppertal, Germany
e-mail: mueller@srm.uni-wuppertal.de

The author of the paper (Müller, 1998) thanks very much for the valuable remark by G.A. Kurina (see this issue). Her result (Kurina, 1993) simplifies the design of linear-quadratic optimal control, particularly for non-proper linear time-invariant descriptor systems.

The result in (Müller, 1998) is based on a more general approach to adapting the calculus of variations and Pontryagin's maximum principle to descriptor systems, even for nonlinear problems. There, the distinction between proper and non-proper system behaviour is required to formulate correctly the optimization problem with respect to higher-order time derivatives of control inputs which appear in the solution of differential-algebraic equations in the non-proper case (let us remark that in (Müller, 1998) the notions of causal and non-causal system behaviour were used. This is correct for discrete-time systems but not for continuous-time systems. Therefore, it is better to use the notions of proper and non-proper systems instead of causal and non-causal ones). From this point of view, in the second approach in (Müller, 1998) it was necessary to introduce the extension (87) to handle correctly time-derivatives to the control input u .

The result (91) of (Müller, 1998) fully coincides with the result (11) of (Kurina, 2002) for the assumed parameters (10). Equation (91) of (Müller, 1998) leads to

$$\ddot{u} = -k_1 \dot{u} - (1 + k_2) u, \quad (1)$$

using k_1 , and k_2 of (Kurina, 2002). Since in this example we have the relations

$$u = -x_3, \quad \dot{u} = -x_2, \quad \ddot{u} = -u - x_1 = x_3 - x_1, \quad (2)$$

equation (1) can be rewritten as

$$u = x_1 + k_1 x_2 + (k_2 - 1) x_3, \quad (3)$$

which coincides with (11) from (Kurina, 2002) for $k_4 = -1$.

Additionally, (1) and (2) lead to the requirement

$$0 = x_1 + k_1 x_2 + k_2 x_3 \quad (4)$$

such that by subtracting (4) twice from (3),

$$u = -x_1 - k_1 x_2 - (k_2 + 1) x_3 \quad (5)$$

is obtained, which coincides with (11) from (Kurina, 2002) for $k_4 = 1$.

Because of (4), the static state feedback (3) or (5) is not unique. For each m , the feedback

$$u = (1 + m) x_1 + (1 + m) k_1 x_2 + [(1 + m) k_2 - 1] x_3 \quad (6)$$

is feasible. But the filter (1) with the initial conditions $u(0) = -x_{30}$ and $\dot{u}(0) = -x_{20}$ defines a unique dynamic feedback for the descriptor system. The consistent initial condition x_{10} has to satisfy (4) for $t = 0$. Therefore, the author prefers the realization of feedback control by the filter (1).

The last remark corresponds to a correction in (Müller, 1998). The formula (92) has to be corrected into

$$P_{12} = -q_1 b_1 b_3 + \sqrt{(q_1 b_3^2 + r_3) [q_1 b_1^2 + q_2 b_2^2 + q_3 b_3^2 + r_1]}. \quad (7)$$

References

- Kurina G.A. (1993): *On regulating by descriptor systems in an infinite interval*. — Izvestija RAN, Tekhnicheskaja Kibernetika, No. 6, pp. 33–38 (in Russian).
- Kurina G.A. (2002): *Optimal feedback control proportional to the system state can be found for non-causal descriptor systems (A remark on a paper by P.C. Müller)*. — This issue.
- Müller P.C. (1998): *Stability and optimal control of nonlinear descriptor systems: A survey*. — Appl. Math. Comput. Sci., Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 269–286.