stichting
mathematisch
centrum

AFDELING MATHEMATISCHE BESLISKUNDE BW 169/82 OKTOBER
(DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH)

H. NIJMEIJER

FEEDBACK DECOMPOSITION OF NONLINEAR CONTROL SYSTEMS

Preprint

kruislaan 413 1098 SJ amsterdam

Printed at the Mathematical Centre, 413 Kruislaan, Amsterdam.

The Mathematical Centre, founded the 11-th of February 1946, is a non-profit institution aiming at the promotion of pure mathematics and its applications. It is sponsored by the Netherlands Government through the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

1980 Mathematics subject classification: 93C10, 49E15

Feedback decomposition of nonlinear control systems*)

by

H. Nijmeijer

ABSTRACT

By using the recently developed (differential) geometric approach to nonlinear systems a feedback decomposition for nonlinear control systems is derived.

KEY WORDS & PHRASES: *nonlinear control systems; differential geometric methods; controllability distributions; parallel decomposition*

---

*) This report will be submitted for publication elsewhere.

1. Introduction

Consider a control system of the form

$$(1.1a) \qquad \dot{x} = A(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} B_i(x)u_i$$

$$(1.1b) \qquad z_i = H_i(x) \quad , \quad i = 1,\ldots,m$$

where x are local coordinates of a smooth n-dimensional manifold M, $A,B_1,\ldots,B_m$ are smooth vector fields on M and $H_i : M \to N_i$ is a smooth output map from M to a smooth p_i-($p_i \geq 1$) dimensional manifold N_i for $i = 1,\ldots,m$. We assume that each H_i, $i = 1,\ldots,m$, is a surjective submersion. Furthermore we will assume that the system (1.1a) is strongly accessible (see [12]).
In this note we will study the *static state feedback noninteracting control problem.* That is, see [4], we seek a control law of the form

$$(1.2) \qquad u = \alpha(x) + \beta(x)v$$

where $\alpha : M \to \mathbb{R}^m$, $\beta : M \to \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ are smooth maps, $\beta(x) = (\beta_{ij}(x))$ is nonsingular for all x in M and $v = (v_1,\ldots,v_m)^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $\tilde{A}(x) = A(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} B_i(x)\alpha_i(x)$ and $\tilde{B}_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} B_j(x)\beta_{ji}(x)$. Then in suitable local coordinates the modified dynamics $\dot{x} = \tilde{A}(x) + \sum_{i=a}^{m} \tilde{B}_i(x)v_i$ should read

$$(1.3a) \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \dot{x}_m \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}_1(x_1) \\ \tilde{A}_2(x_2) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{A}_m(x_m) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{B}_1(x_1) & & & 0 \\ & \tilde{B}_2(x_2) & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & \tilde{B}_m(x_m) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_m \end{pmatrix}$$

$$(1.3b) \qquad \begin{cases} z_1 = H_1(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ z_m = H_m(x_m) \end{cases}$$

where $x = (x_1,\ldots,x_m)$ with each x_i and z_i being possibly a vector. For linear systems the above problem - the Restricted Decoupling Problem (RDP) - has been solved under the additional assumption that the set of outputs is "complete", i.e. $\bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \operatorname{Ker} D_i = 0$, see [13]. In the solution we present here we use as key tools the so called (regular) controllability distributions, introduced in [8]. In this way our approach completely fits in the systematic work on the generalization of Wonham's geometric approach to linear systems, see e.g. [3-10]. We note that a *parallel decomposition* as in (1.3a) has been studied in [11]. We also note that similar results are derived in [4] and, in a different style in [1]. The main purpose of this note is to show that the solution of the nonlinear RDP also can be derived by directly generalizing the theory of [13].

2. Problem formulation

Recall the following definitions, see [3-9].

DEFINITION 2.1. An involutive distribution D of fixed dimension, on M, is *controlled invariant* for the system (1.1a) if there exists a feedback of the form (1.2) such that the modified dynamics $\dot{x} = \tilde{A}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{B}_i(x)v_i$ leaves D invariant, i.e.

$$[\tilde{A},D] \subset D$$

$$[\tilde{B}_i,D] \subset D, \quad i = 1,\dots,m.$$

DEFINITION 2.2. An involutive distribution D of fixed dimension, on M, is a *regular controllability distribution* of the system (1.1a) if it is controlled invariant for the system and moreover

$$D = \text{involutive closure of } \{\mathrm{ad}^k_{\tilde{A}} \tilde{B}_i \mid k \in \mathbb{N},\ i \in I\}$$

for a certain subset $I \subset \{1,\dots,m\}$.

Instead of the above notion of controlled invariance it is sufficient to use a somewhat weaker concept.

DEFINITION 2.3. An involutive distribution D of ficed dimension, on M, is *locally controlled invariant* for the system (1.1a) if locally around each point $x_0 \in M$ there exists a feedback of the form (1.2) such that the modified dynamics $\dot{x} = \tilde{A}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{B}_i(x)v_i$ leaves D invariant.

Similarly one defines a local version of definition 2.2: the regular local controllability distributions.

In considering the static state feedback noninteracting control problem we seek regular local controllability distributions $R_1,\dots,R_m$ defined by

$$(2.1) \qquad R_i := \text{involutive closure of } \{\mathrm{ad}^k_{\tilde{A}} \tilde{B}_i \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

where $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}_i$ are as in (1.3a), $i = 1,\dots,m$.

REMARK: In the local coordinates of (1.3a) we see that $R_i = \mathrm{Span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\}$, and clearly each distribution R_i satisfies $[\tilde{A},R_i] \subset R_i$ and $[\tilde{B}_j,R_i] \subset R_i$, $j = 1,\dots,m$, $i = 1,\dots,m$.

Assuming (2.1) we see that

(2.2) $\quad R_i \subset \text{Ker } H_{j*} =: K_j \quad j \neq i,\ i,j = 1,\ldots,m,$

which exactly means that $v_j(\cdot)$ does not affect the output $z_i(\cdot)$, for $j \neq i$. Secondly we have the nonlinear version of *output controllability*, that is

(2.3) $\quad H_{i*}(R_i) = TN_i \qquad\qquad i = 1,\ldots,m.$

This follows from the fact that the system (1.1a) is strongly accessible, so also (1.3a) is strongly accessible. But then each of the systems $\dot{x}_i = \tilde{A}_i(x_i) + \tilde{B}_i(x_i)v_i$ is strongly accessible and by the fact that the map H_i is a surjective submersion we see that the set of reachable output values has nonempty interior in N_i for all $i = 1,\ldots,m$.
Thus the static state feedback noninteracting control problem can be stated as follows.
Given the system (1.1a,b) *find* (*if possible*) *a local feedback law of the form* (1.2) *such that* (2.2) *and* (2.3) *hold for the distributions* R_i *defined by* (2.1)
Now, as in the linear case, there is a compatibility problem (see [13]). Clearly if we have controlled invariant distributions $D_1,\ldots,D_m$, then by no means it follows that there exists a local feedback (1.2) which leaves each of them invariant. Therefore we make the following assumption

(2.4) $\quad \bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \text{Ker } H_{i*} = 0,$

which means that the map

$$H : M \to N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus N_m, \quad H(x) = (H_1(x),\ldots,H_m(x))$$

is locally injective.

3. Main theorem

Define $\quad R_i^* :=$ supremal regular local controllability distribution in $\bigcap_{j\neq i} \text{Ker } H_{j*},\ i = 1,\ldots,m.$

REMARK: R_i^* is well defined, see [6,8] but probably the dimension is not fixed.

THEOREM 3.1. *Under the assumption* (2.4) *and the assumption that each* R_i^* *has fixed dimension,* $i = 1,\ldots,m$, *the static state feedback noninteracting control problem is solvable in a local fashion if and only if*

(3.1) $\quad R_i^* + K_i = TM.$

PROOF: Assume (3.1) holds, then (2.2) and (2.3) are true for R_i^*. We show next that the $\hat{K}_i := \bigcap_{j\neq i} \text{Ker } H_{j^*}$, $i = 1,\dots,m$, are independent. Indeed

$$\hat{K}_i \cap \sum_{j\neq i} \hat{K}_j = \left(\bigcap_{r\neq i} \text{Ker } H_{r^*}\right) \cap \sum_{j\neq i} \left(\bigcap_{s\neq j} \text{Ker } H_{s^*}\right)$$
$$\subset \left(\bigcap_{r\neq i} \text{Ker } H_{r^*}\right) \cap \text{Ker } H_{i^*} = \bigcap_{r=1}^{m} \text{Ker } H_{r^*} = 0.$$

Since $R_i^* \subset \hat{K}_i$, $i = 1,\dots,m$, it follows that the R_i^* are independent. In the next step we will show that the R_i^* are compatible, i.e. there is a local feedback (1.2) which leaves each of the distributions R_i^* invariant. From (3.1) we see that for each $i = 1,\dots,m$ $R_i^* \neq 0$. For if $R_i^* = 0$ for an $i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$, then $K_i = TM$, which means that $z_i = D_i(x)$ is constant. Therefore we know, by the independence of the R_i^* that locally there exist independent vector fields $0 \neq \bar{B}_i$ with $\bar{B}_i \in R_i^* \cap \text{Span}\{B_1,\dots,B_m\}$, $i = 1,\dots,m$. So $\text{Span}\{B_1,\dots,B_m\} = \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_1,\dots,\bar{B}_m\}$. We also have that $\dim R_i^* \geq p_i$ (by assumption R_i^* has fixed dimension) and thus from the independency of the R_i^* we have $R_1^* = \dots + R_m^* = TM$. Thus the distributions $R_1^*,\dots,R_m^*$ are *simultaneously integrable* (see definition 3.1 and lemma 3.1 of [11]). So locally around each point $x_0 \in M$ there exist coordinates such that $R_i^* = \text{Span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\}$ $i = 1,\dots,m$, with each x_i possibly being a vector. Now from the fact that the distributions R_i^* are locally controlled invariant we have that

(3.2a) $\qquad [\bar{B}_i, R_j^*] \subset R_j^* + \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_1,\dots,\bar{B}_m\}$, $i = 1,\dots,m$

(3.2a) $\qquad [A, R_j^*] \subset R_j^* + \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_1,\dots,\bar{B}_m\}$

for all $j = 1,\dots,m$.
From (3.2a) we see that

(3.3) $\qquad [\bar{B}_1, R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*] \subset R_2^* + \dots + R_m^* + \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_1,\dots,\bar{B}_m\}$

$$= R_2^* + \dots + R_m^* + \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_1\},$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\bar{B}_i \in R_i^*$, $i = 1,\dots,m$. Note also that the distribution $R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*$ is involutive, cf. [11]. Now from (3.3) and [5,7] it follows that there locally exists a vector field $\tilde{B}_1$ such that $\text{Span}\{\tilde{B}_1\} = \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_1\}$ and $[\tilde{B}_1, R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*] \subset R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*$. Therefore in the coordinate system constructed above we have that $\tilde{B}_1(x) = (\tilde{B}_1(x_1),0,\dots,0)^t$.
Similarly we construct vector fields $\tilde{B}_i$, $i = 2,\dots,m$, such that $[\tilde{B}_i, R_1^* + \dots + R_{i-1}^* + R_{i+1}^* + \dots + R_m^*] \subset R_1^* + \dots + R_{i-1}^* + R_{i+1}^* + \dots + R_m^*$ and $\text{Span}\{\tilde{B}_i\} = \text{Span}\{\bar{B}_i\}$.
Thus

$$B_i(x) = (0,\dots,0, B_i(x_i),0,\dots,0)^t.$$

Next from (3.2b) we see that

$$(3.4) \qquad [A, R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*] \subset R_2^* + \dots + R_m^* + \mathrm{Span}\{\bar{B}_1\}$$

and therefore we can construct a local feedback $u = \bar{B}(x)\alpha_1(x)$ such that $\tilde{A}(x) = A(x) + \bar{B}_1(x)\alpha_1(x)$ satisfies (cf. [3]) $[\tilde{A}, R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*] \subset R_2^* + \dots + R_m^*$. Similarly for the distribution $R_1^* + \dots + R_{i-1}^* + R_{i+1}^* + \dots + R_m^*$ we construct a feedback $u = \bar{B}_i(x)\alpha_i(x)$ such that the modified dynamics leave this distribution invariant. Finally by applying the total feedback $u = \bar{B}_1(x)\alpha_1(x) + \dots + \bar{B}_m(x)\alpha_m(x)$ we obtain that $A(x) = (A_1(x_1), A_2(x_2), \dots, A_m(x_m))$. So we have established a local feedback (1.2) such that the modified dynamics are as in (1.3a) and also from (3.1) (1.3b) is satisfied. Furthermore we note that each system $\dot{x}_i = A_i(x_i) + B_i(x_i)v_i$ is strongly accessible and we have that

$$R_i^* = \text{involutive closure of } \{\mathrm{ad}_{\tilde{A}}^k \tilde{B}_i \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}, \; i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Conversely from the fact that the R_i^* are supremal relative to the condition (2.2) and from (2.3) - which is equivalent to $R_i + K_i = TM$ - it follows that (3.1) is necessary. □

4. Remarks

(i) In lemma 3.1 of [11] the distributions $D_1, \dots, D_L$ should be independent, i.e. for each disjoint subset I_1 and I_2 of $\{1, \dots, L\}$ one has that $D^{I_1} \cap D^{I_2} = \underline{0}$.

(ii) $[\mathrm{ad}_{\tilde{A}}^k \tilde{B}_i, \mathrm{ad}_{\tilde{A}}^{\ell} \tilde{B}_j] = 0$ for all $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \neq j$, (see also [11]).

(iii) If the number of output channels is smaller than the number of inputs the above procedure still works in a slightly modified way. Namely there are more than one independent vectorfields $\bar{B}_i$ in $R_i^* \cap \mathrm{Span}\{B_1, \dots, B_m\}$ and/or there exist some additional input vector fields $\tilde{B}_k$ which do not belong to one of the distributions R_i^*, but - after applying feedback - also have the form $\tilde{B}_k(x) = (\tilde{B}_k^1(x_1), \tilde{B}_k^1(x_2), \dots, \tilde{B}_k^m(x_m))^t$. These vector fields are superfluous for the whole control synthesis of the system.

(iv) Each of the systems $\dot{x}_i = \tilde{A}_i(x_i) + \tilde{B}_i(x_i)v_i$, $z_i = H_i(x_i)$ is strongly invertible, see [2]. This has also been clarified in a geometric way in [9], and follows directly from the condition that $R_i^* + K_i = TM$, so R_i^* is not contained in $\mathrm{Ker}\, H_{i*}$. We also note that the situation described in theorem 3.1 is even more special. Namely the system $\dot{x}_i = \tilde{A}_i(x_i) + \tilde{B}_i(x_i)v_i$ is strongly invertible with respect to each of the components of the output z_i.

References

[1] CLAUDE, D., Decoupling of nonlinear systems, *Syst. Contr. Lett.* *1*, pp 242-248 (1982).

[2] HIRSCHORN, R.M., Invertibility of nonlinear control systems, *SIAM J. Contr.* *17*, pp 289-297 (1979).

[3] HIRSCHORN, R.M., (A,B)-invariant distributions and disturbance decoupling of nonlinear systems, *SIAM J. Contr. Opt.* *19*, pp 1-19 (1981).

[4] ISIDORI, A, A.J. KRENER, C. GORI-GIORGI & S. MONACO, Nonlinear decoupling via feedback: a differential geometric approach, IEEE *Trans Aut. Contr.* *26*, pp 331-345 (1981).

[5] ISIDORI, A., A.J. KRENER, C. GORI-GIORGI & S. MONACO, Locally (f,g)-invariant distributions, *Syst. Contr. Lett.* *1*, pp 12-15 (1981).

[6] KRENER, A.J. & A. ISIDORI, (Ad f,G) invariant and controllability distributions, in feedback control of linear and nonlinear systems, Lect. Notes in Control and Information Sciences 39, pp 157-164.

[7] NIJMEIJER, H., Controlled invariance for affine control systems, *Int. J. Contr.* *34*, pp 825-833 (1981).

[8] NIJMEIJER, H., Controllability distributions for nonlinear systems, *Syst. Contr. Lett.*, vol. 2, pp 122-129, 1982.

[9] NIJMEIJER, H., Invertibility of affine nonlinear control systems: a geometric approach, to appear in *Syst. Contr. Lett.*

[10] NIJMEIJER, H. & A.J. VAN DER SCHAFT, Controlled invariance for nonlinear systems, IEEE Trans Aut. Contr., vol. 27, pp 904-914, 1982.

[11] RESPONDEK, W., On decomposition of nonlinear control systems, *Syst. Contr. Lett.* *1*, pp 301-308 (1982).

[12] SUSSMANN, H.J. & V. JURDJEVIC, Controllability of nonlinear systems. *J. Diff. Eq.* *12*, pp 95-116 (1972).

[13] WONHAM, W.M., Linear multivariable control, a geometric approach, 2nd ed. Springer (1979).