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Chapter 1

Introduction

Feedback control is used to influence the behavior of dynamical systems. Without feedback control systems, modern technologies such as computers, aircraft, and spacecraft would not exist. One common example of control is the use of cruise control in modern automobiles. Cruise control enables the driver to set and maintain a desired vehicle speed without using the throttle. An open-loop, that is, no feedback action, method of cruise control would be to lock the throttle in a particular position; however, the vehicle speed would eventually drift given different terrains. By incorporating available sensors such as vehicle speed and engine load into a feedback loop, modern cruise controllers can accurately maintain vehicle speed over a wide variety of terrains. Additional applications of feedback control can be found in mechanical systems, electrical systems, financial systems, and even biological systems. In fact, balancing a stick on the tip of your finger is an example of feedback control; you use both your sense of sight and sense of touch to move your arm and keep the stick from falling.

Numerous design methods are commonly used in feedback control problems, ranging from classical control to modern control. Stabilizing a dynamical system when the plant parameters are uncertain or unknown, however, presents a challenging problem.
For example, consider the problem of stabilizing the equilibrium of the scalar plant

\[ \dot{x}(t) = ax(t) + bu(t), \]

where \( a > 0 \) and \( b \neq 0 \). If \( a \) and \( b \) are known, then the control law \( u(t) = -\text{sgn}(b)kx(t) \) stabilizes the system for all \( k > a/|b| \). If \( a \) and \( b \) are uncertain, but the modeling uncertainty can be contained a priori within a given set, robust controllers [22, 25, 73, 120, 136] can be used to fix the control gain \( k \) based on the fixed level of modeling uncertainty. However, if \( a \) and \( b \) are unknown or if the modeling uncertainty cannot be ascertained a priori, knowledge of \text{sgn} b can be used to calculate either a positive high-gain feedback \( u(t) = kx(t) \) or a negative high-gain feedback \( u(t) = -kx(t) \) such that the closed-loop system is asymptotically stable for a sufficiently large feedback gain \( k > 0 \).

Unlike robust control, adaptive control algorithms tune the feedback gains in response to the true plant and exogenous signals, that is, commands and disturbances. Generally speaking, adaptive controllers require less prior modeling information than robust controllers, and thus can be viewed as highly parameter-robust control laws. The price paid for the ability of adaptive control laws to operate with limited prior modeling information is the complexity of analyzing and quantifying the stability and performance of the closed-loop system, especially in light of the fact that adaptive control laws, even for linear plants, are nonlinear.

The adaptive control literature focuses primarily on adaptive stabilization, adaptive command following, and model reference adaptive control [7, 16, 19, 24, 26, 28, 32, 46, 49, 50, 61, 65, 67, 77, 88, 90, 107, 118, 122]. These adaptive control problems have been approached using parameter-estimation-based adaptive controllers [7, 50, 90, 122], universal stabilizers [46, 47, 64, 79, 81, 86, 87, 96, 106, 130, 132], high-gain adaptive controllers [17, 18, 27, 29, 41, 46, 48, 61, 76, 77, 102], and adaptive
predictive controllers [19, 74, 88, 107].

In addition to stabilization and command following, disturbance rejection is another common objective arising in noise control, vibration suppression, and structural control [24, 32, 77, 90, 122]. Adaptive feedforward control is frequently used to reject harmonic disturbances when the disturbance spectrum is known or can be estimated [62, 80, 95]. Adaptive feedforward algorithms typically rely on least-mean-square (LMS) or recursive least-mean-square (RLMS) algorithms to update parameters. These methods include the filtered-u LMS and filtered-x LMS algorithms. However, adaptive feedforward algorithms do not account for the transfer function from the control signals to the measurements.

Model reference adaptive control (MRAC), in which a reference model is designed to generate a desired trajectory, is one of the primary approaches to adaptive control [3, 7, 32, 50, 51, 65, 68, 72, 75, 82, 85, 90–92, 94, 122, 123, 131]. In this case, the objective is to force an unknown plant to follow the output of a known reference model. In many formulations of model reference adaptive control, the control law depends on the solution of a Lyapunov equation, which, in turn depends on the reference model, and ultimately the system matrices $A$ and $B$. Therefore, these control laws inherently depend on the modeling information expressed by $A$ and $B$. In Chapter 5, we consider model reference adaptive control as a special case of the command-following problem; this controller does not rely on specialized assumptions about the reference model.

Stability and performance analysis of adaptive control laws often entails assumptions on the dynamics of the plant. For example, a widely invoked assumption in adaptive control is passivity [90], which is restrictive and difficult to verify in practice. A related assumption is that the plant is minimum phase or stably invertible [33, 45], which may entail the same difficulties. In fact, sampled-data control may give rise to nonminimum-phase zeros whether or not the continuous-time system is minimum
phase [8]. Since inverse-system representations are used to establish boundedness of the system inputs and outputs, nonminimum-phase zeros are known to present a challenge in proofs of stability and convergence for adaptive control algorithms [5]. Beyond these assumptions, adaptive control laws are known to be sensitive to unmodeled dynamics and sensor noise [9, 104], which motivates robust adaptive control laws [50].

In addition to these basic issues, adaptive control laws may entail unacceptable transients during adaptation, which may be exacerbated by actuator limitations [60, 98, 135]. In fact, adaptive control under extremely limited modeling information such as uncertainty in the high-frequency gain [64, 69] may yield a transient response that exceeds the practical limits of the plant. Therefore, the type and quality of the available modeling information as well as the speed of adaptation must be considered in the analysis and implementation of adaptive control laws. These issues are discussed in [5].

Certain modeling information may be required a priori to express the set in which the adaptive controller gain matrix is known to be contained. Furthermore, if the adaptive controller gain matrix is not contained within a particular set, projection algorithms may be used to force the adaptive controller gain into that set; see [7, 16, 26, 32, 50, 61, 67, 90, 118, 122]. With plant changes, however, a stabilizing adaptive controller gain may lie outside of this set, inducing an unstable closed-loop system. In addition, although many adaptive control laws assume matched uncertainty [7, 32, 90, 122], not all uncertainty is matched. This assumption frames the model assumptions on which the method is based. The adaptive controllers presented in this dissertation do not assume matched uncertainty.

Although the discrete-time adaptive control literature is more limited than the continuous-time literature, there are discrete-time versions of many continuous-time algorithms [2, 3, 7, 35, 51, 55, 66, 67, 91, 122], as well as adaptive control algorithms
unique to discrete time [28, 31–34, 66, 71, 93, 127, 134]. In [33], the authors present five algorithms for stabilization and command following of single-input single-output and multi-input multi-output minimum-phase systems. Although these algorithms require only that the command signal be bounded, they are based on the assumption that an ideal tracking controller exists. Disturbance rejection is not addressed.

In [127], a discrete-time adaptive disturbance rejection algorithm is developed based on a retrospective performance measure and ARMARKOV system representations. The retrospective performance of a system is the performance of the system at the current time assuming that the current controller was used over a past window of time. In [127], the retrospective performance is used in connection with time-series modeling of both the plant and the controller to develop an adaptive disturbance rejection algorithm that requires knowledge of only the numerator of the transfer function from the control to the performance, and does not require knowledge of the disturbance spectrum. Extensions of this method and experimental results are given in [1, 37, 42, 63, 108, 110] as well as computational fluid dynamics (CFD)-based flow control simulation results in [21, 103, 115, 116]. Robustness of the ARMARKOV adaptive disturbance rejection algorithm is studied in [109].

In this dissertation we consider discrete-time adaptive control since these control laws can be implemented directly in embedded code without requiring an intermediate discretization step with potential loss of phase margin. Furthermore, the adaptive controllers in this dissertation are developed under minimal modeling assumptions. In particular, the adaptive controllers require knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional modeling information is necessary. The use of Markov parameters, or impulse response coefficients, facilitates identification and online retuning. Markov parameters are readily identifiable with least-squares (LS) or recursive least-squares (RLS) algorithms, as well as the observer/Kalman filter iden-
tification (OKID) algorithm [57]. Another application of Markov-parameter-based control is iterative learning control [83, 84], where the primary objective is repetitive-motion command following.

Applications of the adaptive control algorithms presented in this dissertation are published in [99, 117]. In [99], the adaptive control algorithm developed in Chapter 2 is used for three-degree-of-freedom angular-velocity command following in a six-degree-of-freedom Stewart platform. Closed-loop experiments were shown to reduce root mean square (RMS) angular-velocity command-following errors by at least a factor of 2 in all axes during a 10-minute test. In [117], the adaptive control algorithm developed in Chapter 5 is used to identify multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems. The adaptive controller is used in feedback with an initial model to adapt the closed-loop response of the system to match the response of an unknown plant to a known input.

The remainder of this introduction summarizes the contents of Chapter 2 through Chapter 6 of this dissertation. In particular, these summaries outline the original contributions of each chapter. Two primary areas of research are presented in this dissertation. Specifically, Chapter 2 focuses on gradient-based adaptive control, while Chapters 3-6 relate to retrospective-cost-based adaptive control. Detailed literature reviews are provided at the beginning of each individual chapter.

**Chapter 2 Summary**

The results of Chapter 2 are an extension of the work presented in [36, Chapter VII], where an adaptive controller is developed that requires limited model information for stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, minimum-phase, discrete-time systems. Specifically, the controller requires knowledge of the open-loop system's relative degree and a bound on the first nonzero Markov parameter. Notably, the controller does not
require knowledge of the command or disturbance spectrum as long as the command
and disturbance signals are generated by Lyapunov-stable linear systems.

The original contribution of Chapter 2, beyond the material presented in [36,
Chapter VII], is the use of a logarithmic Lyapunov function to prove Lyapunov stabil-
ity for systems whose exogenous dynamics are unknown and unmeasured. In addition,
we construct the adaptive update law as a gradient-based adaptive control algorithm.
Since an ideal deadbeat internal model controller is proven to exist, the gradient-based
construction allows us to compute and implement an optimal gradient step size. Fur-
thermore, the gradient-based construction provides a framework for directly analyzing
tradeoffs between transient performance and modeling accuracy. Finally, we derive an
inverse system representation for multi-input, multi-output, minimum-phase systems
which is necessary for the proof of Theorem 2.6.1.

Chapter 2 uses three key tools to prove global convergence of the performance
variable. First, we use a nonminimal state-space realization of the plant. Similar non-
minimal state-space realizations are considered in [23, 30, 32, 38, 101, 124, 127, 134].
Second, we prove the existence of an ideal fixed-gain controller that incorporates a
deadbeat internal model controller, also developed in Chapter 2. Lastly, using a log-
arithmetic Lyapunov function, we prove global asymptotic convergence for command
following and disturbance rejection as well as Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop
adaptive system when the open-loop system is asymptotically stable. Since we use
a logarithmic Lyapunov function, we do not need to make use of the key technical
lemma [32], which is limited to output convergence. The key technical lemma along
with logarithmic Lyapunov functions [2, 3, 34, 35, 53–56, 59] are the two principal
techniques used to prove stability for discrete-time adaptive systems.
Chapter 3 Summary

Chapter 3 begins the main topic of this dissertation. Since the method of proof for the gradient-based adaptive control algorithm presented in Chapter 2 cannot be extended to nonminimum-phase systems, we now focus on retrospective-cost-based adaptive control. In particular, this chapter investigates full-state-feedback stabilization in multi-input, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems. Retrospective cost optimization [127] is a measure of performance at the current time based on a past window of data and without assumptions about the command or disturbance signals. In particular, retrospective cost optimization acts as an inner loop to the adaptive control algorithm by modifying the performance variables based on the difference between the actual past control inputs and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law. This technique is inherent in [127] in the use of the estimated performance variable, but is more fully developed in this dissertation.

The original contribution of Chapter 3 is the development of a retrospective-cost-based adaptive controller for full-state-feedback stabilization. Furthermore, we prove Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop system for a special case. We also present numerical examples to illustrate the robustness of the algorithm under conditions of Markov-parameter uncertainty. Theoretical and numerical results suggest that the converged adaptive controller has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an infinite upward adaptive gain margin, which is reminiscent of continuous-time fixed-gain LQR control. Guaranteed stability margins for discrete-time fixed-gain LQR are discussed in [119], but the margins are found to be inferior to their continuous-time counterparts.

Chapter 4 Summary

To further develop retrospective-cost-based adaptive control, the results of Chapter 4 generalize the results of Chapter 3 to static-output-feedback stabilization.
Specifically, we construct a retrospective-cost-based adaptive controller for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems with knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the poles or zeros need be known. In addition, we develop a theoretical link between nonminimum-phase zero information and Markov parameters. This link is detailed in Appendix A. We also present numerical examples to illustrate the robustness of the algorithm under conditions of Markov parameter uncertainty.

**Chapter 5 Summary**

The results of Chapter 5 are based on the adaptive control algorithms developed in [127] as well as Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 of this dissertation. Specifically, Chapter 5 generalizes the results of Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 to dynamic compensation for stabilization, command following, disturbance rejection, and model reference adaptive control. We construct a retrospective-cost-based adaptive controller for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems with knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the poles or the zeros need be known.

A novel feature of the adaptive control algorithms developed in Chapters 3-5 of this dissertation is the use of an adjustable learning-rate parameter $\alpha$ which allows us to develop Newton-step-based adaptive update laws. In addition, Chapter 5 further develops the theoretical link between Markov parameters and nonminimum-phase zeros. We also develop preliminary metrics for analyzing the gain and phase margins for discrete-time adaptive systems. Finally, numerical robustness analysis with uncertainty in the required modeling information is presented for plants that are multi-input, multi-output, nonminimum phase, and possibly unstable. These
numerical studies show that the adaptive control algorithm is effective for handling nonminimum-phase zeros under minimal modeling assumptions. These studies also provide guidance into the choice of the learning-rate parameter $\alpha$ for stable response and acceptable transient behavior.

Chapter 6 Summary

Adaptive control algorithms can be classified as either direct or indirect, depending on whether they employ an explicit parameter estimation algorithm within the overall adaptive scheme; see [32, 50, 77, 90]. Most direct adaptive control algorithms, with the exception of universal adaptive control algorithms [46, 47, 64, 79, 81, 86, 87, 96, 106, 130, 132], require some prior modeling information, such as the sign of the high-frequency gain. By updating the required modeling information, perhaps through closed-loop identification, a direct adaptive control algorithm can be converted to an indirect adaptive control algorithm, which may yield greater versatility in practice.

The results of Chapter 6 extend the results of Chapter 5. Specifically, the direct adaptive controller developed in Chapter 5 is augmented with recursive least-squares estimation to form a discrete-time indirect adaptive control law that is effective for systems that are multi-input, multi-output, and/or nonminimum phase. Recursive least-squares estimation is used for concurrent Markov parameter updating. We present numerical examples to illustrate the algorithm’s effectiveness in handling nonminimum-phase zeros as plant changes occur. These results are noteworthy since nonminimum-phase zeros are known to be challenging for adaptive control algorithms [5]. Numerical results show that the algorithm is able to update the Markov parameters and maintain stabilization of the system.
Chapter 2

Adaptive Gradient-Based Dynamic Compensation

In this chapter, we present an adaptive controller that requires limited model information for stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, minimum-phase, discrete-time systems. Specifically, the controller requires knowledge of the open-loop system’s relative degree and a bound on the first nonzero Markov parameter. Notably, the controller does not require knowledge of the command or disturbance spectrum as long as the command and disturbance signals are generated by Lyapunov-stable linear systems. Thus, the command and disturbance are combinations of discrete-time sinusoids and steps. In addition, the controller uses feedback action only and thus does not require a direct measurement of the command or disturbance signals. We prove global asymptotic convergence for command following and disturbance rejection.

The results of this chapter are an extension of the work presented in [36, Chapter VII]. Beyond the material presented in [36, Chapter VII], this dissertation incorporates a logarithmic Lyapunov function to prove Lyapunov stability for systems whose exogenous dynamics are unknown and unmeasured. In addition, the adaptive update law is now constructed as a gradient-based adaptive control algorithm. In contrast to [127], which was only able to compute an implementable gradient step size, we
prove the existence of an ideal deadbeat internal model controller, and thus, we are now able to compute the optimal gradient step size. Furthermore, the gradient-based construction provides a framework for directly analyzing tradeoffs between transient performance and modeling accuracy. Finally, an appendix includes the derivation of an inverse system representation for multi-input, multi-output, minimum-phase systems. This derivation is necessary for the proof of Theorem 2.6.1. A precursor to the results of this chapter is given in [39], while the full results and methods of this chapter are published in [45]. An application of this algorithm to 3-axis angular velocity command following in a six-degree-of-freedom Stewart platform is published in [99], and a variation of the adaptive control algorithm developed in this chapter is implemented on an experimental testbed in [43] to demonstrate broadband adaptive disturbance rejection.

2.1 Introduction

The adaptive control literature focuses primarily on adaptive stabilization, adaptive tracking, and model reference adaptive control [7, 28, 32, 50, 67, 90, 122]. These adaptive control problems have been approached using parameter-estimation-based adaptive controllers [7, 50, 90, 122], universal stabilizers [47, 79, 81, 86, 96, 106, 130], and high-gain adaptive controllers [18, 27, 29, 41, 46, 48, 61, 76, 77, 102]. In addition to stabilization and command following, disturbance rejection is a third common objective, arising in noise control, vibration suppression, and structural control. In the present chapter, we consider the combined stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection problem for uncertain minimum-phase discrete-time systems with command and disturbance signals generated by exogenous dynamics with unknown spectra. Furthermore, unlike adaptive feedforward control, we do not require a direct measurement of the command or disturbance signals.
Adaptive feedforward control is frequently used to reject harmonic disturbances when the disturbance spectrum is known or can be estimated [62, 80, 95]. Adaptive feedforward algorithms typically rely on least-mean-square (LMS) or recursive least-mean-square (RLMS) algorithms to update parameters. These methods include the filtered-u LMS and filtered-x LMS algorithms. However, adaptive feedforward algorithms do not account for the transfer function from the control signals to the measurements.

In [127], a discrete-time adaptive disturbance rejection algorithm is developed based on a retrospective performance measure. The retrospective performance of a system is the performance of the system at the current time assuming that the current controller was used over a past window of time. In [127], the retrospective performance is used in connection with time-series modeling of both the plant and the controller to develop an adaptive disturbance rejection algorithm that requires knowledge of only the numerator of the transfer function from the control to the performance, and does not require knowledge of the disturbance spectrum. Extensions of this method and experimental results are given in [42, 63, 108, 110].

Although the discrete-time adaptive control literature is more limited than the continuous-time literature, there are discrete-time versions of many continuous-time algorithms [2, 3, 7, 35, 51, 55, 66, 67, 91, 122], as well as adaptive control algorithms unique to discrete time [32, 33, 71, 134]. In [33], the authors present five algorithms for stabilization and command following of single-input single-output (SISO) and multi-input multi-output (MIMO) minimum-phase systems. Although these algorithms require only that the command signal be bounded, they are based on the assumption that an ideal tracking controller exists. Disturbance rejection is not addressed. In [78], the authors consider output regulation with a known plant and an unknown exosystem that generates reference and disturbance signals.

In the present chapter, we develop a discrete-time adaptive MIMO output feed-
back controller for stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection in minimum-phase systems. This Markov-parameter-based adaptive control algorithm requires knowledge of only the open-loop system’s relative degree and a bound on the first nonzero Markov parameter. We assume that the command and disturbance signals are generated by a Lyapunov-stable linear system so that the command and disturbance signals consist of discrete-time sinusoids and steps. However, we do not require any information regarding the spectrum of the command or the disturbance, and we do not require a direct measurement of the command or the disturbance. We prove globally asymptotic command following and disturbance rejection, as well as Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop error system when the open-loop dynamics are asymptotically stable. If there are no command or disturbance signals, then we prove output stabilization, that is, global asymptotic convergence of the output to zero.

The present chapter uses three key tools to prove global convergence of the performance variable. First, we use a nonminimal state-space realization of the plant. Similar nonminimal state-space realizations are considered in [23, 30, 32, 38, 124, 134]. The nonminimal state-space realization has a state that consists entirely of delayed inputs and outputs, which allows us to represent dynamic output feedback as static full-state feedback. More precisely, dynamic output feedback can be written as the product of a known feedback vector and a matrix of estimated controller parameters. Second, we prove the existence of an ideal fixed-gain controller that incorporates a deadbeat internal model controller. For more information on deadbeat internal model control, see [40]. Lastly, we use a logarithmic Lyapunov-like function to prove asymptotic command following and disturbance rejection. Logarithmic Lyapunov functions, that is, quadratic functions that incorporate a logarithm, are used in [2, 3, 35, 53–56, 59] to prove Lyapunov stability of discrete-time systems. In [128], a quadratic Lyapunov-like function is used to establish convergence of discrete-time systems. Using the logarithmic Lyapunov function, we prove global asymptotic convergence for
command following and disturbance rejection as well as Lyapunov stability of the adaptive system when the open-loop system is asymptotically stable.

### 2.2 Problem Formulation

Consider the MIMO discrete-time system

\[
\begin{align*}
    x(k + 1) &= Ax(k) + Bu(k) + D_1 w(k), \\
y(k) &= Cx(k) + D_2 w(k),
\end{align*}
\]

where \(x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n\), \(y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_y\), \(u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_u\), \(w(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_w\), and \(k \geq 0\). Our goal is to design an adaptive output feedback controller under which the performance variable \(y\) converges to zero in the presence of the exogenous signal \(w\). Note that \(w\) can represent either a command signal to be followed, an external disturbance to be rejected, or both. For example, if \(D_1 = 0\) and \(D_2 \neq 0\), then the objective is to have the output \(Cx\) follow the command signal \(-D_2 w\). On the other hand, if \(D_1 \neq 0\) and \(D_2 = 0\), then the objective is to reject the disturbance \(w\) from the performance measurement \(Cx\). The combined command following and disturbance rejection problem is considered when \(D_1\) and \(D_2\) are block matrices. More precisely, if \(D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{D}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\), \(D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{D}_2 \end{bmatrix}\), and \(w(k) = \begin{bmatrix} w_1(k) \\ w_2(k) \end{bmatrix}\), then the objective is to have \(Cx\) follow the command \(-\hat{D}_2 w_2\) while rejecting the disturbance \(w_1\). Lastly, if \(D_1\) and \(D_2\) are empty matrices, then the objective is output stabilization, that is, global asymptotic convergence of \(y = Cx\) (and thus \(x\)) to zero.

In the nonadaptive case, a sufficient condition for command following and disturbance rejection is \(l_u \geq l_y\) [40, 44]. Furthermore, we require that \(l_u \geq l_u\) because the construction of an ideal fixed-gain controller in Section 2.4 requires that the first nonzero Markov parameter from \(u\) to \(y\) be left invertible. Thus, we require that
\( l_y = l_u \). Henceforth, \( l \triangleq l_y = l_u \).

Next, define the transfer function matrix

\[
G_{yu}(z) \triangleq C(zI - A)^{-1}B = \sum_{i=d}^{\infty} z^{-i}H_i,
\]

and define \( d \) to be the smallest positive integer \( i \) such that the \( i \)th Markov parameter \( H_i \triangleq CA^{i-1}B \) is nonzero. We make the following assumptions:

(A1) The triple \((A, B, C)\) is controllable and observable.

(A2) If \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} A - \lambda I & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} < \text{normal rank} \begin{bmatrix} A - zI & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \) then \( |\lambda| < 1 \).

(A3) \( d \) is known.

(A4) \( H_d \) is nonsingular.

(A5) There exists \( \bar{H}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} \) such that \( 2H_d^T H_d \leq \bar{H}_d^T \bar{H}_d + \bar{H}_d^T H_d \) and \( \bar{H}_d \) is known.

(A6) There exists an integer \( \bar{n} \) such that \( n \leq \bar{n} \) and \( \bar{n} \) is known.

(A7) The performance variable \( y(k) \) is measured and available for feedback.

(A8) The exogenous signal \( w(k) \) is generated by

\[
x_w(k+1) = A_w x_w(k), \quad w(k) = C_w x_w(k),
\]

where \( x_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \) and \( A_w \) has distinct eigenvalues, all of which are on the unit circle.

(A9) There exists an integer \( \bar{n}_w \) such that \( n_w \leq \bar{n}_w \) and \( \bar{n}_w \) is known.

(A10) The exogenous signal \( w(k) \) is not measured.

(A11) \( A, B, C, D_1, D_2, A_w, C_w, n, n_w, \) and \( H_d \) are not known.
Assumption (A1) implies that the McMillan degree of $G_{yu}(z)$ is $n$. In the SISO case, assumption (A1) prevents pole-zero cancellation when forming the transfer function $G_{yu}(z)$, which implies that the order of $G_{yu}(z)$ is $n$.

Let $G_{yu}(z)$ have a left coprime matrix-fraction description $G_{yu}(z) = \mu(z)^{-1} \nu(z)$, where $\mu(z)$ and $\nu(z)$ are $l \times l$ polynomial matrices. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mu(z)$ is in column-Hermite form, that is, $\mu(z)$ is upper triangular where each diagonal entry is a monic polynomial whose degree is higher than the degree of all of the remaining entries in its column [58, Theorem 6.3-2]. Thus, we can write

$$\mu(z) = z^m \mu_0 + z^{m-1} \mu_1 + \cdots + z \mu_{m-1} + \mu_m,$$

where $m \leq n$ and $\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_m \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$ are upper triangular. Note that the leading coefficient matrix $\mu_0$ is not necessarily $I_l$. However, it can be seen that there exists an $l \times l$ upper-triangular polynomial matrix

$$Q(z) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
    z^{h_{11}} & q_{12}z^{h_{12}} & \cdots & q_{1l}z^{h_{1l}} \\
    z^{h_{22}} & q_{22}z^{h_{22}} & \cdots & q_{2l}z^{h_{2l}} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    z^{h_{ll}} & q_{l2}z^{h_{l2}} & \cdots & q_{ll}z^{h_{ll}}
\end{bmatrix},$$

such that the leading term of $\alpha(z) \triangleq Q(z)\mu(z)$ is $z^m I_l$. Thus, we can write

$$\alpha(z) = z^m I_l + z^{m-1} \alpha_1 + z^{m-2} \alpha_2 + \cdots + z \alpha_{m-1} + \alpha_m,$$

where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$. Furthermore, $G_{yu}(z)$ has the matrix-fraction description $G_{yu}(z) = \alpha(z)^{-1} \beta(z)$, where $\beta(z) \triangleq Q(z)\nu(z)$, and we can write

$$\beta(z) = z^{m-d} \beta_d + z^{m-d-1} \beta_{d+1} + \cdots + z \beta_{m-1} + \beta_m,$$
where $\beta_d, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$. Note that if the input to $G_{yu}$ is $u = \delta(0)e_i$, where $\delta(0)$ is the unit impulse at $k = 0$ and $e_i$ is the $i$th column of $I_l$, then the output is
\[
y(k) = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq k < d, \\
\beta_d e_i, & k = d.
\end{cases}
\]

(2.10)

Thus, it follows that $\beta_d = H_d$. Note that $\alpha(z)$ and $\beta(z)$ are not necessarily left coprime. However, since $\mu(z)$ and $\nu(z)$ are left coprime, it follows that $Q(z)$ is the greatest common left divisor of $\alpha(z)$ and $\beta(z)$. Furthermore, since $\det Q(z) = z^{h_1 + \cdots + h_u}$, the pole-zero cancellation that occurs when forming the transfer function $G_{yu}(z) = \alpha(z)^{-1}\beta(z)$ occurs only at $z = 0$.

Define the transfer function matrix
\[
G_{yw}(z) \triangleq C(zI - A)^{-1}D_1 + D_2,
\]
and, assuming that $G_{yw}$ has a matrix-fraction description of the form $G_{yw} = \alpha(z)^{-1}\gamma(z)$, which is not necessarily left coprime, we can write
\[
\gamma(z) = z^m \gamma_0 + z^{m-1} \gamma_1 + \cdots + z \gamma_{m-1} + \gamma_m,
\]

(2.12)

where $\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_m \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times w}$. Therefore, for $k \geq m$, the state-space system (2.1), (2.2) has the time-series representation
\[
y(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} -\alpha_i y(k - i) + \sum_{i=d}^{m} \beta_i u(k - i) + \sum_{i=0}^{m} \gamma_i w(k - i).
\]

(2.13)

**Definition 2.2.1.** Let $G$ be a strictly proper transfer function matrix. Then the normal rank of $G$ is $\text{rank } G = \text{rank } G(\lambda)$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

Next, note that it follows from (2.3) and assumption (A4) that, for all sufficiently large $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\text{rank } G_{yu}(\lambda) = l$. Thus, $G_{yu}(z)$ has full normal rank, that is,
normal rank \( G_{yu} = l \). Consequently, normal rank \( \nu = l \).

**Definition 2.2.2.** Let \( G \) be a strictly proper \( s \times t \) transfer function matrix with the Smith-McMillan form

\[
G(z) = U_1(z) \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{q_1(z)}{p_1(z)} & \cdots & 0 \\
& \ddots & \\
0 & \cdots & \frac{q_r(z)}{p_r(z)} \\
0 & \cdots & 0_{(s-r) \times (t-r)}
\end{bmatrix} U_2(z),
\]

where \( r = \) normal rank \( G \), \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) are unimodular matrices, and \( q_1, \ldots, q_r, p_1, \ldots, p_r \) are monic polynomials such that, for all \( i = 1, \ldots, r \), \( q_i \) and \( p_i \) are coprime and, for all \( i = 1, \ldots, r - 1 \), \( p_{i+1} \) divides \( p_i \) and \( q_i \) divides \( q_{i+1} \). Then the poles of \( G \), counting multiplicity, are the roots of \( p_1 \cdots p_r \), and the transmission zeros of \( G \), counting multiplicity, are the roots of \( q_1 \cdots q_r \).

**Lemma 2.2.3.** Let \( G \) be a strictly proper \( s \times t \) transfer function matrix with a left coprime matrix-fraction description \( G(z) = P(z)^{-1}Z(z) \). Then \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) is a transmission zero of \( G \) if and only if rank \( Z(\lambda) < \) normal rank \( Z \). Furthermore, \( p \in \mathbb{C} \) is a pole of \( G \) if and only if \( \det P(p) = 0 \).

Assumption (A2) states that the invariant zeros of \( (A, B, C) \) are contained in the open unit circle. Since, by assumption (A1), \( (A, B, C) \) is minimal, it follows that the invariant zeros of \( (A, B, C) \) are exactly the transmission zeros of \( G_{yu}(z) \). Therefore, assumption (A2) is equivalent to the assumption that the transmission zeros of \( G_{yu}(z) \) are contained in the open unit circle. Since \( \mu(z) \) and \( \nu(z) \) are left coprime, it follows from Lemma 2.2.3 that assumption (A2) is equivalent to the assumption that, if \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) and rank \( \nu(\lambda) < \) normal rank \( \nu \), then \( |\lambda| < 1 \). Furthermore, since normal rank \( \nu = l \) by assumption (A4), it follows that assumption (A2) implies that, if \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( \det \nu(\lambda) = 0 \), then \( |\lambda| < 1 \). Consequently, since
\[ \text{det} \beta(\lambda) = \text{det} Q(\lambda) \text{det} \nu(\lambda) = z^{h_{11} + \cdots + h_{11}} \text{det} \nu(\lambda), \] it follows that, if \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( \text{det} \beta(\lambda) = 0 \), then \( |\lambda| < 1 \).

For SISO systems, assumption (A5) specializes to the assumption that \( \text{sgn} H_d \) is known and an upper bound on the magnitude \( |H_d| \) is known. For MIMO systems, assumption (A5) is a generalization of this SISO assumption. In particular, if \( H_d \) is positive definite, then assumption (A5) specializes to the assumption that an upper bound on the magnitude of \( \lambda_{\max}(H_d) \) is known. Similarly, if \( H_d \) is negative definite, then assumption (A5) specializes to the assumption that an upper bound on the magnitude of \( |\lambda_{\min}(H_d)| \) is known. More precisely, if \( H_d \) is positive definite, then assumption (A5) is satisfied with \( \bar{H}_d > \lambda_{\max}(H_d)I \), while, if \( H_d \) is negative definite, then assumption (A5) is satisfied with \( \bar{H}_d > |\lambda_{\min}(H_d)|I \). Note that assumptions (A4) and (A5) imply that \( \bar{H}_d \) is nonsingular.

Assumption (A8) restricts our consideration to command and disturbance signals that consist of discrete-time sinusoids and steps. The assumption that the eigenvalues of \( A_w \) are distinct entails no loss in generality compared to the assumption that the eigenvalues of \( A_w \) are semisimple, that is, appear only in Jordan blocks of order 1. For example, consider the system

\[
x_w(k+1) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix} x_w(k), \quad w(k) = x_w(k),
\]  

(2.15)

where \( x_w(k) \triangleq [x_{w1}(k) \quad x_{w2}(k)]^T \). We consider two cases. First, suppose that \( x_{w1}(0) \neq 0 \) and construct the system

\[
x_{wt}(k+1) = \lambda x_{wt}(k), \quad w_t(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{x_{w2}(0)}{x_{w1}(0)} \end{bmatrix} x_{wt}(k).
\]  

(2.16)
Then, with \( x_{w1}(0) = x_{w1}(0) \), it follows that

\[
  w_t(k) = \begin{bmatrix}
    1 \\
    \frac{x_{w2}(0)}{x_{w1}(0)}
  \end{bmatrix} \lambda^k x_{w1}(0) = \begin{bmatrix}
    \lambda^k x_{w1}(0) \\
    \lambda^k x_{w2}(0)
  \end{bmatrix} = w(k).
\]

(2.17)

A similar argument applies to the case \( x_{w2}(0) \neq 0 \). Therefore, it follows that there exists a system with distinct eigenvalues whose output is identical to the output of (2.4), (2.5). Or course, Jordan blocks of order greater than 1 give rise to unbounded disturbances, which are not considered.

Assumption (A10) implies that a direct measurement of the command and disturbance is not required, while assumption (A11) implies that the spectrum of the command and disturbance signals is unknown. We stress that \( y(k) \) is the only signal available for feedback.

### 2.3 Nonminimal State Space Realization

We use a nonminimal state-space realization of the time-series system (2.13) whose state consists entirely of measured information. More specifically, the state consists of past values of the performance variable \( y(k) \) and the control \( u(k) \). To construct the nonminimal state-space realization of the time-series system (2.13), we introduce the following notation. For a positive integer \( p \), define the nilpotent matrix

\[
  \mathcal{N}_p \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
    0_{l \times l} & \cdots & 0_{l \times l} & 0_{l \times l} \\
    I_l & \cdots & 0_{l \times l} & 0_{l \times l} \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    0_{l \times l} & \cdots & I_l & 0_{l \times l}
  \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{lp \times lp},
\]

(2.18)
and define
\[
E_1 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I_l & 0_{l(p-1) \times l} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{lp \times l},
\]
where the dimension \( p \) is given by context.

Now, let \( n_c \geq m \) and consider the \( 2ln_c \)-order nonminimal state-space realization of (2.13)
\[
\dot{\phi}(k+1) = A\phi(k) + Bu(k) + D_1W(k),
\]
\[
y(k) = C\phi(k) + D_2W(k),
\]
where
\[
A \triangleq A_{nil} + \begin{bmatrix} E_1C & 0_{lnc \times 2lnc} \\ 0_{lnc \times 2lnc} & E_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0_{lnc \times l} \\ E_1 \end{bmatrix},
\]
\[
C \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha_1 & \cdots & -\alpha_m & 0_{l \times l(n_c-m)} & 0_{l \times l(d-1)} & \beta_d & \cdots & \beta_m & 0_{l \times l(n_c-m)} \end{bmatrix},
\]
\[
D_1 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} E_1D_2 \\ 0_{lnc \times (m+1)l_w} \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_2 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_0 & \cdots & \gamma_m \end{bmatrix};
\]
\[
A_{nil} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} N_{nc} & 0_{lnc \times lnc} \\ 0_{lnc \times lnc} & N_{nc} \end{bmatrix}.
\]
is nilpotent; and

\[
\phi(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
y(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
y(k-n_c) \\
u(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
u(k-n_c)
\end{bmatrix}, \quad W(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
w(k) \\
\vdots \\
w(k-m)
\end{bmatrix}.
\] (2.26)

Note that the definition of \( C \) in (2.23) requires \( n_c \geq m \). The triple \((A, B, C)\) is stabilizable and detectable. However, \((A, B, C)\) is neither controllable nor observable. In particular, \((A, B, C)\) has \( n \) controllable and observable eigenvalues, while the remaining \( 2n_c - n \) eigenvalues are located at 0. Moreover, \((A, B)\) has \( ln_c - n \) uncontrollable eigenvalues at 0, while \((A, C)\) has \( ln_c \) unobservable eigenvalues at 0. Note that in this basis, the state \( \phi(k) \) contains only past values of the performance variable \( y \) and the control \( u \).

Now, we consider the time-series controller

\[
u(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} M_i u(k-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} N_i y(k-i),
\] (2.27)

where, for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n_c \), \( M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} \) and \( N_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} \). The control can be written as

\[
u(k) = \theta \phi(k),
\] (2.28)

where

\[
\theta \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} N_1 & \cdots & N_{n_c} & M_1 & \cdots & M_{n_c} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times 2ln_c}.
\] (2.29)

The control (2.28), which is dynamic output feedback in terms of \( y \), can be com-
puted by recording and using $n_c$ past values of the performance variable $y$ and the control $u$. However, (2.28) is a full-state-feedback control law for the nonminimal state-space system (2.20)-(2.25). The closed-loop system consisting of (2.20)-(2.25) with the linear time-invariant feedback (2.28) is

\[\dot{\phi}(k + 1) = \tilde{A}\phi(k) + D_1W(k),\]

\[y(k) = C\phi(k) + D_2W(k),\]

where

\[\tilde{A} \triangleq A + B\theta = A_{nil} + \begin{bmatrix} E_1C \\ E_1\theta \end{bmatrix}.\]

### 2.4 Ideal Fixed-Gain Controller

In this section, we prove existence and derive properties of an ideal fixed-gain controller of the form (2.27) for the open-loop system (2.1) and (2.2). This controller, whose structure is illustrated in Figure 2.1, is used in subsequent sections to construct an error system for analyzing the adaptive closed-loop system. We stress that the ideal controller is not intended for implementation. An ideal fixed-gain controller consists of two distinct parts, specifically, a precorrector, which cancels the transmission zeros of the open-loop system, and a deadbeat internal model controller, which operates in feedback on the observable states of the precorrector cascaded with the open-loop system.

First, we demonstrate how to construct the ideal fixed-gain controller. Using
assumption (A4), consider the \( l \times l \) exactly proper precompensator

\[
u_*(k) = -H_d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m-d} \beta_{d+i} u_*(k - i) + u_{db}(k),
\]  

which has a minimal state-space realization of the form

\[
\hat{x}_{pc}(k+1) = \hat{A}_{pc} \hat{x}_{pc}(k) + \hat{B}_{pc} u_{db}(k),
\]

\[
u_*(k) = \hat{C}_{pc} \hat{x}_{pc}(k) + u_{db}(k),
\]

where \( \hat{x}_{pc} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}_{pc}} \) and \( \hat{n}_{pc} \) is the McMillan degree of \( \hat{G}_{pc}(z) \triangleq \beta(z)^{-1} z^{m-d} H_d \), which is the transfer function from \( u_{db} \) to \( u_* \). Note that \( \hat{n}_{pc} \leq l(m - d) \). The poles of the precompensator \( \hat{G}_{pc}(z) \) are exactly the transmission zeros of the open-loop transfer function \( G_{yu}(z) \). Furthermore, assumption (A2) implies that the transmission zeros of \( G_{yu}(z) \), and thus the poles of \( \hat{G}_{pc}(z) \), are asymptotically stable. Therefore, the cascade

\[
G_{yu}(z) \hat{G}_{pc}(z) = \alpha(z)^{-1} \beta(z) \beta(z)^{-1} z^{m-d} H_d
\]

\[
= \alpha(z)^{-1} z^{m-d} H_d
\]
has asymptotically stable pole-zero cancellation. Let $n_o$ be the McMillan degree of $G_{yu}(z)\hat{G}_{pc}(z)$, and note that $n_o \leq lm$.

Define the pseudo-input

$$e(k) \triangleq u(k) - u_*(k), \quad (2.37)$$

and cascade the precompensator (2.34), (2.35) with the open-loop system (2.1), (2.2) to obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix}
  x(k + 1) \\
  \hat{x}_{pc}(k + 1)
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
  A & B\hat{C}_{pc} \\
  0 & \hat{A}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  x(k) \\
  \hat{x}_{pc}(k)
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
  B \\
  \hat{B}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix} u_{db}(k) +
\begin{bmatrix}
  B \\
  0
\end{bmatrix} e(k) +
\begin{bmatrix}
  D_1 \\
  0
\end{bmatrix} w(k), \quad (2.38)$$

$$y_* (k) =
\begin{bmatrix}
  C & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  x(k) \\
  \hat{x}_{pc}(k)
\end{bmatrix} + D_2 w(k), \quad (2.39)$$

where $y_*$ is the ideal system output. Since the poles of $\hat{G}_{pc}(z)$ cancel the transmission zeros of $G_{yu}(z)$, it follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix}
  A & B\hat{C}_{pc} \\
  0 & \hat{A}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
  B \\
  \hat{B}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
  C & 0
\end{bmatrix} \quad (2.40)$$

is not minimal. However, since $(A, B)$ and $(\hat{A}_{pc}, \hat{B}_{pc})$ are controllable, it follows that (2.40) is controllable. Thus,

$$\begin{bmatrix}
  A & B\hat{C}_{pc} \\
  0 & \hat{A}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
  C & 0
\end{bmatrix} \quad (2.41)$$

is not observable. In fact, it follows from the pole-zero cancellations between $\hat{G}_{pc}(z)$
and \( G_{yu}(z) \) that the unobservable modes of (2.41) are exactly the poles of \( \hat{G}_{pc}(z) \), all of which are asymptotically stable.

Next, let \( \hat{x}_{db} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}_{db}} \), and let

\[
\hat{x}_{db}(k + 1) = \hat{A}_{db}\hat{x}_{db}(k) + \hat{B}_{db}y_{*}(k), \tag{2.42}
\]

\[
u_{db}(k) = \hat{C}_{db}\hat{x}_{db}(k), \tag{2.43}
\]

be an internal model controller (whose existence is shown in Section 2.9) for the observable states of (2.38) and (2.39) that guarantees exact command following and disturbance rejection in finite time, that is, (2.42), (2.43) is a deadbeat internal model controller. Thus, the ideal fixed-gain controller consists of the precompensator (2.34), (2.35) and the deadbeat internal model controller (2.42), (2.43). Define the transfer function matrix of the deadbeat internal model controller (2.42), (2.43) by

\[
\hat{G}_{db}(z) \triangleq \hat{C}_{db}(zI - \hat{A}_{db})^{-1}\hat{B}_{db}.
\]

The following theorem constructs the ideal fixed-gain controller

\[
u_{*}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} M_{*i}u_{*}(k - i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} N_{*i}y_{*}(k - i), \tag{2.44}
\]

which can be expressed as

\[
u_{*}(k) = \theta_{*}\phi_{*}(k), \tag{2.45}
\]

where

\[
\theta_{*} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} N_{*1} & \cdots & N_{*nc} & M_{*1} & \cdots & M_{*nc} \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.46}
\]
The closed-loop system with the ideal fixed-gain controller is shown in Figure 2.1 and is given by

\[
\phi(k+1) = \tilde{A}_s \phi(k) + D_1 W(k), 
\]

\[
y(k) = C \phi(k) + D_2 W(k),
\]

where \( \tilde{A}_s \) is given by (2.50)

\[
\tilde{A}_s \triangleq A + B \theta_* = A_{nil} + \begin{bmatrix} E_1 C \\ E_1 \theta_* \end{bmatrix}.
\]

**Theorem 2.4.1.** Consider the ideal closed-loop system consisting of (2.48), (2.49), where \( \tilde{A}_s, B, \) and \( C \) are given by (2.50), (2.22), and (2.23), respectively. Furthermore, let

\[
n_c \geq n_o + 2ln_w + m - d.
\]

Then there exists an ideal linear output-feedback controller (2.44) of order \( n_c \) such that the following statements hold:
(i) For all initial conditions \( \phi^*(0) \) and \( x_w(0) \) and all integers \( k \geq k_0 \), where

\[
k_0 \triangleq n_o + n_c + d - m,
\]

(2.52)

it follows that \( y_s(k) = 0 \).

(ii) \( \tilde{A}_s \) is asymptotically stable.

(iii) For \( i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \),

\[
C \tilde{A}_s^{i-1} B = \begin{cases} H_d, & i = d, \\ 0, & i \neq d. \end{cases}
\]

(2.53)

Proof. We show that a time-series representation of the fixed-gain controller (2.34), (2.35), (2.42), and (2.43) depicted in Figure 2.1 exists and satisfies (i)-(iii).

First, consider the cascade (2.38), (2.39), and recall that (2.40) is controllable but not observable. Furthermore, the unobservable modes of (2.41) are precisely the poles of \( \hat{G}_{pc}(z) \), all of which are asymptotically stable because of assumption (A2). Therefore, it follows from the Kalman decomposition that there exists a nonsingular matrix \( T \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+\hat{n}_{pc}) \times (n+\hat{n}_{pc})} \) such that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
A_o & 0 \\
A_{21} & A_o
\end{bmatrix} = T \begin{bmatrix}
A & B \hat{C}_{pc} \\
0 & \hat{A}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix} T^{-1},
\]

(2.54)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
C_o & 0
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
C & 0
\end{bmatrix} T^{-1},
\]

(2.55)

where \( A_o \in \mathbb{R}^{n_o \times n_o} \) (\( A_o, C_o \)) is observable, and \( A_o \) is asymptotically stable.

Now, defining

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x_o(k) \\
x_o(k)
\end{bmatrix} \triangleq T \begin{bmatrix}
x(k) \\
\hat{x}_{pc}(k)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( x_o(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_o} \), and applying this
change of basis to the cascade (2.38) and (2.39) yields

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_o(k+1) \\
  x_{\bar{o}}(k+1)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  A_o & 0 \\
  A_{21} & A_{\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  x_o(k) \\
  x_{\bar{o}}(k)
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
  B_o \\
  B_{\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} u_{db}(k) \\
+ \begin{bmatrix}
  B_{e,o} \\
  B_{e,\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} e(k) + \begin{bmatrix}
  D_{1,o} \\
  D_{1,\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} w(k),
\]  

(2.56)

\[
y_*(k) = \begin{bmatrix}
  C_o & 0 \\
  C_{\bar{o}} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  x_o(k) \\
  x_{\bar{o}}(k)
\end{bmatrix} + D_2w(k),
\]  

(2.57)

where \( x_o \in \mathbb{R}^{n_o} \) and

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  B_o \\
  B_{\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} = T \begin{bmatrix}
  B \\
  \hat{B}_{pc}
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
  B_{e,o} \\
  B_{e,\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} = T \begin{bmatrix}
  B \\
  0
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
  D_{1,o} \\
  D_{1,\bar{o}}
\end{bmatrix} = T \begin{bmatrix}
  D_1 \\
  0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(2.58)

Note that \((A_o, B_o, C_o)\) is a minimal realization of the transfer function matrix

\[
G_o(z) \Delta \overset{\triangle}{=} C_o[zI - A_o]^{-1}B_o = G_{yu}(z)\hat{G}_{pc}(z) = \alpha(z)^{-1}z^{m-d}H_d.
\]  

(2.59)

Next, we consider a deadbeat internal model controller of the form (2.42), (2.43) designed for the observable subsystem of (2.56), (2.57) given by

\[
x_o(k+1) = A_o x_o(k) + B_o u_{db}(k) + B_{e,o} e(k) + D_{1,o} w(k),
\]  

(2.60)

\[
y_*(k) = C_o x_o(k) + D_2 w(k).
\]  

(2.61)

The invariant zeros of \((A_o, B_o, C_o)\) are located at the origin and thus do not coincide with the eigenvalues of \(A_w\) by assumption (A8). Since, in addition, \((A_o, B_o, C_o)\) is minimal, the dimension of \(y\) equals the dimension of \(u\), and normal rank \(G_o = l\),
it follows from Theorem 2.9.1 with \( \hat{n} = n_o, \hat{n}_w = n_w, \) and \( \hat{l}_y = l \) that, for all \( \hat{n}_{db} \) satisfying
\[
\hat{n}_{db} \geq n_o + 2ln_w,
\]
there exists a discrete-time controller (2.42), (2.43) such that the dynamics matrix
\[
\tilde{A}_{dbo} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
A_o & B_o \hat{C}_{db} \\
\hat{B}_{db} C_o & \hat{A}_{db}
\end{bmatrix},
\]
of the closed-loop system (2.42), (2.43), (2.60), and (2.61), which represents the feedback interconnection of \( G_o \) and \( \hat{G}_{db} \), is nilpotent. Furthermore, with \( e(k) \equiv 0 \), for all initial conditions \( (x_o(0), x_o(0), \hat{x}_{db}(0), x_w(0)) \) and all integers \( k \geq n_o + \hat{n}_{db} \), it follows that \( y_*(k) = 0 \).

The closed-loop system (2.42), (2.43), (2.56), and (2.57) is
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x_o(k+1) \\
\hat{x}_{db}(k+1) \\
x_o(k+1)
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
A_o & B_o \hat{C}_{db} & 0 \\
\hat{B}_{db} C_o & \hat{A}_{db} & 0 \\
A_{21} & B_o \hat{C}_{db} & A_o
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_o(k) \\
\hat{x}_{db}(k) \\
x_o(k)
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
B_{e,o} \\
0 \\
B_{e,o}
\end{bmatrix} e(k) + \begin{bmatrix}
D_{1,o} \\
\hat{B}_{db} D_2 \\
D_{1,o}
\end{bmatrix} w(k),
\]
\[
y_*(k) = \begin{bmatrix}
C_o & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x_o(k) \\
\hat{x}_{db}(k) \\
x_o(k)
\end{bmatrix} + D_2 w(k).
\]
Since $\tilde{A}_{\text{db}}$ is nilpotent and $A_0$ is asymptotically stable, it follows that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
A_0 & B_0\hat{C}_{\text{db}} & 0 \\
\hat{B}_{\text{db}}C_0 & \hat{A}_{\text{db}} & 0 \\
A_{21} & B_0\hat{C}_{\text{db}} & A_0
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(2.66)

is asymptotically stable.

To construct the ideal fixed gain controller, we first write the transfer function matrix of (2.42), (2.43) as

$$
\hat{G}_{\text{db}}(z) = \hat{M}(z)^{-1}\hat{N}(z),
$$

(2.67)

where

$$
\hat{M}(z) = z^{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}}I + z^{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}-1}\hat{M}_1 + \cdots + z\hat{M}_{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}-1} + \hat{M}_{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}},
$$

(2.68)

$$
\hat{N}(z) = z^{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}-1}\hat{N}_1 + z^{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}-2}\hat{N}_2 + \cdots + z\hat{N}_{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}-1} + \hat{N}_{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}},
$$

(2.69)

where, for $i = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}_{\text{db}}$, $\hat{M}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$ and $\hat{N}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$. Therefore, (2.42), (2.43) has the time-series representation

$$
u_{\text{db}}(k) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}} \hat{M}_i u_{\text{db}}(k-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{n}_{\text{db}}} \hat{N}_i y_\ast(k-i).
$$

(2.70)

Now, let $\hat{n}_{\text{db}} = n_c + d - m$, and note that, since (2.51) holds, $\hat{n}_{\text{db}} = n_c + d - m \geq n_0 + 2ln_w$, as required by (2.62). With $e(k) \equiv 0$, and thus $u(k) = u_\ast(k)$ for all $k \geq k_0$, the ideal fixed-gain controller, which consists of the precompensator (2.33) and the deadbeat internal model controller (2.70), is given by (2.44), where, for
\[ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_c, \]

\[
M_{si} \triangleq -H_d^{-1} \beta_{d+i} - \sum_{j=1}^{i} \hat{M}_j H_d^{-1} \beta_{d+j-i}, \quad (2.71)
\]

\[
N_{si} \triangleq \hat{N}_i, \quad (2.72)
\]

where, for all \( i > m \), \( \beta_i = 0 \), and, for all \( i > \hat{n}_{db} \), \( \hat{M}_i = \hat{N}_i = 0 \).

To show \((i)\), consider the \( 2ln_c \)-order nonminimal state-space realization of the controller (2.45), (2.71), and (2.72) given by

\[
\phi_{**}(k+1) = \mathcal{A}_c \phi_{**}(k) + \mathcal{B}_c y_*(k), \quad (2.73)
\]

\[
u_*(k) = \mathcal{C}_c \phi_{**}(k), \quad (2.74)
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{A}_c \triangleq \mathcal{A}_{nil} + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{l_{nc} \times 2l_{nc}} \\ E_1 \theta_* \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B}_c \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} E_1 \\ 0_{l_{nc} \times l} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}_c \triangleq \theta_* \quad (2.75)
\]

Note that \( \mathcal{A}_c = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}_c - \mathcal{B}_c \mathcal{C} \). Therefore, the ideal closed-loop system (2.20)-(2.25) and (2.73)-(2.75) is

\[
\begin{bmatrix} \phi_*(k+1) \\ \phi_{**}(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C}_c \\ \mathcal{B}_c \mathcal{C} & \mathcal{A}_c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_*(k) \\ \phi_{**}(k) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \mathcal{B}_c \mathcal{D}_2 \end{bmatrix} W(k), \quad (2.76)
\]

\[
y_*(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{C} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_*(k) \\ \phi_{**}(k) \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{D}_2 W(k), \quad (2.77)
\]
where

\[ \phi_s(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
  y_s(k-1) \\
  \vdots \\
  y_s(k-n_c) \\
  u(k-1) \\
  \vdots \\
  u(k-n_c)
\end{bmatrix} . \tag{2.78} \]

The closed-loop system (2.76) and (2.77) is a nonminimal representation of the closed-loop system (2.64) and (2.65). Furthermore, every unobservable or uncontrollable mode of (2.76) and (2.77) is located at zero. Thus, the spectrum of

\[ \tilde{A}_{cl} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
  A & BC_c \\
  B_c & A_c
\end{bmatrix} \tag{2.79} \]

consists of the eigenvalues of (2.66) as well as \( 4ln_c - n - \hat{n}_{pc} - \hat{n}_{db} \) eigenvalues located at 0. Therefore, since (2.66) is asymptotically stable, it follows that (2.79) is asymptotically stable. Furthermore, since (2.76), (2.77) is a nonminimal representation of (2.64), (2.65), it follows that, with \( e(k) \equiv 0 \), for all initial conditions \( \phi_{s*}(0) \) and \( x_w(0) \) and all \( k \geq n_o + \hat{n}_{db} = k_0 \), it follows that \( y_s(k) = 0 \). Thus, we have verified (i).
To show (ii), consider the change of basis
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{A}_* & BC_c \\
0 & A_{\text{nil}}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -I & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & BC_c \\ B_cC & A_c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -I & I \end{bmatrix},
\]
(2.80)
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
B \\
-B
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -I & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]
(2.81)
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
C \\
0
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ I & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
C \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(2.82)
Since (2.79) is asymptotically stable and $A_{\text{nil}}$ is nilpotent, it follows from (2.80) that
$\tilde{A}_*$ is asymptotically stable, verifying (ii).

To show (iii), we compute the closed-loop Markov parameters $\tilde{H}_{y,e,i}$ from the pseudo-input $e$ to the performance variable $y_*$ using a state-space realization of the closed-loop system and a transfer function matrix representation of the closed-loop system. First, consider the nonminimal state-space realization (2.76) and (2.77). For $i = 1, 2, \ldots,$ define the Markov parameters
\[
\tilde{H}_{y,e,i} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} C \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & BC_c \\ B_cC & A_c \end{bmatrix}^{i-1} \begin{bmatrix} B \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
= \begin{bmatrix} C \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}_* & BC_c \\ 0 & A_{\text{nil}} \end{bmatrix}^{i-1} \begin{bmatrix} B \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
= C\tilde{A}_*^{i-1}B + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} -C\tilde{A}_*^{i-1}BM_{*i-j},
\]
(2.83)
where $M_{*i} = C_cA_{\text{nil}}^{i-1}B$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_c$ and $M_{*i} = 0$ for all $i > n_c.$
Next, consider the transfer function matrix representation of the open-loop system

\[ y_\ast = G_{yu}(z)u + G_{yw}(z)w \]
\[ = G_{yu}(z)u_\ast + G_{yu}(z)e + G_{yw}(z)w \]
\[ = G_{yu}(z)\hat{G}_{pc}(z)\hat{G}_{db}(z)y_\ast + G_{yu}(z)e + G_{yw}(z)w, \quad (2.84) \]

which implies that the closed-loop system is

\[ y_\ast = \tilde{G}_{ye}e + \tilde{G}_{yw}w, \quad (2.85) \]

where

\[ \tilde{G}_{ye} \triangleq [I_l - G_{yu}(z)\hat{G}_{pc}(z)\hat{G}_{db}(z)]^{-1}G_{yu}(z) \]
\[ = [I_l - \alpha(z)^{-1}z^{m-d}H_d\hat{M}(z)\hat{N}(z)]^{-1}\alpha(z)^{-1}\beta(z) \]
\[ = [\alpha(z) - z^{m-d}H_d\hat{M}(z)\hat{N}(z)]^{-1}\beta(z) \]
\[ = \tilde{D}(z)^{-1}\hat{M}(z)H_d^{-1}\beta(z), \quad (2.86) \]

\[ \tilde{G}_{yw} \triangleq [I_l - G_{yu}(z)\hat{G}_{pc}(z)\hat{G}_{db}(z)]^{-1}G_{yw}(z) \]
\[ = \tilde{D}(z)^{-1}\hat{M}(z)H_d^{-1}\gamma(z), \quad (2.87) \]

and \( \tilde{D}(z) \triangleq \hat{M}(z)H_d^{-1}\alpha(z) - z^{m-d}\hat{N}(z) \). Notice that \( \tilde{D}(z) \) can be written as

\[ \tilde{D}(z) = z^{m+\hat{n}_{db}}H_d^{-1} + z^{m+\hat{n}_{db}-1}\tilde{D}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{D}_{m+\hat{n}_{db}}, \quad (2.88) \]

where, for \( i = 1,2,\ldots,m+\hat{n}_{db} \), \( \tilde{D}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} \). Since (2.63) is nilpotent, it follows that the poles of \( \tilde{G}_{ye} \) and \( \tilde{G}_{yw} \) are located at zero; in particular, \( \text{det} \tilde{D}(z) = z^{l(m+\hat{n}_{db})}\text{det} H_d^{-1} \). In fact, it follows from (2.88) that the coefficients of the deadbeat
controller \( \hat{M}(z)^{-1} \hat{N}(z) \) can be chosen so that \( \hat{D}_1 = \cdots = \hat{D}_{m+\hat{n}_{db}} = 0 \), and thus

\[
\hat{G}_{ye}(z) = \left[ z^{m+\hat{n}_{db}} H_d^{-1} \right]^{-1} \hat{N}(z) = z^{-m-\hat{n}_{db}} H_d \tilde{N}(z),
\]

where

\[
\tilde{N}(z) \triangleq \hat{M}(z) H_d^{-1} \beta(z) = z^{m+\hat{n}_{db}} \tilde{N}_0 + \cdots + N_{m+\hat{n}_{db}}
\]

and

\[
\tilde{N}_i = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq i < d, \\
I_t, & i = d, \\
H_d^{-1} \beta_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-d} \hat{M}_j H_d^{-1} \beta_{i-j}, & d < i \leq m + \hat{n}_{db}.
\end{cases}
\]

Therefore, it follows from (2.71) that

\[
\tilde{N}_i = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq i < d, \\
I_t, & i = d, \\
-M_{i-d}, & d < i \leq m + \hat{n}_{db}.
\end{cases}
\]

It follows from (2.89) that the closed-loop Markov parameters \( \tilde{H}_{y,e,i} \) from the pseudo-input \( e \) to the performance variable \( y_e \) are \( \tilde{H}_{y,e,i} = H_d \tilde{N}_i \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, m + \hat{n}_{db} \) and \( \tilde{H}_{y,e,i} = 0 \) for \( i > m + \hat{n}_{db} \), which implies

\[
\tilde{H}_{y,e,i} = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq i < d, \\
H_d, & i = d, \\
-H_d M_{i-d}, & d < i \leq m + \hat{n}_{db}, \\
0, & i > m + \hat{n}_{db}.
\end{cases}
\]

Then property (iii) follows from comparing the expressions for \( \tilde{H}_{y,e,i} \) given by (2.83)
and (2.93). More specifically, since (2.93) implies that $\tilde{H}_{y,e,1} = \cdots = \tilde{H}_{y,e,d-1} = 0$, it follows from (2.83) that $CB = C\tilde{A}_dB = \cdots = C\tilde{A}_d^{d-2}B = 0$. Next, since $CB = C\tilde{A}_dB = \cdots = C\tilde{A}_d^{d-2}B = 0$ and $\tilde{H}_{y,e,d} = H_d$ (using (2.93)), it follows from (2.83) that $\tilde{H}_{y,e,d} = H_d$. Now, since $CB = C\tilde{A}_dB = \cdots = C\tilde{A}_d^{d-2}B = 0$, $\tilde{H}_{y,e,d} = H_d$, and $\tilde{H}_{y,e,d+1} = -H_dM_{s1}$ (using (2.93)), it follows from (2.83) that $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^1B = 0$. Lastly, since $CB = C\tilde{A}_dB = \cdots = C\tilde{A}_d^{d-2}B = 0$, $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^{d-1}B = H_d$, $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^d = 0$, and $\tilde{H}_{y,e,d+2} = -H_dM_{s2}$ (using (2.93)), it follows from (2.83) that $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^d = 0$. Continuing this analysis yields $CB = C\tilde{A}_dB = \cdots = C\tilde{A}_d^{d-2}B = 0$, $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^{d-1}B = H_d$, and $\tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^d = \tilde{C}\tilde{A}_d^{d+1}B = \cdots = 0$.

\section{Error System}

We now construct an error system using the ideal fixed-gain controller and a controller whose gains are updated by an adaptive law. By assumption (A11), the controller order $n_c$ given by (2.51) is unknown. However, since $m \leq n$ and $n_o \leq lm$, it follows that $n_o + m + 2ln_w - d \leq (l + 1)n + 2ln_w - d$. Therefore, if

$$n_c \geq (l + 1)n + 2ln_w - d,$$

(2.94)

then $n_c$ satisfies (2.51). Assumptions (A3), (A6), and (A9) imply that the lower bound on $n_c$ given by (2.94) is known.

The closed-loop system consisting of (2.20)-(2.25) with the ideal feedback (2.45) is

$$\phi_{**}(k+1) = \tilde{A}_*\phi_{**}(k) + D_1W(k),$$

(2.95)

$$y_s(k) = C\phi_{**}(k) + D_2W(k),$$

(2.96)

where, by (ii) of Theorem 2.4.1, $\tilde{A}_*$ is asymptotically stable.
Next, consider the controller

\[ u(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} M_i(k)u(k-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} N_i(k)y(k-i), \]  

(2.97)

where, for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n_c \), \( M_i : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{t \times t} \) and \( N_i : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{t \times t} \) are given by the adaptive law presented in the following section. The control can be expressed as

\[ u(k) = \theta(k)\phi(k), \]  

(2.98)

where

\[ \theta(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} N_1(k) & \cdots & N_{n_c}(k) & M_1(k) & \cdots & M_{n_c}(k) \end{bmatrix}. \]  

(2.99)

Inserting (2.98) into (2.20) yields

\[ \phi(k+1) = A\phi(k) + B\theta(k)\phi(k) + D_1W(k). \]  

(2.100)

Next, defining

\[ \tilde{\theta}(k) \triangleq \theta(k) - \theta^*, \]  

(2.101)

and substituting \( \theta(k) = \tilde{\theta}(k) + \theta^* \) into (2.100), the closed-loop system consisting of (2.20), (2.21) with the time-varying feedback (2.98) becomes

\[ \phi(k+1) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}\phi(k) + \mathcal{B}\tilde{\theta}(k)\phi(k) + \mathcal{D}_1W(k), \]  

(2.102)

\[ y(k) = \mathcal{C}\phi(k) + \mathcal{D}_2W(k). \]  

(2.103)

Now, we construct an error system by combining the ideal closed-loop system
Define the error state
\[ \tilde{\phi}(k) \triangleq \phi(k) - \phi_*(k), \] (2.104)
and subtract (2.95), (2.96) from (2.102), (2.103) to obtain
\[ \begin{align*}
\tilde{\phi}(k + 1) &= \hat{A}_* \tilde{\phi}(k) + \mathcal{B} \tilde{\theta}(k) \phi(k), \\
\tilde{y}(k) &= C \tilde{\phi}(k),
\end{align*} \] (2.105) (2.106)
where
\[ \tilde{y}(k) \triangleq y(k) - y_*(k). \] (2.107)

Note that the Markov parameters of the error system (2.105), (2.106) are given by (iii) of Theorem 2.4.1.

The following proposition shows that \( y(k) \) is linear in the estimation error \( \tilde{\theta}(k) \). This proposition is essential for developing the adaptive law and analyzing the stability of the error system.

**Proposition 2.5.1.** Consider the error system (2.105) and (2.106). For all \( k \geq k_0 \),
\[ \tilde{y}(k) = y(k) = H_d \tilde{\theta}(k - d) \phi(k - d). \] (2.108)

**Proof.** Substituting (2.105) into (2.106) yields
\[ \tilde{y}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} C \hat{A}_*^{i-1} \mathcal{B} \tilde{\theta}(k - i) \phi(k - i). \] (2.109)
It now follows from (iii) of Theorem 2.4.1 and (2.109) that \( \tilde{y}(k) = H_d \tilde{\theta}(k - d) \phi(k - d) \).
Furthermore, it follows from (i) of Theorem 2.4.1 that, for all \( k \geq k_0 \), \( y_*(k) = 0 \), that
is, \( \tilde{y}(k) = y(k) \). Hence, for all \( k \geq k_0 \), (2.108) holds. \( \square \)

## 2.6 Adaptive Controller and Stability Analysis

We now present the adaptive law for the controller (2.98), (2.99) and analyze the properties of the closed-loop error system. Consider the cost function

\[
J(k) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{y}^T(k) \tilde{y}(k). \tag{2.110}
\]

Substituting (2.108) into (2.110), the gradient of \( J(k) \) with respect to \( \tilde{\theta}(k - d) \) is given by

\[
\frac{\partial J(k)}{\partial \tilde{\theta}(k - d)} = H_d^T y(k) \phi^T(k - d). \tag{2.111}
\]

Since, by assumption (A11), \( H_d \) is unknown, we replace \( H_d \) in (2.111) with \( \tilde{H}_d \), and, in place of (2.111), we use the implementable gradient

\[
G(k) \triangleq \tilde{H}_d^T y(k) \phi^T(k - d). \tag{2.112}
\]

Note that the implementable gradient (2.112) can be used in practice due to assumptions (A3), (A5), and (A7).

Now, consider the adaptive law

\[
\theta(k + 1) = \theta(k - d) - \eta(k) G(k), \tag{2.113}
\]

where \( \eta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) is a step-size function. Note that if \( G(k) = 0 \) then \( \eta(k) \) is irrelevant. In accordance with assumptions (A10) and (A11), the adaptive control law (2.113) does not require a measurement of the exogenous signal \( w(k) \) and does not use knowledge of the exogenous dynamics (2.4), (2.5).
Subtracting $\theta_*$ from both sides of (2.113) yields the estimator-error update equation

$$\tilde{\theta}(k + 1) = \tilde{\theta}(k - d) - \eta(k)G(k).$$

(2.114)

The closed-loop error system is thus given by

$$Y(k + 1) = A_Y Y(k) + B_Y y(k),$$

(2.115)

$$\tilde{\theta}(k + 1) = \tilde{\theta}(k - d) - \eta(k)G(k),$$

(2.116)

$$\vdots$$

$$\tilde{\theta}(k - d + 1) = \tilde{\theta}(k - 2d) - \eta(k - d)G(k - d),$$

(2.117)

where

$$A_Y \triangleq N_{l(n_c + d)}, \quad B_Y \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I_l \\ 0_{l(n_c + d - 1) \times l} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y(k - 1) \\ \vdots \\ y(k - n_c - d) \end{bmatrix}.$$  

(2.118)

**Theorem 2.6.1.** Consider the open-loop system (2.1), (2.2) satisfying assumptions (A1)-(A11) and the adaptive feedback controller (2.94), (2.98), (2.99), (2.108), and (2.113). Furthermore, for all $k \geq k_0$, let $\zeta(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$0 < \zeta_1 \triangleq \inf_{j \geq k_0} \zeta(j) \leq \zeta(k) \leq \zeta_u \triangleq \sup_{j \geq k_0} \zeta(j) < 2.$$  

(2.119)
Finally, for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( G(k) \neq 0 \), let \( \eta(k) \in [0, \infty) \) satisfy

\[
\eta(k) = 0, \quad \text{if } k < k_0, \quad (2.120)
\]

\[
\eta(k) = \zeta(k)\eta_{\text{opt}}(k), \quad \text{if } k \geq k_0, \quad (2.121)
\]

where

\[
\eta_{\text{opt}}(k) \triangleq \frac{\|y(k)\|_2^2}{\|G(k)\|_F^2}. \quad (2.122)
\]

Then, for all initial conditions \( x(0) \) and \( \theta(0) \), \( \theta(k) \) is bounded, \( u(k) \) is bounded, \( \lim_{k \to \infty} y(k) = 0 \), and \( x(k) \) satisfying (2.1) is bounded. If, in addition, the open-loop dynamics matrix \( A \) is asymptotically stable and \( u(k) = 0 \) for all \( k = 0, \ldots, k_0 - 1 \), then, for all \( x_w(0) \), the zero solution of the closed-loop error system (2.115)-(2.117) is Lyapunov stable.

**Proof.** Let \( k \geq k_0 \) so that, by Proposition 2.5.1, \( \tilde{y}(k) = y(k) \). Consider the quadratic function

\[
J(Y) \triangleq Y^T \mathcal{P} Y, \quad (2.123)
\]

where \( \mathcal{P} > 0 \) satisfies the discrete-time Lyapunov equation

\[
\mathcal{P} = A_Y^T \mathcal{P} A_Y + Q + \alpha I, \quad (2.124)
\]

where \( Q > 0 \) and \( \alpha > 0 \). Note that \( \mathcal{P} \) exists since \( A_Y \) is asymptotically stable. Defining

\[
\Delta J(k) \triangleq J(Y(k + 1)) - J(Y(k)), \quad (2.125)
\]
it follows from (2.115) that

$$\Delta J(k) = Y^T(k+1)P Y(k+1) - Y^T(k)P Y(k)$$

$$= - Y^T(k) (Q + \alpha I) Y(k) + Y^T(k) A_y^T \mathcal{P} B_y y(k)$$

$$+ y^T(k) B_y^T \mathcal{P} A_y Y(k) + y^T(k) B_y^T \mathcal{P} B_y y(k)$$

$$\leq - Y^T(k) (Q + \alpha I) Y(k) + y^T(k) B_y^T \mathcal{P} B_y y(k) + \alpha Y^T(k) Y(k)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\alpha} y^T(k) \left[ B_y^T \mathcal{P} A_y A_y^T \mathcal{P} B_y \right] y(k)$$

$$\leq - Y^T(k) Q Y(k) + \sigma_1 y^T(k) y(k), \quad (2.126)$$

where $\sigma_1 \triangleq \lambda_{\text{max}} \left( B_y^T \mathcal{P} B_y + \frac{1}{\alpha} B_y^T \mathcal{P} A_y A_y^T \mathcal{P} B_y \right)$.

Now, consider the positive-definite, radially unbounded Lyapunov-like function

$$V(Y(k), \bar{\theta}(k), \ldots, \bar{\theta}(k-d)) \triangleq \ln \left( 1 + a_1 Y^T(k) \mathcal{P} Y(k) \right) + a_2 \sum_{i=0}^{d} \| \bar{\theta}(k-i) \|_F^2$$

$$= \ln \left( 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) \right) + a_2 \sum_{i=0}^{d} \| \bar{\theta}(k-i) \|_F^2, \quad (2.127)$$

where $a_1 > 0$ and $a_2 > 0$ are specified below. The Lyapunov-like difference is thus given by

$$\Delta V(k) \triangleq V(Y(k+1), \bar{\theta}(k+1), \ldots, \bar{\theta}(k-d+1))$$

$$- V(Y(k), \bar{\theta}(k), \ldots, \bar{\theta}(k-d)). \quad (2.128)$$

Evaluating $\Delta V(k)$ along the trajectories of the closed-loop error system (2.115)-
\( \Delta V(k) = \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 Y^T(k+1) P Y(k+1) \right] - \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 Y^T(k) P Y(k) \right] + a_2 \eta^2(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F - 2a_2 \eta(k) \left[ \text{tr} \left( \bar{\theta}(k-d) G^T(k) \right) \right] \\
= \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) + a_1 \Delta J(k) \right] - \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) \right] + a_2 \eta^2(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F - 2a_2 \eta(k) \left[ \text{tr} \left( \bar{\theta}(k-d) \phi(k-d) Y^T(k) \bar{H}_d \right) \right] \\
= \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) + a_1 \Delta J(k) \right] - \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) \right] + a_2 \eta^2(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F - a_2 \left( 2\eta(k) \phi^T(k-d) \bar{\theta}^T(k-d) H_d^T \bar{H}_d \bar{\theta}(k-d) \phi(k-d) \right) \\
= \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) + a_1 \Delta J(k) \right] - \ln \left[ 1 + a_1 J(Y(k)) \right] + a_2 \eta^2(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F - a_2 \eta(k) \phi^T(k-d) \bar{\theta}^T(k-d) \left[ H_d^T \bar{H}_d + \bar{H}_d^T H_d \right] \bar{\theta}(k-d) \phi(k-d). \)

By assumption (A5) and using (2.108), we have

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) + a_2 \left[ -2\eta(k) \phi^T(k-d) \bar{\theta}^T(k-d) \times \right. \\
\left. H_d^T H_d \bar{\theta}(k-d) \phi(k-d) + \eta^2(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F \right] \\
= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) + a_2 \left[ -2\eta(k) \| y(k) \|^2_2 + \eta^2(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F \right] \\
= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) - 2a_2 \eta(k) \| y(k) \|^2_2 + a_2 \eta^2(k) \frac{\| y(k) \|^2_2}{\eta_{\text{opt}}(k)} \\
= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) - 2a_2 \eta^2_{\text{opt}}(k) \frac{\eta(k)}{\eta_{\text{opt}}(k)} \| y(k) \|^2_2 \\
+ a_2 \eta^2_{\text{opt}}(k) \left( \frac{\eta(k)}{\eta_{\text{opt}}(k)} \right)^2 \| y(k) \|^2_2 \\
= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) - a_2 \eta^2_{\text{opt}}(k) \left[ 2\zeta(k) - \zeta^2(k) \right] \| G(k) \|^2_F \\
\leq \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) - a_2 \kappa \eta^2_{\text{opt}}(k) \| G(k) \|^2_F \\
= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} \right) - a_2 \kappa \| y(k) \|^2_2 \| G(k) \|^2_F \], \tag{2.130}
where \( \kappa \) is defined by

\[
\kappa \triangleq \inf_{j \geq k_0} [2\zeta(j) - \zeta^2(j)]
\]

\[
= \min\{2\zeta_l - \zeta_u, 2\zeta_u - \zeta_l^2\}. \tag{2.131}
\]

Since \( 0 < \zeta_l \leq \zeta_u < 2 \), it follows that \( \kappa \) is positive.

Since, for all \( x > 0 \), \( \ln x \leq x - 1 \), using

\[
\|G(k)\|^2_F \leq \sigma^2_{\max} (\bar{H}_d) \|y(k)\|^2_2 \|\phi(k - d)\|^2_2 \tag{2.132}
\]

and (2.126) we have

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq a_1 \frac{\Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))} - a_2 \kappa \frac{y^T(k)y(k)}{\sigma^2_{\max}(H_d)\|\phi(k - d)\|^2_2}
\]

\[
\leq - a_1 \frac{Y^T(k)QY(k)}{1 + a_1 Y^T(k)PY(k)} + a_1 \sigma_1 \frac{y^T(k)y(k)}{1 + a_1 Y^T(k)PY(k)}
\]

\[
- a_2 \kappa \frac{y^T(k)y(k)}{\sigma^2_{\max}(H_d)\|\phi(k - d)\|^2_2}. \tag{2.133}
\]

Furthermore, defining

\[
U_0(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u(k - 1) \\ \vdots \\ u(k - n_c) \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_0(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y(k - 1) \\ \vdots \\ y(k - n_c) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.134}
\]

it follows from \( \|\phi(k - d)\|^2_2 = \|Y_0(k - d)\|^2_2 + \|U_0(k - d)\|^2_2 \) that

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq - a_1 \frac{Y^T(k)QY(k)}{1 + a_1 Y^T(k)PY(k)} + a_1 \sigma_1 \frac{y^T(k)y(k)}{1 + a_1 \lambda_{\min}(\mathcal{P}) \|Y(k)\|^2_2}
\]

\[
- a_2 \kappa \frac{y^T(k)y(k)}{\sigma^2_{\max}(H_d) \left[ \|Y_0(k - d)\|^2_2 + \|U_0(k - d)\|^2_2 \right]}. \tag{2.135}
\]

Assumption (A2) implies that the invariant zeros of the system (2.1)-(2.5) from
u to \( y \) are asymptotically stable. Thus, it follows from Theorem 2.10.1 with \( p = n_c \) that there exist \( b_1 > 0 \) and \( b_2 > 0 \) such that

\[
||U_0(k - d)||_2^2 \leq b_1 + b_2 \|y(k - 1)\|^2 + \cdots + \|y(k - n_c - 1)\|^2 \\
= b_1 + b_2 \|Y_0(k)\|^2 \\
\leq b_1 + b_2 \|Y(k)\|^2 - b_1 + b_2 \|Y(k)\|^2 \\
= b_1 + b_2 ||Y(k)||_2^2.
\]

Therefore, since \( \|Y_0(k - d)||_2^2 \leq \|Y(k)||_2^2 \), it follows that

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq -a_1 \frac{Y^T(k)QY(k)}{1 + a_1Y^T(k)PY(k)} + a_1\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)} \|b_1 + \|Y_0(k - d)||_2^2 + b_2 \|Y(k)||_2^2 \\
- a_2\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)} \|b_1 + \|Y(k)||_2^2 \|Y(k)||_2^2 \\
- a_3\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)} \|b_1 + \|Y(k)||_2^2 \|y(k)||_2^2 \\
= -a_1 \frac{Y^T(k)QY(k)}{1 + a_1Y^T(k)PY(k)} + a_1\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)} \|b_1 + \|Y(k)||_2^2 \|Y(k)||_2^2 \\
- a_2\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)} \|b_1 + \|Y(k)||_2^2 \|y(k)||_2^2 \\
- a_3\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)} \|b_1 + \|Y(k)||_2^2 \|y(k)||_2^2, \tag{2.137}
\]

where \( b_3 \triangleq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{max}}(H_d)b_1} \) and \( b_4 \triangleq \frac{b_2 + 1}{b_1} \).
Next, letting $a_1 \triangleq \frac{b_4}{\lambda_{\min}(P)}$ and $a_2 \triangleq \frac{a_1 a_4}{b_3 \kappa}$, it follows that
\[
\Delta V(k) \leq - W(Y(k)), \quad (2.138)
\]
where
\[
W(Y(k)) \triangleq a_1 \frac{Y^T(k)QY(k)}{1 + a_1 Y^T(k)PY(k)}. \quad (2.139)
\]

To show that $\tilde{\theta}(k)$ and $Y(k)$ are bounded, summing (2.138) from $k_0$ to $k - 1$, where $k_0 \leq k - 1$, yields
\[
V(Y(k), \tilde{\theta}(k), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k - d)) = V(Y(k_0), \tilde{\theta}(k_0), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k_0 - d)) + \sum_{j=k_0}^{k-1} \Delta V(j)
\]
\[
\leq V(Y(k_0), \tilde{\theta}(k_0), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k_0 - d)) - \sum_{j=k_0}^{k-1} W(Y(j))
\]
\[
\leq V(Y(k_0), \tilde{\theta}(k_0), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k_0 - d)). \quad (2.140)
\]

Thus, $V(Y(k), \tilde{\theta}(k), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k - d))$ is bounded. Since $V(Y(k), \tilde{\theta}(k), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k - d))$ is positive definite and radially unbounded, it follows that $\tilde{\theta}(k)$ and $Y(k)$ are bounded. Thus, $\theta(k) = \tilde{\theta}(k) + \theta_*$ is bounded.

Now, we show that $\lim_{k \to \infty} Y(k) = 0$. Since $V$ is positive definite, it follows from (2.138) that
\[
0 \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{j=k_0}^{k} W(Y(j))
\]
\[
\leq - \lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{j=k_0}^{k} \Delta V(j)
\]
\[
= V(Y(k_0), \tilde{\theta}(k_0), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k_0 - d)) - \lim_{k \to \infty} V(Y(k), \tilde{\theta}(k), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k - d))
\]
\[
\leq V(Y(k_0), \tilde{\theta}(k_0), \ldots, \tilde{\theta}(k_0 - d)), \quad (2.141)
\]
where all three limits exist. Thus, \( \lim_{k \to \infty} W(Y(k)) = 0 \). Next, note that
\[
0 \leq v(\|Y(k)\|) \leq W(Y(k)),
\]
where
\[
v(\|Y(k)\|) \triangleq \frac{a_1 \lambda_{\min}(Q)\|Y(k)\|^2}{1 + a_1 \lambda_{\max}(P)\|Y(k)\|^2}.
\]
Thus \( \lim_{k \to \infty} v(\|Y(k)\|) = 0 \). Rewriting (2.143) as
\[
\|Y(k)\| = \sqrt{\frac{v(\|Y(k)\|)}{a_1 (\lambda_{\min}(Q) - v(\|Y(k)\|)\lambda_{\max}(P))}},
\]
it follows that \( \lim_{k \to \infty} Y(k) = 0 \), and thus \( \lim_{k \to \infty} y(k) = 0 \). Finally, it follows from (2.136) that \( u(k) \) is bounded. Thus, \( \phi(k) \) is bounded. Since \( \phi(k) \) is the state of the nonminimal state-space realization (2.20)-(2.25) of the time-series representation (2.13) for the original state-space system (2.1), (2.2), it follows that \( x(k) \) is bounded.

To prove the last statement of Theorem 2.6.1, let \( x_w(0) \) be given and let
\[
\mathcal{X}(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
  Y(k) \\
  \hat{\theta}(k - d) \\
  \vdots \\
  \hat{\theta}(k - 2d)
\end{bmatrix}
\]
be the state of the closed-loop error system (2.115)-(2.117). Since \( V \) is positive definite and, by (2.138), \( \Delta V \) is negative semidefinite, it follows from [77, Lemma A.3.12] that the zero solution of the closed-loop error system is Lyapunov stable starting at \( k_0 \). Therefore, given \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \), there exists \( \delta_0 > 0 \) such that, if \( \|\mathcal{X}(k_0)\| < \delta_0 \), then \( \|\mathcal{X}(k)\| < \varepsilon_0 \) for all \( k \geq k_0 \).

Now, assume that the open-loop dynamics matrix \( A \) is asymptotically stable and
that $u(k) = 0$ for all $k < k_0$. Then, it follows that there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that, if $\|X(0)\| < \delta_1$, then $\|X(k)\| < \delta_0$ for all $k = 0, \ldots, k_0 - 1$. Consequently, for all $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that, if $\|X(0)\| < \delta_1$, then $\|X(k)\| < \varepsilon_0$ for all $k \geq 0$. Therefore, the zero solution of the closed-loop error system (2.115)-(2.117) is Lyapunov stable starting at $k = 0$.

The step size $\eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$ given by (2.122) has the following interpretation. Note that (2.130) can be written as

$$\Delta V(k) \leq \ln \left(1 + \frac{a_1 \Delta J(k)}{1 + a_1 J(Y(k))}\right) + a_2 \left[(\eta(k) - \eta_{\text{opt}}(k))^2 - \eta_{\text{opt}}^2(k)\right] \|G(k)\|_F^2. \tag{2.146}$$

Since the quadratic function $(\eta(k) - \eta_{\text{opt}}(k))^2 - \eta_{\text{opt}}^2(k)$ achieves its minimum at $\eta(k) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$, it follows that the upper bound for $\Delta V(k)$ given by (2.146) is minimized by $\eta(k) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$.

An analogous optimal step size is constructed in [127], where an ideal (not necessarily deadbeat) controller is assumed to exist. However, in the present chapter, an ideal deadbeat internal model controller is proven to exist and have the properties given by Theorem 2.4.1 and Proposition 2.5.1. Hence, for all $k \geq k_0$, $\tilde{y}(k) = y(k)$ is known, and thus $\eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$ is computable.

In [127], $\tilde{y}(k) = y(k) - y^*(k)$ is unknown since $y^*(k)$ is unknown, and thus the optimal step size is not computable in [127]. To obtain a computable step size in [127], several implementable step sizes are defined. We can construct an analogous step size $\eta_{\text{imp}}(k)$. Specifically, $\eta_{\text{imp}}(k)$ defined by

$$\eta_{\text{imp}}(k) \triangleq \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \sigma^2_{\text{max}}(H_d)\|\phi(k-d)\|_2^2}, \tag{2.147}$$

Since the quadratic function $(\eta(k) - \eta_{\text{opt}}(k))^2 - \eta_{\text{opt}}^2(k)$ achieves its minimum at $\eta(k) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$, it follows that the upper bound for $\Delta V(k)$ given by (2.146) is minimized by $\eta(k) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$.
where \( \varepsilon \geq 0 \), satisfies

\[
\eta_{\text{imp}}(k) \leq \eta_{\text{opt}}(k).
\]

(2.148)

Theorem 2.6.1 holds with (2.121) replaced by

\[
\eta(k) = \zeta(k)\eta_{\text{imp}}(k).
\]

(2.149)

However, (2.147) is not needed in the present chapter since \( \tilde{y}(k) = y(k) \) is known for all \( k \geq k_0 \) and thus \( \eta_{\text{opt}}(k) \) is computable and thus implementable.

Let \( \{\psi(k)\}_{k=k_0}^\infty \) satisfy

\[
\frac{\zeta_u}{2} < \sup_{j \geq k_0} \psi(j) < \infty,
\]

(2.150)

and define \( \hat{\zeta}(k) \triangleq \frac{\zeta(k)}{\psi(k)} \). Then, if (2.119) holds for \( \{\zeta(k)\}_{k=k_0}^\infty \), then it also holds with \( \{\zeta(k)\}_{k=k_0}^\infty \) replaced by \( \{\hat{\zeta}(k)\}_{k=k_0}^\infty \). The term \( \psi(k) \) can be viewed as a tuning variable relating to the magnitude of the bound \( \bar{H}_d \) representing the accuracy with which \( H_d \) is modeled. In particular, by defining the time-varying bound

\[
\tilde{H}_{d,k} \triangleq \sqrt{\psi(k)}H_d,
\]

(2.151)

\( \tilde{H}_d \) can be replaced with \( \tilde{H}_{d,k} \) in assumption (A5) and (2.112). The example in the next section shows that the transient response is directly related to \( \psi(k) \) and thus \( \zeta(k) \). Therefore \( \psi(k) \) and \( \zeta(k) \) are indirectly related to the conservatism of the bound \( \tilde{H}_d \) on the first nonzero Markov parameter.
2.7 Mass-Spring-Dashpot Example

Consider the 3-mass structure with all possible spring and dashpot connections given by

\[
M \ddot{q} + C \dot{q} + K q = \mu \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \mu \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_3 \end{bmatrix},
\]

(2.152)

where

\[
M \triangleq \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3),
\]

(2.153)

\[
C \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
    c_1 + c_{1,2} + c_{1,3} & -c_{1,2} & -c_{1,3} \\
    -c_{1,2} & c_{1,2} + c_2 + c_{2,3} & -c_{2,3} \\
    -c_{1,3} & -c_{2,3} & c_{1,3} + c_{2,3} + c_3 
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(2.154)

\[
K \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
    k_1 + k_{1,2} + k_{1,3} & -k_{1,2} & -k_{1,3} \\
    -k_{1,2} & k_{1,2} + k_2 + k_{2,3} & -k_{2,3} \\
    -k_{1,3} & -k_{2,3} & k_{1,3} + k_{2,3} + k_3 
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(2.155)

\[
q \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \\ q_3 \end{bmatrix}^T,
\]

(2.156)

\(u\) is the control, and \(w_1, w_2,\) and \(w_3\) are disturbances. For this example, the masses are \(m_1 = 0.01\) kg, \(m_2 = 0.02\) kg, \(m_3 = 0.01\) kg; the damping coefficients are \(c_1 = 5\) kg/sec, \(c_2 = 3\) kg/sec, \(c_3 = 4\) kg/sec, \(c_{1,2} = 0.1\) kg/sec, \(c_{1,3} = 0.2\) kg/sec, \(c_{2,3} = 0.3\) kg/sec; and the spring constants are \(k_1 = 11\) kg/sec\(^2\), \(k_2 = 12\) kg/sec\(^2\), \(k_3 = 13\) kg/sec\(^2\), \(k_{1,2} = 70\) kg/sec\(^2\), \(k_{1,3} = 60\) kg/sec\(^2\), \(k_{2,3} = 30\) kg/sec\(^2\). The input gain \(\mu = 10^4\) is used for numerical conditioning.

The control objective is to reject the disturbances \(w_1, w_2,\) and \(w_3\) while forcing the position of \(m_2\) to follow the command \(w_4\). Thus the performance variable is given
by $y = q_2 - w_4$. We assume that the command and disturbance signals are generated by a Lyapunov-stable discrete-time linear system whose spectrum is unknown.

The continuous-time system (2.152)-(2.156) is sampled at 100 Hz with input provided by a zero-order hold. It follows from [20] that the resulting sampled-data system is minimum phase from $u$ to $y$. Thus assumption (A2) is satisfied. Furthermore, the sampled-data system has a delay $d = 1$, and the first nonzero Markov parameter is $H_1 = 0.3$. Let the bound on the first nonzero Markov parameter be $\bar{H}_1 = 1.5H_1 = 0.45$, which satisfies assumption (A5). Thus the mass-spring-dashpot sampled-data system satisfies assumptions (A1)-(A11).

The unknown disturbance signals are discrete sinusoids with frequency $\omega_1 = 5$ Hz, and the unknown command signal is a discrete sinusoid with frequency $\omega_2 = 13$ Hz plus a constant bias. More specifically, the unknown disturbance and command signals are

$$w_1(k) = \sin 2\pi \omega_1 T_s k,$$
$$w_2(k) = -1.5 \sin 2\pi \omega_1 T_s k,$$
$$w_3(k) = 2 \sin 2\pi \omega_1 T_s k,$$
$$w_4(k) = \sin 2\pi \omega_2 T_s k + 7,$$

where the sample time is $T_s = 0.01$ sec. The open-loop system is given the initial conditions $q(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$ m and $\dot{q}(0) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$ m/s. Figure 2.2 is a time history of the performance variable $y$. The system is allowed to run open loop for 5 seconds. Then the adaptive controller (2.98) and (2.113) with $n_c = 20$, $d = 1$, $\bar{H}_1 = 0.45$, and $\eta(k) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$ is implemented in feedback with the initial condition $\theta(0) = 0$. The performance variable $y$ converges to zero, which implies that the position $q_2$ asymptotically follows the command $w_4$ and rejects the disturbances $w_1$, $w_2$, and $w_3$. In particular, Figure 2.3 shows that the controller places poles at
The adaptive controller with \( \eta(k) = \eta_{\text{opt}}(k) \) (that is, \( \zeta(k) \equiv 1 \)) is implemented in the feedback loop after 5 seconds. The performance variable \( y \) converges to zero.

The disturbance frequencies \( \omega_1 = 5 \text{ Hz} \) and \( \omega_2 = 13 \text{ Hz} \). Note that \( k_0 = 21 \), which corresponds to 0.21 sec.

The controller’s transient performance has significant peaks, as shown in Figure 2.2. This transient behavior is due in part to the bound \( \bar{H}_1 \) on the first nonzero Markov parameter \( H_1 \). However, the speed of adaptation and thus the transient performance are directly influenced by \( \zeta(k) \). Specifically, the controller adapts more slowly when \( \zeta(k) \) is small and more quickly when \( \zeta(k) \) is large. To demonstrate this effect, consider the adaptive controller (2.98) and (2.113) with \( \eta(k) = \frac{1}{5} \eta_{\text{opt}}(k) \). After the system is allowed to run open loop for 5 seconds, the adaptive controller (2.98) and (2.113) with \( n_c = 20, d = 1, \bar{H}_1 = 0.45 \), and \( \eta(k) = \frac{1}{5} \eta_{\text{opt}}(k) \) is implemented in feedback with the initial condition \( \theta(0) = 0 \). Figure 2.4 shows that the performance variable \( y \) converges to zero with improved transient performance, but at the expense of convergence time. Equivalently, setting \( \zeta(k) \equiv 1, \psi(k) \equiv 5 \), and replacing \( \bar{H}_1 \) with \( \bar{H}_{1,k} \equiv 0.45\sqrt{5} = 1.0 \) yields the same result. In this case, the transient performance is
Figure 2.3  Bode magnitude plot of the adaptive controller at \( t = 15 \) sec. The adaptive controller places poles at the disturbance frequencies \( \omega_1 = 5 \) Hz and \( \omega_2 = 13 \) Hz. The controller magnitude \( |G_c(e^{j\omega T_s})| \) is plotted for \( \omega \) up to the Nyquist frequency \( \omega_{Nyq} = \frac{\pi}{T_s} = 314 \) rad/sec.

viewed as a consequence of how well the bound \( H_{1,k} \) models the first nonzero Markov parameter \( H_1 \).

For this mass-spring-dashpot example, slower adaptation can reduce peaks in the transient performance, but faster adaptation causes faster convergence. In fact, these observations hold for many open-loop stable systems; however, if the system is open-loop unstable, then the effects of adaptation speed differ. For the open-loop stable mass-spring-dashpot system, one might consider using slower adaptation when the controller is initially turned on, then increasing the adaptation speed. In particular, let \( \zeta(k) = \exp(-3/k) \). Figure 2.5 shows a time history of the performance variable \( y \). The system is allowed to run open loop for 5 seconds. Then the adaptive controller (2.98) and (2.113) with \( n_c = 20, d = 1, \bar{H}_1 = 0.45 \), and \( \eta(k) = \exp(-3/k)\eta_{opt}(k) \) is implemented in feedback with the initial condition \( \theta(0) = 0 \). The performance variable \( y \) converges to zero with improved transient performance and good conver-
The adaptive controller with $\eta(k) = \frac{1}{5} \eta_{\text{opt}}(k)$ (that is, $\zeta(k) \equiv \frac{1}{5}$) is implemented in the feedback loop after 5 seconds. The performance variable $y$ converges to zero with improved transient performance but much slower convergence compared to Figure 2.2.

gence time. Equivalently, setting $\zeta(k) \equiv 1$, $\psi(k) = \exp(3/k)$, and replacing $\bar{H}_1$ with $\bar{H}_{1,k} = 0.45 \sqrt[3]{\exp(3/k)}$ yields the same result.

2.8 Conclusion

We considered adaptive stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, minimum-phase, discrete-time systems where the command and disturbance signals are generated by a linear system with unknown dynamics. The adaptive controller requires limited model information, specifically, knowledge of the open-loop system’s relative degree and a bound on the first nonzero Markov parameter. We considered command and disturbance signals generated by Lyapunov-stable linear systems. Thus, the command and disturbance signals are combinations of discrete-time sinusoids and steps. We proved
Figure 2.5 The adaptive controller with $\eta(k) = \exp(-3/k)\eta_{opt}(k)$ (that is, $\zeta(k) = \exp(-3/k)$) is implemented in the feedback loop after 5 seconds. The performance variable $y$ converges to zero with improved transient performance compared to figures 2.2 and 2.4. Furthermore, the performance converges almost as quickly as in Figure 2.2 and more quickly than in Figure 2.4.

global asymptotic convergence for command following and disturbance rejection.

2.9 Appendix: Deadbeat Internal Model Control

Theorem 2.9.1. Consider the discrete-time system

$$\dot{x}(k+1) = \hat{A}\dot{x}(k) + \hat{B}u(k) + \hat{D}_1w(k), \quad (2.161)$$
$$y(k) = \hat{C}\dot{x}(k) + \hat{D}_2w(k), \quad (2.162)$$

where $\dot{x}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^\hat{n}$, $y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^\hat{l}_y$, $u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^\hat{l}_u$, $w(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_w$, and assume that the following conditions hold.

(i) $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C})$ is controllable and observable.

(ii) $\hat{l}_u \geq \hat{l}_y$.  
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(iii) The exogenous signal \( w(k) \) is generated from the output of the linear system

\[
\dot{x}_w(k+1) = \hat{A}_w \dot{x}_w(k), \quad w(k) = \hat{C}_w \dot{x}_w(k),
\] (2.163)

where \( \dot{x}_w(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \), \((\hat{A}_w, \hat{C}_w)\) is observable, for all \( \lambda \in \text{spec}(\hat{A}_w) \), \( \lambda \) is not a transmission zero of \( G(z) = \hat{C}(zI - \hat{A})^{-1}\hat{B} \), and normal rank \( G = \min(\hat{l}_u, \hat{l}_y) \).

Furthermore, consider the linear time-invariant controller

\[
\dot{x}_c(k+1) = \hat{A}_c \dot{x}_c(k) + \hat{B}_c y(k), \quad u(k) = \hat{C}_c \dot{x}_c(k),
\] (2.164)

where \( \dot{x}_c(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{db}} \) so that the closed-loop system is given by

\[
x_{cl}(k+1) = A_{cl} x_{cl}(k) + D_{cl} w(k),
\] (2.165)

\[
y(k) = C_{cl} x_{cl}(k) + D_2 w(k),
\] (2.166)

where

\[
A_{cl} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A} & \hat{B}\hat{C}_c \\ \hat{B}_c\hat{C} & \hat{A}_c \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{cl} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{D}_1 \\ \hat{B}_c\hat{D}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_{cl} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_{cl} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{x}_c \end{bmatrix}.
\] (2.167)

Then, for all \( n_{db} \geq n + 2 \hat{n}_w \hat{l}_y \), there exists \((\hat{A}_c, \hat{B}_c, \hat{C}_c)\) such that \( A_{cl} \) is nilpotent. Consequently, for all initial conditions \( x_{cl}(0) \) and \( \dot{x}_w(0) \), and, for all \( k \geq 2 \left( n + \hat{n}_w \hat{l}_y \right) \), \( y(k) = 0 \).

**Proof.** A straightforward extension of the arguments used in Section 2.2 to show that \( A_w \) can be chosen to have distinct eigenvalues shows that, without loss of generality, \( \hat{A}_w \) can be assumed to be cyclic. We consider the open-loop system (2.161)-(2.162) connected in cascade with an internal model of the exogenous dynamics

\[
\dot{x}_1(k+1) = A_W \dot{x}_1(k) + B_W y(k),
\] (2.168)
where $A_W \triangleq I_y \otimes \hat{A}_w$, $B_W \triangleq I_y \otimes \hat{B}_w$, and $\hat{B}_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ is chosen such that $(\hat{A}_w, \hat{B}_w)$ is controllable [14, Fact 5.12.6] or [15, Fact 5.14.7]. Note that the dynamics (2.168) contains $\hat{l}_y$ copies of the exogenous dynamics $\hat{A}_w$. The cascade (2.161), (2.162), and (2.168) is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{x}(k+1) \\
\hat{x}_1(k+1)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} & 0 \\
B_W \hat{C} & A_W
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{x}(k) \\
\hat{x}_1(k)
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{B} \\
0
\end{bmatrix} u(k) + \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{D}_1 \\
B_W \hat{D}_2
\end{bmatrix} w(k),
\]

(2.169)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
y(k) \\
\hat{x}_1(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{C} & 0 \\
0 & I
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{x}(k) \\
\hat{x}_1(k)
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{D}_2 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} w(k).
\]

(2.170)

Now, we show that the augmented system (2.169), (2.170) is controllable and observable. First, define the stable region

\[
\mathcal{S} \triangleq \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| < 1 \},
\]

(2.171)

and the unstable region $\mathcal{U} \triangleq \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{S}$. Let $z \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\lambda \in \text{spec} (\hat{A}_w) \subset \mathcal{U}$. Since $(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$ is controllable, it follows that

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - zI & \hat{B} & 0 \\
B_W \hat{C} & 0 & A_W - zI
\end{bmatrix} & \geq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - \lambda I & \hat{B} & 0 \\
B_W \hat{C} & 0 & A_W - \lambda I
\end{bmatrix} \\
& \geq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix}
I_{\hat{n}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & B_W & A_W - \lambda I
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - \lambda I & \hat{B} & 0 \\
\hat{C} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I_{i_y n_w}
\end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
\]

(2.172)
Conditions (ii) and (iii) imply that rank
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - \lambda I & \hat{B} & 0 \\
\hat{C} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I_{\hat{n} \hat{y} \hat{n}_w}
\end{bmatrix}
= \hat{n} + \hat{y} \hat{n}_w, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - \lambda I & \hat{B} & 0 \\
\hat{C} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I_{\hat{n} \hat{y} \hat{n}_w}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
is full row rank. Therefore,
\[
\hat{n} + \hat{y} \hat{n}_w \geq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - zI & \hat{B} & 0 \\
B_W \hat{C} & A_W - zI
\end{bmatrix} \geq \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix}
I_{\hat{n}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & B_W & A_W - \lambda I
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(2.173)

Since \((A_W, B_W)\) is controllable, rank
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_{\hat{n}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & B_W & A_W - \lambda I
\end{bmatrix} = \hat{n} + \hat{y} \hat{n}_w, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} - zI & \hat{B} & 0 \\
B_W \hat{C} & A_W - zI
\end{bmatrix}
\]
is observable. Thus, there exists an observer-based controller that stabilizes the augmented system (2.169)-(2.170) and yields a closed-loop system with nilpotent dynamics. It follows that, for all \(n_{db} \geq \hat{n} + 2 \hat{n}_w \hat{y}\), there exists a linear time-invariant controller (2.164) of order \(n_{db}\), such that the equilibrium of the closed-loop system (2.165)-(2.167) is asymptotically stable, where \(A_{cl}\) is nilpotent and, for all initial conditions \(x_{cl}(0)\) and \(\hat{x}_w(0)\),
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} y(k) = 0.
\]

The closed-loop system (2.165)-(2.167) with exogenous input \(w(k)\), can be written
as

\[ x_s(k + 1) = A_s x_s(k), \quad y(k) = C_s x_s(k), \]  

(2.175)

where

\[
A_s \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
A_{cl} & D_{cl} \hat{C}_w \\
0 & \hat{A}_w
\end{bmatrix}, \quad C_s \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
C_{cl} & \hat{D}_2 \hat{C}_w
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(2.176)

and \( x_s \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} x_{cl} \\ \hat{x}_w \end{bmatrix} \). Since \( \lim_{k \to \infty} y(k) = 0 \) and \( A_{cl} \) is asymptotically stable, it follows from [40, 44, Lemma 2.1] there exists \( S \in \mathbb{R}^{2(\hat{n} + \hat{n}_w \hat{l}_y) \times \hat{n}_w} \) such that

\[
A_{cl} S - S \hat{A}_w = D_{cl} \hat{C}_w, \]  

(2.177)

\[
C_{cl} S = \hat{D}_2 \hat{C}_w. \]  

(2.178)

Now define \( Q \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I & -S \\
0 & I \end{bmatrix} \), and consider the change of basis

\[
\bar{A}_s \triangleq Q^{-1} A_s Q = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{cl} & 0 \\
0 & \hat{A}_w
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{C}_s \triangleq C_s Q = \begin{bmatrix}
C_{cl} & 0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(2.179)

Then, we have \( y(k) = \bar{C}_s \bar{A}_s^k Q^{-1} x_s(0) = C_{cl} A_{cl}^k \left[ x_{cl}(0) + S \hat{x}_w(0) \right] \). Since \( A_{cl} \in \mathbb{R}^{2(\hat{n} + \hat{n}_w \hat{l}_y) \times 2(\hat{n} + \hat{n}_w \hat{l}_y)} \) is nilpotent, it follows that, for all initial conditions \( x_{cl}(0) \) and \( \hat{x}_w(0) \) and for all \( k \geq 2 \left( \hat{n} + \hat{n}_w \hat{l}_y \right) \), \( y(k) = 0. \) \( \square \)
2.10 Appendix: Inverse System Bounds

Consider the discrete-time system (2.1), (2.2), where \( y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l, u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l \). To derive the inverse system, we increment (2.2) by \( d \) steps, yielding

\[
y(k + d) = Cx(k + d) + D_2w(k + d) \\
= CA^d x(k) + H_d u(k)
\]

\[
+ \left[ D_2 \quad CD_1 \quad \cdots \quad CA^{d-1} D_1 \right] \begin{bmatrix} w(k + d) \\ \vdots \\ w(k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.181)
\]

where \( H_d \triangleq CA^{d-1}B \) is the first nonzero Markov parameter from \( u \) to \( y \). It follows from (2.181) and assumption (A4) that

\[
u(k) = -H_d^{-1} CA^d x(k) + H_d^{-1} y(k + d)
\]

\[
- H_d^{-1} \left[ D_2 \quad CD_1 \quad \cdots \quad CA^{d-1} D_1 \right] \begin{bmatrix} w(k + d) \\ \vdots \\ w(k) \end{bmatrix}.
\]

The inverse system is thus given by

\[
x(k + 1) = A_R x(k) + B_R y(d) + D_{1R} W_d(k), \quad (2.182)
\]
\[
u(k) = C_R x(k) + D_R y(d) + D_{2R} W_d(k), \quad (2.183)
\]

where

\[
A_R \triangleq A - BH_d^{-1} CA^d, \quad B_R \triangleq BH_d^{-1},
\]
\[
C_R \triangleq -H_d^{-1} CA^d, \quad D_R \triangleq H_d^{-1},
\]
$D_{1R} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -BH_d^{-1}D_2 & -BH_d^{-1}CD_1 & \cdots & -BH_d^{-1}CA^{d-2}D_1 & D_1 - BH_d^{-1}CA^{d-1}D_1 \end{bmatrix}$,

$D_{2R} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -H_d^{-1}D_2 & -H_d^{-1}CD_1 & \cdots & -H_d^{-1}CA^{d-1}D_1 \end{bmatrix}$,

$y_d(k) \triangleq y(k + d), \quad W_d(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} w(k + d) \\ \vdots \\ w(k) \end{bmatrix}$. \hspace{1cm} (2.184)

Since, by assumption (A1), $(A,B,C)$ is minimal, it follows from [125, Proposition 4.2] that the eigenvalues of $A_R$ consist of the invariant zeros of $(A,B,C)$ as well as $n - d$ eigenvalues equal to 0. Therefore, by assumption (A2), $A_R$ is asymptotically stable.

**Theorem 2.10.1.** Consider the system (2.1), (2.2) and its inverse (2.182), (2.183). Let $p$ be a positive integer. Then, subject to assumptions (A1), (A2), (A4), and (A8), there exist $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|\bar{U}(k - d)\|_2^2 \leq c_1 + c_2\|\bar{Y}(k)\|_2^2,$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.185)

where

$$\bar{U}(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u(k - 1) \\ \vdots \\ u(k - p) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{Y}(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y(k - 1) \\ \vdots \\ y(k - p - 1) \end{bmatrix}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.186)
Proof. By successive substitution,

\[ u(k) = C_R A_R^k x(0) + D_R y_d(k) + D_{2R} W_d(k) \]

\[ + \sum_{i=1}^{k} C_R A_R^{i-1} B_R y_d(k - i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} C_R A_R^{i-1} D_{1R} W_d(k - i). \]

Taking the norm of both sides yields

\[ \|u(k)\|^2 \leq 5 \left\{ \|C_R\|^2 \|A_R^k\|^2 \|x(0)\|^2 + \|D_R\|^2 \|y_d(k)\|^2 + \|D_{2R}\|^2 \|W_d(k)\|^2 \right. \]

\[ + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|C_R\| \|A_R^{i-1}\| \|B_R\| \|y_d(k - i)\| \right]^2 \]

\[ + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|C_R\| \|A_R^{i-1}\| \|D_{1R}\| \|W_d(k - i)\| \right]^2 \}

where \( \| \cdot \| \) is the Euclidean norm. Since \( A_R \) is asymptotically stable, it follows that there exist \( \lambda \in [0,1) \) and \( c > 0 \) such that, for every positive integer \( k \), \( \|A_R^k\| \leq c \lambda^k \). Therefore, there exists \( c_3 > 0 \) such that

\[ \|u(k)\|^2 \leq c_3 \left[ \lambda^{2k} + \|y_d(k)\|^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda^{i-1} \|y_d(k - i)\| \right)^2 \right. \]

\[ + \|W_d(k)\|^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda^{i-1} \|W_d(k - i)\| \right)^2 \]

Since, by assumption (A8), \( w(k) \) is bounded for all \( k \), it follows that \( \|W_d(k)\|^2 \) is also bounded, that is, there exists \( \rho > 0 \) such that \( \|W_d(k)\|^2 \leq \rho \) for all \( k \). Thus, there exists \( c_4 > 0 \) such that

\[ \|u(k)\|^2 \leq c_4 \left[ \rho + \lambda^{2k} + \|y_d(k)\|^2 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{i-1} \right) \times \right. \]

\[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda^{i-1} \|y_d(k - i)\|^2 \right) + \left( \rho \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{i-1} \right)^2 \right]. \]
Since $|\lambda| < 1$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{i-1} = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}$, where $0^0 \triangleq 1$. Thus, it follows that there exist $c_5 > 0$ and $c_6 > 0$ such that

$$
\|u(k)\|^2 \leq c_5 \left[ c_6 + \|y_d(k)\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda^{i-1} \|y_d(k-i)\|^2 \right].
$$

(2.187)

Summing both sides of (2.187) from $k - p$ to $k - 1$ yields

$$
\sum_{j=k-p}^{k-1} \|u(j)\|^2 \leq c_5 \left[ c_7 + \sum_{j=k-p}^{k-1} \|y_d(j)\|^2 + \sum_{j=k-p}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{j} \lambda^{i-1} \|y_d(j-i)\|^2 \right],
$$

(2.188)

where $c_7 > 0$. Introducing $\tau \triangleq j - i$ yields

$$
\sum_{j=k-p}^{k-1} \|u(j)\|^2 \leq c_5 \left[ c_7 + \sum_{j=k-p}^{k-1} \|y_d(j)\|^2 + \sum_{\tau=k-p}^{k-2} \sum_{j=\tau+1}^{k-1} \lambda^{j-\tau-1} \|y_d(\tau)\|^2 \right]
\leq c_8 \left[ c_7 + \sum_{j=k-p}^{k-1} \|y_d(j)\|^2 + \sum_{\tau=k-p-1}^{k-2} \|y_d(\tau)\|^2 \right]
\leq c_1 + c_2 \sum_{j=k-p-1}^{k-1} \|y_d(j)\|^2,
$$

(2.189)

where $c_8 > 0$. Decrementing (2.189) by $d$ steps and using the definitions of $y_d(k)$, $\tilde{U}(k)$, and $\tilde{Y}(k)$ from (2.184) and (2.186), (yields 2.185).
In the previous chapter, we developed a gradient-based adaptive control algorithm for stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection of multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, minimum-phase, discrete-time systems. A seemingly obvious extension would be to use the theory and methods developed in Chapter 2 to generalize the adaptive control algorithm for handling nonminimum-phase systems. Unfortunately, the same method of proof used in the previous chapter will not work for nonminimum-phase systems. Specifically, the development of the ideal fixed-gain controller in Section 2.4 requires a precompensator to exactly cancel the zeros of the open-loop plant. If nonminimum-phase zeros were present, this would cause unstable pole-zero cancellation in the loop. Even though the ideal fixed-gain controller is never implemented in practice, it must be shown to exist for the development of the adaptive control algorithm. In addition, the stability and convergence analysis of the adaptive controller in Section 2.6 requires that the control inputs $u$ be bounded by the performance measurements $y$. For minimum-phase systems, this follows from Theorem 2.10.1, but the same is not true in general for systems with nonminimum-phase zeros.
To overcome nonminimum-phase zero restrictions, lifting techniques [4, 10–12, 71], which transform a high-rate nonminimum-phase system into a low-rate minimum-phase system, were explored. Lifting is able to transform a nonminimum-phase system into a minimum-phase system by forcing the system to run open loop, that is \( u = 0 \), over a periodic window of time. However, when operating the system open loop, the performance measurement \( y \) will not converge to zero if there are additional commands and/or disturbances driving the plant. The same is true for systems that are open-loop unstable.

This chapter marks a shift in the focus of this dissertation from gradient-based adaptive control to retrospective-cost-based adaptive control. In particular, this chapter investigates full-state-feedback stabilization in multi-input, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems. The results of this chapter support and motivate the retrospective-cost-based adaptive controllers developed in Chapters 4 and 5 by providing a basis for retrospective cost optimization. Retrospective cost optimization [127] is a measure of performance at the current time based on a past window of data and without assumptions about the command or disturbance signals. In particular, retrospective cost optimization acts as an inner loop to the adaptive control algorithm by modifying the performance variables based on the difference between the actual past control inputs and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law.

The novel features of this chapter include a Lyapunov-based stability and convergence proof for a special case. We also present numerical examples to illustrate the robustness of the algorithm under conditions of Markov parameter uncertainty. Theoretical and numerical results suggest that the converged adaptive controller has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an infinite upward adaptive gain margin, which is reminiscent of continuous-time fixed-gain LQR control.
3.1 Introduction

Modern control engineering primarily focuses on state-space methods. Of these approaches, the full-state-feedback stabilization problem is perhaps the most well known. Given a linear, time-invariant system, the full-state-feedback problem is to find a stabilizing static feedback gain such that the closed-loop system with state feedback is asymptotically stable. Under certain conditions, namely controllability of the pair \((A, B)\), it is possible to arbitrarily assign the closed-loop system’s eigenvalues by appropriate feedback of the system state \(x\). Further details are discussed in [6, 97].

The most well-developed approaches to the full-state-feedback problem are to use pole-placement or eigenvalue-assignment schemes. For a scalar-input plant, a stabilizing feedback gain can be found graphically through root locus or Nyquist techniques. Alternatively, a stabilizing feedback gain \(K\) can be obtained directly by constructing a desired closed-loop characteristic equation \(\det(sI - A + BK)\) [6]. Another well-known approach is to use a linear quadratic regulator (LQR) for full-state-feedback. Instead of directly assigning closed-loop eigenvalues, LQR places the closed-loop poles based on the optimization of a cost function. One drawback of these approaches is that they all depend on an accurate model of the system. Since adaptive controllers can accommodate (to an extent) inaccurate models of the system and adapt online to the true system, this motivates the use of adaptive control for full-state-feedback stabilization.

The goal of this chapter is to present a discrete-time, adaptive, full-state-feedback control law that is effective for systems that are multi-input and/or unstable. The algorithm is developed in discrete time based on a discrete-time plant model obtained by either plant discretization or discrete-time system identification so that the controller can be implemented directly as embedded code without an intermediate controller discretization step.

The results of this chapter support and motivate the retrospective-cost-based
adaptive controllers developed in Chapters 4 and 5 by providing a basis for retrospective cost optimization. This method is used to adapt dynamic compensators for disturbance rejection, adaptive stabilization, adaptive command following, and model reference adaptive control in [113, 127]. Retrospective cost optimization is a measure of performance at the current time based on a past window of data and without assumptions about the command or disturbance signals. In particular, retrospective cost optimization acts as an inner loop to the adaptive control algorithm by modifying the performance variables based on the difference between the actual past control inputs and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law. We prove Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop error system for a special scalar case.

We present numerical examples to illustrate the algorithm’s effectiveness in handling systems that are unstable to provide insight into the modeling information required for controller implementation. This information includes a limited number of Markov parameters, and in many cases, only a bound on the input matrix $B$ need be known. For full-state feedback, these numerical results suggest that the retrospective-cost adaptive controller has downward and upward gain margins of 6 dB and $\infty$ dB, respectively, which is reminiscent of continuous-time fixed-gain LQR control.

### 3.2 Problem Formulation

Consider the discrete-time system

$$x(k + 1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k),$$

(3.1)

where $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and $k \geq 0$. We assume that $(A, B)$ is controllable and that measurements of $x$ are available for feedback. Our goal is to develop an adaptive full-state-feedback controller such that $x$ converges to
zero.

For a nonnegative integer \( r \), we define the extended state vector \( X(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{nr} \) and the extended input vector \( U(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{mr} \) by

\[
X(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} x(k-r+1) \\ \vdots \\ x(k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad U(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u(k-r+1) \\ \vdots \\ u(k) \end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(3.2)

Note that (3.1) can be rewritten as

\[
X(k+1) = AX(k) + BU(k),
\]

(3.3)

where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{nr \times nr} \) and \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{nr \times mr} \) are given by

\[
\mathcal{A} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ A^2 & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^r & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ H_2 & H_1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ H_r & H_{r-1} & \cdots & H_1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

(3.4)

where, for all \( i > 0 \), the Markov parameters \( H_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) of the system (3.1) are

\[
H_i \triangleq A^{i-1}B.
\]

(3.5)

In particular, \( H_1 = B \).
3.3 Retrospective Cost Optimization

Let

\[ u(k) = K(k)x(k), \quad (3.6) \]

where \( K(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) is the gain matrix. From (3.6), it follows that the extended input vector \( U(k) \) can be rewritten as

\[ U(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} L_i K(k - i + 1)x(k - i + 1), \quad (3.7) \]

where

\[
L_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
0_{(r-i) \times m} \\
I_m \\
0_{(i-1) \times m}
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{mr \times m}. \quad (3.8)
\]

Next, for \( \mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \), define the retrospective state vector \( \hat{X}(\mathcal{K}, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{nr} \) by

\[ \hat{X}(\mathcal{K}, k + 1) \triangleq AX(k) + B\hat{U}(\mathcal{K}, k), \quad (3.9) \]

where \( \hat{U}(\mathcal{K}, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{mr} \) is the recomputed input vector, given by

\[ \hat{U}(\mathcal{K}, k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{r} L_i \mathcal{K} x(k - i + 1). \quad (3.10) \]

Subtracting (3.3) from (3.9) yields

\[ \hat{X}(\mathcal{K}, k + 1) = X(k + 1) - B \left[ U(k) - \hat{U}(\mathcal{K}, k) \right]. \quad (3.11) \]
Note that

\[ \hat{U}(\mathcal{K}, k) = E(k) \text{vec } \mathcal{K}, \]  

where

\[ E(k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{r} x^T(k - i + 1) \otimes L_i \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}, \]  

\[ \text{vec} \text{ is the column-stacking operator, and } \otimes \text{ represents the Kronecker product. Furthermore,} \]

\[ \hat{X}(\mathcal{K}, k+1) = f(k) + D(k) \text{vec } \mathcal{K}, \]

where

\[ f(k) \triangleq X(k+1) - \mathbf{B}U(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{nr}, \]

\[ D(k) \triangleq \mathbf{B}E(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{nr \times mn}. \]

Now consider the retrospective cost function

\[ J(\mathcal{K}, k) \triangleq \hat{X}^T(\mathcal{K}, k+1) R_1(k) \hat{X}(\mathcal{K}, k+1) + \alpha(k) \text{tr} \left[ (\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{K}(k))^T (\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{K}(k)) \right], \]

where, for all \( k \geq 0 \), \( R_1(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{nr \times nr} \) is positive semidefinite and the learning rate \( \alpha(k) \in \mathbb{R} \) satisfies

\[ 0 < \alpha(k) \leq \alpha_u \triangleq \sup_{j \geq 0} \alpha(j) < \infty. \]
Substituting (3.14) into (3.17) yields

\[ J(K, k) = c(k) + b^T(k)\text{vec } K + (\text{vec } K)^T M(k) \text{vec } K, \tag{3.19} \]

where

\[ M(k) \triangleq D^T(k)R_1(k)D(k) + \alpha(k)I_{mm}, \tag{3.20} \]
\[ b(k) \triangleq 2D^T(k)R_1(k)f(k) - 2\alpha(k)\text{vec } K(k), \tag{3.21} \]
\[ c(k) \triangleq f^T(k)R_1(k)f(k) + \alpha(k)\text{tr } [K^T(k)K(k)]. \tag{3.22} \]

Since \( M(k) \) is positive definite, \( J(K, k) \) has the strict global minimizer \( K(k+1) \) given by

\[ K(k+1) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{vec}^{-1} \left[ M^{-1}(k)b(k) \right]. \tag{3.23} \]

Since \( K(k+1) \) depends on \( x(k+1) \) through the dependence of \( b(k) \) on \( X(k+1) \), it follows that \( u(k+1) = K(k+1)x(k+1) \) can be implemented at step \( k+1 \).

Note that \( M(k) \) and \( b(k) \) depend on \( D(k) \) and \( f(k) \), which in turn depend on the Markov parameter matrix \( B \). Since \( B \) may not be known in practice, we replace \( B \) by an estimate \( \hat{B} \) in \( D(k), f(k), \) and \( K(k+1) \). Therefore, for all \( k \geq 1 \), the implemented control gain \( \hat{K}(k) \) depends on \( \hat{B} \), that is,

\[ u(k) = \hat{K}(k)x(k), \tag{3.24} \]
\[ \hat{K}(k+1) \triangleq -\frac{1}{2} \text{vec}^{-1} \left[ \hat{M}^{-1}(k)\hat{b}(k) \right], \tag{3.25} \]
where

\[
\hat{M}(k) \triangleq \hat{D}^T(k)R_1(k)\hat{D}(k) + \alpha(k)I_{mn}, \tag{3.26}
\]
\[
\hat{b}(k) \triangleq 2\hat{D}^T(k)R_1(k)\hat{f}(k) - 2\alpha(k)\operatorname{vec} \hat{K}(k), \tag{3.27}
\]

and

\[
\hat{f}(k) \triangleq X(k + 1) - \hat{B}U(k), \tag{3.28}
\]
\[
\hat{D}(k) \triangleq \hat{B}E(k), \tag{3.29}
\]
\[
\hat{B} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{H}_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\hat{H}_2 & \hat{H}_1 & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
\hat{H}_r & \hat{H}_{r-1} & \cdots & \hat{H}_1
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.30}
\]

where, for all \(i = 1, \ldots, r\), \(\hat{H}_i\) is an estimate of \(H_i\). For convenience, we specialize (3.20)–(3.22) and (3.26), (3.27) with \(R_1(k) \triangleq I_{nr}\).

The learning rate \(\alpha(k)\) affects the convergence speed of the adaptive control algorithm. As \(\alpha(k)\) is increased, convergence speed is lowered. Likewise, as \(\alpha(k)\) is decreased, convergence speed is raised. By varying \(\alpha(k)\), we study tradeoffs between transient performance and convergence speed.
3.4 Closed-loop System

For all $k \geq 0$, the closed-loop system is given by

$$
X(k+1) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & I_n & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & A + B\hat{K}(k)
\end{bmatrix} X(k).
$$

(3.31)

$$\vec{\hat{K}}(k+1) = -\frac{1}{2} \hat{M}^{-1}(k)\hat{b}(k),$$

(3.32)

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\vec{\hat{K}}(k) \\
\vec{\hat{K}}(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
\vec{\hat{K}}(k-r+2)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{mn} & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & I_{mn} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\vec{\hat{K}}(k) \\
\vec{\hat{K}}(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
\vec{\hat{K}}(k-r+1)
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(3.33)

Note that the order of the closed-loop system is $(m+1)nr$.

Let $m = 1$ so that $E(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} L_{i}x^{T}(k - i + 1)$. Then, for all $k \geq 0$, (3.32) can be written as

$$\vec{\hat{K}}(k+1) = \vec{\alpha}(k)\hat{K}(k) - X^{T}(k+1)\hat{B}E(k) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} x^{T}(k - i + 1)\hat{K}^{T}(k - i + 1)L_{i}^{T}\hat{B}^{T}\hat{B}E(k)$$

\cdot \left[\alpha(k)I_{n} + E^{T}(k)\hat{B}^{T}\hat{B}E(k)\right]^{-1}.

(3.34)
3.5 Closed-Loop Error System \((m = r = 1)\)

Let \(m = r = 1\). Then, for all \(k \geq 0\), the closed-loop system with gain matrix \(\hat{K}(k)\) is given by

\[
x(k + 1) = \left[ A + B\hat{K}(k) \right] x(k), \quad (3.35)
\]

\[
\hat{K}(k + 1) = \hat{K}(k) - \frac{x^T(k + 1)\hat{B}}{\alpha(k) + B^T\hat{B}x^T(k)x(k)}x^T(k). \quad (3.36)
\]

Let \(K^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}\) be a gain matrix that renders the ideal closed-loop system nilpotent, that is,

\[
x^*(k + 1) = \mathcal{N}x^*(k), \quad (3.37)
\]

where \(x^*(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n\), and the matrix \(\mathcal{N} \triangleq A + BK^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) is nilpotent. Consequently, for all \(k \geq n\), \(x^*(k) = 0\). Define the error states \(\tilde{x}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n\) and \(\tilde{K}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}\) by

\[
\tilde{x}(k) \triangleq x(k) - x^*(k), \quad (3.38)
\]

\[
\tilde{K}(k) \triangleq \hat{K}(k) - K^*. \quad (3.39)
\]

Thus, for all \(k \geq n\), \(\tilde{x}(k) = x(k)\). Therefore, for all \(k \geq n\), substituting \(\bar{K}(k) = \hat{K}(k) + K^*\) into (3.35) and (3.36) yields the closed-loop error system

\[
x(k + 1) = \left[ \mathcal{N} + B\bar{K}(k) \right] x(k), \quad (3.40)
\]

\[
\bar{K}(k + 1) = \bar{K}(k) - \frac{x^T(k + 1)\hat{B}}{\alpha(k) + B^T\hat{B}x^T(k)x(k)}x^T(k). \quad (3.41)
\]

By substituting (3.40) into (3.41), the closed-loop error system can be rewritten
for all $k \geq n$ as

$$x(k + 1) = \left[ N + B\tilde{K}(k) \right] x(k), \quad \text{(3.42)}$$

$$\tilde{K}^T(k + 1) = A(k)\tilde{K}^T(k) - \frac{\hat{B}^T N x(k)}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k) x(k)} x(k), \quad \text{(3.43)}$$

where

$$A(k) \triangleq I_n - \frac{\hat{B}^T B}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k) x(k)} x(k) x^T(k). \quad \text{(3.44)}$$

The multispectrum of $A(k)$ is given by

$$\text{mspec } [A(k)] = \left\{ 1, \ldots, 1, 1 - \frac{\hat{B}^T B x^T(k) x(k)}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k) x(k)} \right\}. \quad \text{(3.45)}$$

**Proposition 3.5.1.** Assume that $B^T B < 2\hat{B}^T B$ and consider (3.45). Then, for all $k \geq n$,

$$1 - \frac{B^T B}{\hat{B}^T B} < 1 - \frac{\hat{B}^T B x^T(k) x(k)}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T B x^T(k) x(k)} \leq 1. \quad \text{(3.46)}$$

Furthermore,

$$\left| 1 - \frac{B^T B}{\hat{B}^T B} \right| < 1. \quad \text{(3.47)}$$

**Proof.** Let $k \geq n$. Since $B^T B < 2\hat{B}^T B$, we have

$$0 < \frac{B^T B}{\hat{B}^T B} < 2,$$
and thus,
\[
\left| 1 - \frac{B^T B}{B^T B} \right| < 1.
\]

Now, since \(0 < \alpha(k) B^T B\), we have
\[
0 \leq \hat{B}^T B \hat{B}^T B x^T(k)x(k) < \alpha(k) B^T B + \hat{B}^T B \hat{B}^T B x^T(k)x(k).
\]

Therefore,
\[
0 \leq \hat{B}^T B \hat{B}^T B x^T(k)x(k) < B^T B \left[ \alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k)x(k) \right],
\]

and thus,
\[
0 \leq \frac{\hat{B}^T B x^T(k)x(k)}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k)x(k)} < \frac{B^T B}{B^T B},
\]

which implies
\[
1 - \frac{B^T B}{B^T B} < 1 - \frac{\hat{B}^T B x^T(k)x(k)}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k)x(k)} \leq 1.
\]

It follows from Proposition 3.5.1 that the singular values of \(A(k)\) are given by
\[
\sigma[A(k)] = \left\{ 1, \ldots, 1, 1 - \frac{\hat{B}^T B x^T(k)x(k)}{\alpha(k) + \hat{B}^T \hat{B} x^T(k)x(k)} \right\}.
\] (3.48)

### 3.6 Special Case \((n = m = r = 1)\)

Let \(n = m = r = 1\) and define \(K^* \triangleq -A/B\), which yields \(x^*(k) \equiv 0\) for all \(k \geq 1\). Consequently, for all \(k \geq 1\), \(\tilde{x}(k) = x(k)\). Therefore, for all \(k \geq 1\), it follows from (3.42), (3.43) that the closed-loop error system is
\[ x(k + 1) = B K(k) x(k), \quad (3.49) \]
\[ K(k + 1) = \Gamma(\gamma(k) x^2(k)) K(k), \quad (3.50) \]

where, for \( \lambda \geq 0, \)
\[ \Gamma(\lambda) \triangleq \frac{1 + \eta \lambda}{1 + \lambda}, \quad (3.51) \]

\( \eta \triangleq 1 - 1/\delta, \) \( \delta \triangleq \hat{B}/B, \) and \( \gamma(k) \triangleq \hat{B}^2/\alpha(k). \) Note that \( \Gamma(0) = 1, \) \( \Gamma(\lambda) \rightarrow \eta \) as \( \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \) and \( \Gamma(\lambda) \) is a decreasing function of \( \lambda \) on \([0, \infty)\). Also, note that \( \eta \in (-1, 1) \) if and only if \( \delta > \frac{1}{2}. \)

Further simplification is possible when \( B \) is known. In particular \( \eta = 0 \) if and only if \( \hat{B} = B. \) In this case, \( (3.49), (3.50) \) simplify to
\[ x(k + 1) = B \tilde{K}(k) x(k), \quad (3.52) \]
\[ \tilde{K}(k + 1) = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma(k) x^2(k)} \tilde{K}(k). \quad (3.53) \]

**Lemma 3.6.1.** Assume that \( \delta > \frac{1}{2} \) and consider \( (3.49), (3.50). \) Then, for all \( k \geq 1, \) \( \eta < \Gamma(\gamma(k)x^2(k)) \leq 1. \) Furthermore, for all \( k \geq 1 \) such that \( x(k) \neq 0, \)
\( \eta < \Gamma(\gamma(k)x^2(k)) < 1, \) and thus \( |\Gamma(\gamma(k)x^2(k))| < 1. \)

**Proof.** Let \( k \geq 1. \) Since \( \eta \in (-1, 1), \) it follows that
\[ \eta < 1 \leq 1 + (1 - \eta) \gamma(k) x^2(k). \]

Therefore,
\[ \eta [1 + \gamma(k) x^2(k)] < 1 + \eta \gamma(k) x^2(k) \leq 1 + \gamma(k) x^2(k), \]
and thus,

\[ \eta < \Gamma(\gamma(k)x^2(k)) \leq 1. \]

Furthermore, for all \( k \geq 1 \) such that \( x(k) \neq 0 \), it follows that \(-1 < \eta < \Gamma(\gamma(k)x^2(k)) < 1\). \( \square \)

**Theorem 3.6.2.** Assume that \( n = m = r = 1 \), assume that \( \delta > \frac{1}{2} \), and consider the open-loop system (3.1) and the adaptive feedback controller (3.24), (3.25). Then, for all initial conditions \( x(0) \) and \( \hat{K}(0) \), the following statements hold:

(i) \( \hat{K}(k) \) is bounded.

(ii) \( \lim_{k \to \infty} x(k) = 0. \)

(iii) \( \{ |\tilde{K}(k)| \}_{k=1}^{\infty} \) is nonincreasing.

(iv) \( \lim_{k \to \infty} |\tilde{K}(k)| < 1/|B|. \)

(v) There exists \( k_0 \geq 1 \) such that \( \{ |x(k)| \}_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \) is decreasing.

(vi) The zero solution of the closed-loop error system (3.49), (3.50) is Lyapunov stable.

**Proof.** Let \( k \geq 1 \) so that \( \tilde{x}(k) = x(k) \). Consider the positive-definite, radially unbounded Lyapunov candidate

\[ V(x, \tilde{K}) \overset{\Delta}{=} \ln \left( 1 + \gamma_0 x^2 \right) + a\tilde{K}^2, \quad (3.54) \]

where \( \gamma_0 \overset{\Delta}{=} \hat{B}^2/\alpha_u > 0 \) and \( a > 0 \) is specified below. The Lyapunov difference is thus given by

\[ \Delta V(k) \overset{\Delta}{=} V(x(k+1), \tilde{K}(k+1)) - V(x(k), \tilde{K}(k)). \quad (3.55) \]
Evaluating $\Delta V(k)$ along the trajectories of the closed-loop error system (3.49), (3.50) yields

$$
\Delta V(k) = \ln (1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k + 1)) - \ln (1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k)) + a \left( \bar{K}^2(k + 1) - \bar{K}^2(k) \right)
= \ln \left( 1 + \gamma_0 B^2 \bar{K}^2(k) x^2(k) \right) - \ln (1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k))
+ a \left[ \frac{(1 + \eta \gamma(k)x^2(k))^2}{(1 + \gamma(k)x^2(k))^2} \bar{K}^2(k) - \bar{K}^2(k) \right]
= \ln \left[ 1 + \gamma_0 B^2 \bar{K}^2(k) x^2(k) \right] \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k)} \right]
+ a \left[ 1 + 2\eta \gamma(k)x^2(k) + (\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)x^4(k) \right] \bar{K}^2(k) - 1 \bar{K}^2(k)
= \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{\gamma_0 B^2 \bar{K}^2(k) x^2(k) - \gamma_0 x^2(k)}{1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k)} \right]
+ a \left[ \frac{2(\eta - 1)\gamma(k)x^2(k) + (\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)x^4(k)}{(1 + \gamma(k)x^2(k))^2} \right] \bar{K}^2(k)
= \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{\left( B^2 \bar{K}^2(k) - 1 \right) \gamma_0 x^2(k)}{1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k)} \right]
+ a \left[ \frac{2(\eta - 1)\gamma(k)x^2(k) + (\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)x^4(k)}{(1 + \gamma(k)x^2(k))^2} \right] \bar{K}^2(k).
$$

(3.56)

Defining $b_1(k) \triangleq 1 + \gamma_0 x^2(k)$ and $b_2(k) \triangleq 1 + \gamma(k)x^2(k)$, it follows that

$$
\Delta V(k) = \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{\left( B^2 \bar{K}^2(k) - 1 \right) \gamma_0 x^2(k)}{b_1(k)} \right]
+ a \left[ \frac{2(\eta - 1)\gamma(k)x^2(k) + (\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)x^4(k)}{b_2^2(k)} \right] \bar{K}^2(k).
$$

(3.57)
Since, for all \( z > 0 \), \( \ln z \leq z - 1 \), we have

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq \frac{\left( B^2 \tilde{K}^2(k) - 1 \right) \gamma_0 x^2(k)}{b_1(k)} + a \left[ \frac{2(\eta - 1)\gamma(k)x^2(k) + (\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)x^4(k)}{b_2^2(k)} \right] \tilde{K}^2(k)
\]

\[
= \frac{(B^2 \tilde{K}^2(k) - 1)\gamma_0 b_2^2(k)x^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)} + 2a(\eta - 1)\gamma(k)b_1(k)x^2(k)\tilde{K}^2(k) + a(\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)b_1(k)x^4(k)\tilde{K}^2(k)
\]

\[
= \frac{[B^2\gamma_0 b_2^2(k) + 2a(\eta - 1)\gamma(k)b_1(k) + a(\eta^2 - 1)\gamma^2(k)x^2(k)b_1(k)]x^2(k)\tilde{K}^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)} - \frac{\gamma_0 b_2^2(k)x^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)}
\]

\[= \frac{[2a(\eta - 1)\gamma(k) + B^2\gamma_0 + (a(\eta^2 - 1) + B^2)\gamma_0 x^2(k)]x^2(k)\tilde{K}^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)} + \frac{[(2B^2\gamma_0 + 2a(\eta - 1)\gamma_0 + a(\eta^2 - 1)\gamma(k))\gamma(k)x^2(k)]x^2(k)\tilde{K}^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)} - \frac{\gamma_0 b_2^2(k)x^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)}. \tag{3.58}\]

Letting \( a \triangleq \frac{B}{2b-1} > 0 \) and noting that, for all \( k \geq 0 \), \( \gamma_0 \leq \gamma(k) \), it follows that

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq \frac{-b_3\gamma_0 [1 + \gamma(k)x^2(k)]x^2(k)\tilde{K}^2(k) - \gamma_0 b_2^2(k)x^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)}, \tag{3.59}\]

where \( b_3 \triangleq \frac{B}{2b-1} \). Thus,

\[
\Delta V(k) \leq -W(x(k), \tilde{K}(k)), \tag{3.60}\]
where

\[
W(x(k), \tilde{K}(k)) \triangleq \frac{b_3 \gamma_0 [1 + \gamma(k)x^2(k)] \tilde{K}^2(k) + \gamma_0 b_2^2(k)}{b_1(k)b_2^2(k)} x^2(k)
\]

\[
= \left[ 1 + b_3 \tilde{K}^2(k) \right] \gamma_0 x^2(k) + \left[ 2 + b_3 \tilde{K}^2(k) \right] \gamma_0 \gamma(k) x^4(k) + \gamma_0 \gamma^2(k) x^6(k)
\]

\[
\frac{1}{1 + [2\gamma(k) + \gamma_0] x^2(k) + [2\gamma_0 + \gamma(k)] \gamma(k) x^4(k) + \gamma_0 \gamma^2(k) x^6(k)}.
\]

(3.61)

To show \((i)\), summing (3.60) from 1 to \(k - 1\) and noting that, for all \(k \geq 0\),

\[
W(x(k), \tilde{K}(k)) \geq 0,
\]

yields

\[
V(x(k), \tilde{K}(k)) = V(x(1) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \Delta V(j), \tilde{K}(1))
\]

\[
\leq V(x(1) - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} W(x(j), \tilde{K}(j)), \tilde{K}(1))
\]

\[
\leq V(x(1), \tilde{K}(1)).
\]

(3.62)

Thus, \(V(x(k), \tilde{K}(k))\) is bounded. Since \(V(x(k), \tilde{K}(k))\) is positive definite and radially unbounded, it follows that \(x(k)\) and \(\tilde{K}(k)\) are bounded. Thus, \(\tilde{K}(k) = \bar{K}(k) + K^*\) is bounded.

Now, we show \((ii)\). Since \(V\) is positive definite, it follows from (3.60) that

\[
0 \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k} W(x(j), \tilde{K}(j))
\]

\[
\leq - \lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Delta V(j)
\]

\[
= V(x(1), \tilde{K}(1)) - \lim_{k \to \infty} V(x(k), \bar{K}(k))
\]

\[
\leq V(x(1), \tilde{K}(1)),
\]

(3.63)

where all three limits exist. Thus \(\lim_{k \to \infty} W(x(k), \tilde{K}(k)) = 0\). It now follows from
}\]

We now show \((iii)\). Since, by Lemma 3.6.1, \(-1 < \Gamma(\gamma(k)x^2(k)) \leq 1\) for all \(k \geq 1\), it follows from (3.50) that \(\{|\tilde{K}(k)|\}_{k=1}^\infty\) is nonincreasing. Let \(\kappa \triangleq \lim_{k \to \infty} |\tilde{K}(k)|\), and note that \(\kappa \geq 0\) and, for all \(k \geq 1\), \(|\tilde{K}(k)| \geq \kappa\).

To show \((iv)\), suppose that \(\kappa \geq 1/|B|\). Then, for all \(k \geq 1\), it follows that \(|x(k+1)| \geq \kappa|B||x(k)| \geq |x(k)|\). Consequently, \(\{|x(k)|\}_{k=1}^\infty\) is nondecreasing. Therefore, if \(x(1) \neq 0\), then \(\{|x(k)|\}_{k=1}^\infty\) does not converge to zero. Hence \(\kappa < 1/|B|\).

We now show \((v)\). Since \(\{|\tilde{K}(k)|\}_{k=1}^\infty\) is nonincreasing and \(\kappa < 1/|B|\), it follows that there exists \(k_0 \geq 1\) such that, for all \(k \geq k_0\), \(|\tilde{K}(k)| < 1/|B|\), and thus \(|B\tilde{K}(k)| < 1\). Consequently, it follows from (3.49) that \(\{|x(k)|\}_{k=k_0}^\infty\) is decreasing.

Finally, to show \((vi)\), let

\[
\chi(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} x(k) \\ \tilde{K}(k) \end{bmatrix}
\]  

be the state of the closed-loop error system (3.49), (3.50). Since \(V\) is positive definite and, by (3.60), \(\Delta V\) is negative semidefinite, it follows from [77, Lemma A.3.12] that the zero solution of the closed-loop error system is Lyapunov stable. \(\square\)

A discussion about generalizations of this scalar proof is presented in Section 3.8.

### 3.7 Full-State-Feedback Examples

In each example below, the adaptive controller gain matrix \(\hat{K}(k)\) is initialized to zero.

**Example 3.7.1** (Scalar input and plant, unstable plant). Consider the unstable scalar
with pole located at \( \{2\} \). Taking \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1 \), the closed-loop response is shown in Figure 3.1 for \( x_0 = -4.3 \). The state approaches zero within 6 time steps.\[\]

**Figure 3.1** Closed-loop response for an unstable, scalar-input plant with \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1 \). The state approaches zero within 6 time steps.

**Example 3.7.2 (Scalar input, asymptotically stable plant).** Consider the stable plant

\[
x(k + 1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1 & 0.4 & 0.45 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u(k),
\]

with poles located at \( \{-0.5 \pm 0.5 j, 0.9\} \). To demonstrate the effect of the learning rate, we take either \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1 \) or \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1000 \). The open and closed-loop responses are shown in Figure 3.2 for \( x_0 = [-4.3, -16.7, 1.3]^T \). With \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1 \), \( x \) approaches zero within 10 time steps, while, with \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1000 \), \( x \) approaches zero within 20 time steps.
Figure 3.2 Closed-loop responses for a stable, scalar-input plant. To demonstrate the effect of the learning rate, we take either $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ or $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. With $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$, $x$ approaches zero within 10 time steps, while, with $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$, $x$ approaches zero within 20 time steps.

To develop a gain-margin metric, and thus demonstrate robustness of the adaptive control algorithm to knowledge of the input matrix $\hat{B}$, we take $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ and $\hat{B} = \lambda B$, where $\lambda \in (0.5, 5]$ is a scale factor and $\hat{B}$ is the scaled input matrix to be used with the adaptive control algorithm. We define the performance metric

$$\min_k \frac{1}{5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \|x(k - i + 1)\| < 0.1,$$

(3.67)

which represents the minimum number of time steps for the average of the norm of the previous five state values to be below 0.1. A plot of the performance metric is shown in Figure 3.3. These results suggest that the converged adaptive control algorithm has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an upward adaptive gain margin of at least 14 dB. This is consistent with the results of Theorem 3.6.2 for the case $n > 1$.  

■
Figure 3.3  Performance metric to demonstrate robustness of the adaptive control algorithm to knowledge of the input matrix $\hat{B}$ for a stable, scalar-input plant. We take $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ and $\hat{B} = \lambda B$, where $\lambda \in (0.5, 5]$ is a scale factor and $\hat{B}$ is the scaled input matrix to be used with the adaptive control algorithm. These results suggest that the converged adaptive control algorithm has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an upward adaptive gain margin of at least 14 dB.

Example 3.7.3 (Scalar input, unstable plant). Consider the unstable plant

$$x(k + 1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.38 & 0.46 & 1.03 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u(k),$$

(3.68)

with poles located at $\{-\sqrt{2}/2 \pm \sqrt{2}/2, 1.03\}$. To demonstrate the effect of the learning rate, we take either $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ or $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. The open and closed-loop responses are shown in Figure 3.4 for $x_0 = [-4.3, -16.7, 1.3]^T$. With $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$, $x$ approaches zero within 10 time steps, while, with $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$, $x$ approaches zero within 20 time steps.

To further develop a gain-margin metric, and thus demonstrate robustness of the adaptive control algorithm to knowledge of the input matrix $\hat{B}$, we take $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ and
Figure 3.4  Closed-loop responses for an unstable, scalar-input plant with either $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ or $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. With $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$, $x$ approaches zero within 10 time steps, while, with $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$, $x$ approaches zero within 20 time steps.

$\hat{B} = \lambda B$, where $\lambda \in (0.5, 5]$ is a scale factor and $\hat{B}$ is the scaled input matrix to be used with the adaptive control algorithm. A plot of the performance metric (3.67) is shown in Figure 3.5. These results suggest that the converged adaptive control algorithm has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an upward adaptive gain margin of at least 14 dB. This is consistent with the results of Theorem 3.6.2 for the case $n > 1$.

3.8 Algorithm Limitations

Although the retrospective-cost-based full-state-feedback adaptive control algorithm has been shown to work well with $r = 1$ in certain cases, there are situations that may require $r > 1$. We explore these cases through example.
Figure 3.5  Performance metric to demonstrate robustness of the adaptive control algorithm to knowledge of the input matrix $\hat{B}$ for an unstable, scalar-input plant. We take $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$ and $\hat{B} = \lambda B$, where $\lambda \in (0.5,5]$ is a scale factor and $\hat{B}$ is the scaled input matrix to be used with the adaptive control algorithm. These results suggest that the converged adaptive control algorithm has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an upward adaptive gain margin of at least 14 dB.

Example 3.8.1 (Scalar input, unstable plant). Consider the unstable plant

$$x(k+1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1.05 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 1.05 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u(k), \quad (3.69)$$

with poles located at \{0, -1.05\}. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 3.6 for $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$, $r = 1$, $\hat{K}(0) = 0$, and $\hat{B} = B$. The state $x$ does not go to zero, in fact, the closed-loop system is unstable. To understand what is happening, consider the closed-loop equations (3.35), (3.36) for $m = r = 1$. Letting $\hat{K}(0) = 0$, the equations
can be written as

\[ x(1) = Ax(0), \]  
\[ \hat{K}(1) = -\frac{x^T(1)\hat{B}}{\alpha(0) + \hat{B}^T\hat{B}x^T(0)x(0)}x^T(0), \]

which further simplify to

\[ x(1) = Ax(0), \]  
\[ \hat{K}(1) = -\frac{x^T(0)A^T\hat{B}}{\alpha(0) + \hat{B}^T\hat{B}x^T(0)x(0)}x^T(0). \]

Since \( B \) lies in the null space of \( A^T \) and \( \hat{B} \) is a scalar multiple of \( B \), it follows that \( A^T\hat{B} = 0 \), and hence, \( \hat{K}(1) = 0 \). In this case, the adaptive control algorithm doesn’t compute a stabilizing feedback gain \( \hat{K}(k) \) before \( \hat{B}^T x(k + 1) = 0 \). Therefore, since the open-loop system is unstable, the adaptive control algorithm does not stabilize the plant.
Now, we let \( r = 2 \) while keeping \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1, \hat{K}(0) = 0, \) and \( \hat{B} = B. \) The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 3.7, where, now the state \( x \) does go to zero. In this case \( \hat{B}^T x(k+1) \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty, \) but a stabilizing feedback gain \( \hat{K}(k) \) is reached before the adaptive control gains converge.

![Graphs showing state norm, \( \lambda_{\text{max}}(A+BK) \), and control input over time.]

Figure 3.7  Closed-loop response for an unstable, scalar-input plant with \( \alpha(k) \equiv 1, r = 2, \hat{K}(0) = 0, \) and \( \hat{B} = B. \) The closed-loop system is stabilized.

Other cases can be constructed with similar properties to those of Example 3.8.1. It is found that \( \hat{B}^T x(k+1) \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \) whether or not \( \hat{K}(k) \) is stabilizing. Therefore, in the cases where adaptation stops before a stabilizing feedback gain \( \hat{K}(k) \) is computed, we must increase \( r. \) Based on numerical testing, Table 3.1 gives lower bounds on \( r, \) based on certain properties of the dynamics matrix \( A, \) that were found to stabilize all systems. In all cases, \( r = n + 1 \) was found to stabilize the open-loop system, though in many cases, \( r = 1 \) was sufficient. Although \( r = n + 1 \) requires more knowledge of the Markov parameters than with \( r = 1, \) it is still less information than required to reconstruct a system model through techniques such as the eigenstructure realization algorithm (ERA), which generally requires \( 2n \) Markov parameters.
\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
$A$ & Stable & Unstable \\
\hline
Singular & $r \geq n + 1$ & $r \geq n + 1$ \\
Nonsingular & $r = 1$ & $r \geq n + 1$ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Guidelines for choosing $r$ based on the properties of the dynamics matrix $A$ to reach a stabilizing closed-loop feedback gain. In all cases, $r = n + 1$ stabilizes the open-loop system, though in many cases, $r = 1$ is sufficient.}
\end{table}

3.9 Conclusion

We presented a discrete-time, adaptive, full-state-feedback control algorithm based on retrospective cost optimization. We demonstrated the algorithm’s effectiveness through numerical examples. We thus developed rules of thumb for choosing the parameters necessary for controller implementation.

A Lyapunov-based stability and convergence proof was presented for a special scalar case. Theoretical and numerical results suggest that the converged adaptive controller has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an infinite upward adaptive gain margin. Future work includes extending the Lyapunov-based stability and convergence proof to the more general case to include multi-input, multi-dimensional plants with $r > 1$. 
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Chapter 4

Adaptive Retrospective-Cost-Based Static Output Feedback

The previous chapter considered retrospective-cost-based adaptive stabilization for systems with full-state feedback. In this chapter, we generalize those results to static-output-feedback stabilization. Specifically, this chapter considers retrospective-cost-based adaptive control for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems with knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the poles or zeros need be known. We also present numerical examples to illustrate the robustness of the algorithm under conditions of Markov parameter uncertainty. The results and methods of this chapter are published in [111].

4.1 Introduction

Given a linear, time-invariant system, the static-output-feedback problem is to find a stabilizing static feedback gain such that the closed-loop system with output feedback is asymptotically stable. While seemingly simple, this subject remains an
open problem in systems and control theory [13]. For full-state-feedback, as detailed in the previous chapter, a stabilizing feedback gain exists if the system is stabilizable. In the general output-feedback case, however, the conditions are much more subtle and further complicated by MIMO plants and the presence of transmission zeros. These issues are discussed in [121].

For a SISO plant, a stabilizing feedback gain can be found graphically through root locus or Nyquist techniques. Papers addressing MIMO static output feedback often require a minimum-phase assumption and/or a restriction on the plant’s relative degree [121]. The minimum-phase assumption, while already not applicable to several real systems, added to a restriction on the plant’s relative degree often leads to a strictly-positive-real (SPR) assumption, which is unrealistic and often impossible to prove in practice.

The most well-developed approach to the static-output-feedback problem is to use a pole-placement scheme, such as the algorithm in [105]. Other well-known approaches include eigenstructure assignment and the use of LQR for static-output-feedback [121]. Inverse linear quadratic approaches, such as [126], solve a modified LQR problem, but finding a solution to these problems can be difficult. Applying structural constraints [100] or coupled linear matrix inequalities (LMI) with quadratic Lyapunov functions [52] both lead to non-convex optimization problems, where iterative algorithms do not guarantee solution convergence.

The use of adaptive control for the static-output-feedback problem is motivated from the notion that this subject is still an open problem in systems and control theory [13]. The goal of this chapter is to present a discrete-time, adaptive, MIMO, static-output-feedback controller that is effective for systems that are unstable, nonsquare, and/or nonminimum-phase. The algorithm is developed in discrete time based on a discrete-time plant model obtained by either plant discretization or discrete-time system identification so that the controller can be implemented directly as embedded...
code without an intermediate controller discretization step.

The adaptive controller presented in this chapter is based on retrospective cost optimization. This method is used to adapt dynamic compensators for disturbance rejection, adaptive stabilization, adaptive command following, and model reference adaptive control in [113, 127]. Retrospective cost optimization is a measure of performance at the current time based on a past window of data and without assumptions about the command or disturbance signals. In particular, retrospective cost optimization acts as an inner loop to the adaptive control algorithm by modifying the performance variables based on the difference between the actual past control inputs and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law.

We present numerical examples to illustrate the algorithm’s effectiveness in handling systems that are unstable and/or nonminimum phase and to provide insight into the modeling information required for controller implementation. This information includes a sufficient number of Markov parameters to capture the sign of the high-frequency gain as well as to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). These examples are intended to provide motivation for future proofs of stability and convergence.

4.2 Problem Formulation

Consider the MIMO discrete-time system

\begin{align*}
x(k + 1) &= Ax(k) + Bu(k), \\
y(k) &=Cx(k), \\
z(k) &=E_1x(k),
\end{align*}

(4.1) (4.2) (4.3)
where \( x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l \), \( z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l \), \( u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l \), and \( k \geq 0 \). We assume that the open-loop system (4.1)-(4.3) is controllable and observable and that measurements of \( y \) and \( z \) are available for feedback. Our goal is to develop an adaptive static-output-feedback controller for performance stabilization, that is, convergence of the performance variable \( z \) to zero.

For a positive integer \( r \), we define the extended performance vector \( Z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z r} \) and the extended input vector \( U(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u r} \) by

\[
Z(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
z(k - r + 1) \\
z(k - r + 2) \\
\vdots \\
z(k)
\end{bmatrix}, \quad U(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
u(k - r) \\
u(k - r + 1) \\
\vdots \\
u(k - 1)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Note that \( Z(k) \), \( U(k) \), and \( x(k) \) are related by

\[
Z(k) = \Gamma x(k - r) + \mathcal{H}U(k),
\]

where \( \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z r} \) and \( \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z r \times l_u r} \) are given by

\[
\Gamma \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
E_1 A \\
E_1 A^2 \\
\vdots \\
E_1 A^r
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{H} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
H_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
H_2 & H_1 & \cdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
H_r & H_{r-1} & \cdots & H_1
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and, for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \), the Markov parameters \( H_i \) of the system (4.1)-(4.3) from \( u \) to \( z \) are

\[
H_i \triangleq E_1 A^{i-1} B.
\]
Let \( d \) denote the relative degree of \((A, B, E_1)\), that is, the smallest positive integer \( i \) such that the \( i \)th Markov parameter \( H_i \) is nonzero. Note that, if \( r < d \), then \( \mathcal{H} = 0 \). Therefore, we assume that \( r \geq d \).

### 4.3 Retrospective Cost Optimization

Let

\[
    u(k) = K(k)y(k),
\]

where \( K(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times l_y} \) is the gain matrix. From (4.6), it follows that \( U(k) \) can be rewritten as

\[
    U(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} L_i K(k - i)y(k - i),
\]

where

\[
    L_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(r-i)l_u \times l_u} \\ I_{l_u} \\ 0_{(i-1)l_u \times l_u} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times l_u}. 
\]

Next, for \( K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \), define the retrospective performance vector \( \hat{Z}(K, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_x} \) by

\[
    \hat{Z}(K, k) \triangleq \Gamma x(k - r) + \mathcal{H}\hat{U}(K, k),
\]

where \( \hat{U}(K, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u} \) is the recomputed input vector, given by

\[
    \hat{U}(K, k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{r} L_i K y(k - i).
\]
Subtracting (4.4) from (4.9) yields

\[ \hat{Z}(K, k) = Z(k) - \mathcal{H} \left[ U(k) - \hat{U}(K, k) \right], \quad (4.11) \]

and hence,

\[ \hat{Z}(K, k) = f(k) + D(k) \text{vec } K, \quad (4.12) \]

where

\[ f(k) \triangleq Z(k) - \mathcal{H} U(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_x r}, \quad (4.13) \]
\[ D(k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{r} y^T(k-i) \otimes (\mathcal{H} L_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_x r \times l_u l_y}, \quad (4.14) \]

vec is the column-stacking operator, and \( \otimes \) represents the Kronecker product.

Now consider the \textit{retrospective cost function}

\[ J(K, k) \triangleq \hat{Z}^T(K, k) R_1(k) \hat{Z}(K, k) + \alpha(k) \text{tr} \left[ (K - K(k))^T (K - K(k)) \right], \quad (4.15) \]

where, for all \( k \geq 0 \), \( R_1(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_x r \times l_x r} \) is positive semidefinite and \( \alpha(k) > 0 \) is the \textit{learning rate}. Substituting (4.12) into (4.15) yields

\[ J(K, k) = c(k) + b^T(k) \text{vec } K + (\text{vec } K)^T M(k) \text{vec } K, \quad (4.16) \]

where

\[ M(k) \triangleq D^T(k) R_1(k) D(k) + \alpha(k) I_{l_u l_y}, \quad (4.17) \]
\[ b(k) \triangleq 2 D^T(k) R_1(k) f(k) - 2 \alpha(k) \text{vec } K(k), \quad (4.18) \]
\[ c(k) \triangleq f^T(k) R_1(k) f(k) + \alpha(k) \text{tr} \left[ K^T(k) K(k) \right]. \quad (4.19) \]
Since $M(k)$ is positive definite, $J(K, k)$ has the strict global minimizer $K(k+1)$ given by

$$K(k+1) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{vec}^{-1} \left[ M^{-1}(k)b(k) \right]. \quad \text{(4.20)}$$

Note that $M(k)$ and $b(k)$ depend on $D(k)$ and $f(k)$, which in turn depend on the Markov-parameter matrix $H$. Since $H$ may not be known in practice, we replace $H$ by an estimate $\hat{H}$ in $D(k)$, $f(k)$, and $K(k+1)$. Therefore, for all $k \geq 1$, the implemented control gain $\hat{K}(k)$ depends on $\hat{H}$, that is

$$u(k) = \hat{K}(k)y(k), \quad \text{(4.21)}$$

$$\hat{K}(k+1) \triangleq -\frac{1}{2} \text{vec}^{-1} \left[ \hat{M}^{-1}(k)\hat{b}(k) \right], \quad \text{(4.22)}$$

where

$$\hat{M}(k) \triangleq \hat{D}^T(k)R_1(k)\hat{D}(k) + \alpha(k)I_{u,v}, \quad \text{(4.23)}$$

$$\hat{b}(k) \triangleq 2\hat{D}^T(k)R_1(k)\hat{f}(k) - 2\alpha(k)\text{vec} \hat{K}(k), \quad \text{(4.24)}$$

and

$$\hat{f}(k) \triangleq Z(k) - \hat{H}U(k), \quad \text{(4.25)}$$

$$\hat{D}(k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{r} y^T(k-i) \otimes (\hat{H}L_i), \quad \text{(4.26)}$$

$$\hat{H} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \hat{H}_2 & \hat{H}_1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \hat{H}_r & \hat{H}_{r-1} & \cdots & \hat{H}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{(4.27)}$$

where, for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $\hat{H}_i$ is an estimate of $H_i$. For convenience, we specialize
(4.17)–(4.19) and (4.23), (4.24) with \( R_1(k) \triangleq I_{l,r} \).

The learning rate \( \alpha(k) \) affects convergence speed of the adaptive control algorithm. As \( \alpha(k) \) is increased, convergence speed is lowered. Likewise, as \( \alpha(k) \) is decreased, convergence speed is raised. By varying \( \alpha(k) \), we study tradeoffs between transient performance and convergence speed.

### 4.4 Static-Output-Feedback Examples

We now present numerical examples to investigate the effect of \( r \) and \( \alpha(k) \) as well as the accuracy of \( \hat{H} \) on the adaptive control algorithm. The adaptive controller gains are initialized to zero, that is \( \hat{K}(0) = 0 \). Unless otherwise noted, we take \( z(k) = y(k) \).

**Example 4.4.1** (SISO, minimum-phase, asymptotically stable plant). *Consider the asymptotically stable, minimum-phase plant*

\[
x(k+1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4 & 0.33 & 0.76 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u(k), \quad (4.28)
\]

\[
y(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -0.25 \end{bmatrix} x(k), \quad (4.29)
\]

with poles \( \{-0.65 \pm 0.65 j, 0.9\} \) and zero \( \{0.25\} \). The first 25 Markov parameters are shown in Figure 4.1.

We investigate the effect of \( r \) on the closed-loop response. Table 4.1 lists the roots of the Markov parameter polynomial \( p_r(q) \) (as defined in (A.10)) as a function of \( r \). Note that, since \( d = 2 \), we must choose \( r \geq 2 \), and, as \( r \) increases, \( p_r(q) \) contains spurious roots, none of which approximates the zero. We consider \( r = 2, r = 3, \) or \( r = 4 \) with \( \alpha(k) \equiv 50 \). The open and closed-loop responses are shown in Figure 4.2 for \( x(0) = [-4.3, -16.7, 1.3]^T \). In each case, the adaptive controller reduces \( z \) faster than
Figure 4.1  First 25 Markov parameters for the asymptotically stable, minimum-phase plant in Example 4.4.1.

Table 4.1  Roots of $p_r(q)$ as a function of $r$ for the asymptotically stable, minimum-phase plant in Example 4.4.1.

As $r$ increases from 2 to 3, the adaptive controller reduces $z$ faster, but no additional performance is gained by increasing $r$ from 3 to 4.

Example 4.4.2 (SISO, nonminimum-phase, asymptotically stable plant). Consider the asymptotically stable, nonminimum-phase plant

$$x(k+1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4 & 0.33 & 0.76 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u(k), \quad (4.30)$$

$$y(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix} x(k), \quad (4.31)$$
Figure 4.2 Closed-loop response for the asymptotically stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant in Example 4.4.1 with $\alpha(k) \equiv 50$ and either $r = 2$, $r = 3$, or $r = 4$. In each case, the adaptive controller reduces $z$ faster than the open-loop response. As $r$ increases from 2 to 3, the adaptive controller reduces $z$ faster, but no additional performance is gained by increasing $r$ from 3 to 4.

with poles \{-0.65 \pm 0.65\jmath, 0.9\} and zero \{2\}. The first 25 Markov parameters are shown in Figure 4.3.

We demonstrate the effect of $r$ for this nonminimum-phase plant. Table 4.2 lists the roots of the Markov-parameter polynomial $p_r(q)$ as a function of $r$. It is seen that the roots of the Markov parameter polynomial include an estimate of the nonminimum-phase zero of the transfer function from $u$ to $z$. As $r$ increases, this approximation improves. For each value of $r$, the remaining roots play no role in the stability and convergence of the adaptive control algorithm, but what is important is the need to choose $r$ sufficiently large to adequately approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros. Note that, as $r$ increases, the nonminimum-phase zero at $z = 2$ is more accurately modeled, but $p_r(q)$ also contains spurious roots, although these roots have no effect on the adaptive controller. For $r \leq 3$, the closed-loop simulation fails. We thus take $r = 4$, $r = 5$, or $r = 6$ with $\alpha(k) \equiv 50$. The open and closed-loop responses are shown
Figure 4.3  First 25 Markov parameters for the asymptotically stable, nonminimum-phase plant in Example 4.4.2.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
r & \text{roots}(p_r(q)) \\
\hline
3 & \{2.4\} \\
4 & \{0.81,1.59\} \\
5 & \{0.27±0.46j,1.86\} \\
6 & \{-0.55,0.46±0.92j,2.04\} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Table 4.2  Roots of \(p_r(q)\) as a function of \(r\) for the asymptotically stable, nonminimum-phase plant in Example 4.4.2. As \(r\) increases, the nonminimum-phase zero at \(z = 2\) is more accurately modeled.

in Figure 4.4 for \(x(0) = [-4.3, -16.7, 1.3]^T\). In each case, the adaptive controller reduces \(z\) faster than the open-loop response. In addition, as \(r\) increases, and thus the nonminimum-phase zero is more accurately modeled, the adaptive controller reduces \(z\) even faster.

Example 4.4.3 (SISO, nonminimum-phase, unstable plant). Consider the unstable,
Figure 4.4  Closed-loop response for the asymptotically stable, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant in Example 4.4.2 with \( \alpha(k) \equiv 50 \) and either \( r = 4 \), \( r = 5 \), or \( r = 6 \). In each case, the adaptive controller reduces \( z \) faster than the open-loop response. In addition, as \( r \) increases, and thus the nonminimum-phase zero is more accurately modeled, the adaptive controller reduces \( z \) even faster.

nonminimum-phase plant

\[
x(k + 1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.36 & 0.48 & 1.05 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u(k),
\]

(4.32)

\[
y(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -4 \end{bmatrix} x(k),
\]

(4.33)

\[
z(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -6 \end{bmatrix} x(k),
\]

(4.34)

with poles \( \{-\sqrt{2}/2 \pm \sqrt{2}/2, 1.05\} \), zeros \( \{2, -3\} \) from \( u \) to \( z \), and zero \( \{4\} \) from \( u \) to \( y \). Table 4.3 lists the roots of the Markov-parameter polynomial \( p_r(q) \) as a function of \( r \). Note that, as \( r \) increases, the nonminimum-phase zeros are more accurately modeled, but \( p_r(q) \) also contains additional spurious roots. For \( r \leq 3 \), the closed-loop simulation fails. We thus take \( r = 4 \) and set \( \alpha(k) \equiv 100 \). The open and closed-loop
Table 4.3  Roots of $p_r(q)$ as a function of $r$ for the unstable, nonminimum-phase plant in Example 4.4.3. As $r$ increases, the nonminimum-phase zeros are more accurately modeled.

responses are shown in Figure 4.5 for $x(0) = [-4.3, -16.7, 1.3]^T$. The adaptive controller stabilizes the plant.

Figure 4.5  Closed-loop response for the unstable, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant in Example 4.4.3 with $\alpha(k) \equiv 100$ and $r = 4$. The adaptive controller stabilizes the plant.

These results, along with those of Example 4.4.2, suggest that, for nonminimum-phase plants, the adaptive controller requires a sufficient number of Markov parameters to capture the approximate locations of any nonminimum-phase zeros. In particular, Examples 4.4.2 and 4.4.3 require $r \geq n + 1$. This bound is consistent with the numerical results of Chapter 3, and, in particular, Table 3.1. Furthermore, as seen from Tables 4.2 and 4.3, as the order of the Markov-parameter polynomial increases,
and hence $r$ increases, the accuracy of all nonminimum-phase zeros improves.

**Example 4.4.4** (SISO, non/minimum-phase, unstable plant). Consider the unstable plant with both minimum-phase and nonminimum-phase zeros, given by

$$x(k + 1) = \begin{bmatrix} -0.36 & 0.48 & 1.05 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u(k), \quad (4.35)$$

$$y(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix} x(k), \quad (4.36)$$

$$z(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -0.1 \end{bmatrix} x(k), \quad (4.37)$$

with poles $\{-\sqrt{2}/2 \pm \sqrt{2}/2, 1.05\}$, zero $\{0.1\}$ from $u$ to $z$, and zero $\{2\}$ from $u$ to $y$. Note that the transfer function from $u$ to $y$ contains a nonminimum-phase zero while the transfer function from $u$ to $z$ is minimum phase. We take $\alpha(k) \equiv 500$ and $r = 2$. The open and closed-loop responses are shown in Figure 4.6 for $x(0) = [-4.3, -16.7, 1.3]^T$. The adaptive controller stabilizes the plant.

![Figure 4.6](image-url)
Example 4.4.5 (SISO, minimum-phase, Lyapunov-stable plant). Consider a discrete-time model of a laboratory process obtained using identification techniques [70]. A state-space model for this system sampled at $T_s = 0.08$ sec is given by

$$
x(k + 1) = \begin{bmatrix}
1.2885 & 1 & 6.555 & 0 \\
-0.4065 & 0 & 4.383 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} x(k) + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
1
\end{bmatrix} u(k), \quad (4.38)
$$

$$
y(k) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} x(k). \quad (4.39)
$$

This system is minimum phase and Lyapunov stable. A root locus plot is shown in Figure 4.7, where the range of stabilizing output-feedback gain is $-3.7 \times 10^{-3} < K < 0$. We take $\alpha(k) \equiv 10^8$ and $r = 3$. The open and closed-loop responses are shown in Figure 4.8 for $x(0) = [-0.43, -1.67, 0.13, 0.29]^T$. The adaptive controller stabilizes the plant, and the output-feedback gain converges to the steady-state value $-1.5 \times 10^{-3}$.

4.5 Conclusion

We presented a discrete-time, adaptive, static-output-feedback control algorithm based on retrospective cost optimization. We demonstrated the algorithm’s effectiveness in handling nonminimum-phase zeros through numerical examples illustrating the response of the algorithm under conditions of uncertainty. We thus developed rules of thumb for choosing the parameters necessary for controller implementation. These numerical studies serve as motivation for future development of Lyapunov-based stability, robustness, and convergence proofs of the adaptive control algorithm.
Figure 4.7 Root locus plot for the Lyapunov-stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant in Example 4.4.5. The range of stabilizing output-feedback gain is $-3.7 \times 10^{-3} < K < 0$.

Figure 4.8 Closed-loop response for the Lyapunov-stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant in Example 4.4.5 with $\alpha(k) \equiv 10^8$ and $r = 3$. The adaptive controller stabilizes the plant, and the output-feedback gain converges to the steady-state value $-1.5 \times 10^{-3}$. 
The previous two chapters considered retrospective-cost-based adaptive stabilization for systems with static feedback. In this chapter, we generalize the results to dynamic compensation for stabilization, command following, disturbance rejection, and model reference adaptive control (MRAC). Specifically, this chapter considers retrospective-cost-based adaptive control for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems with knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the poles or the zeros need be known.

The adaptive control algorithm presented in this chapter is based on the adaptive control algorithm developed in [127]. The algorithm developed in [127] uses a gradient-based update with a fixed step-size. In contrast, the algorithms presented in Chapters 3-5 of this dissertation utilize an adjustable learning-rate parameter $\alpha$ which allows us to develop Newton-step-based adaptive update laws. In addition, this chapter further develops the theoretical link between Markov parameters and nonminimum-phase zeros. The development and analysis of this link is detailed in Appendix A. We also develop preliminary metrics for analyzing the gain and phase
margins for discrete-time adaptive systems. Finally, we present numerical examples to illustrate the robustness of the algorithm under conditions of uncertainty. The adaptive control algorithm is shown to be effective for systems that are unstable, MIMO, and/or nonminimum phase. The results and methods of this chapter are published in [113, 114]. In [117], the adaptive control algorithm developed in this chapter is used to identify multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems.

5.1 Introduction

Unlike robust control, which fixes the control gains based on a prior, fixed level of modeling uncertainty, adaptive control algorithms tune the feedback gains in response to the true plant and exogenous signals, that is, commands and disturbances. Generally speaking, adaptive controllers require less prior modeling information than robust controllers, and thus can be viewed as highly parameter-robust control laws. The price paid for the ability of adaptive control laws to operate with limited prior modeling information is the complexity of analyzing and quantifying the stability and performance of the closed-loop system, especially in light of the fact that adaptive control laws, even for linear plants, are nonlinear.

Stability and performance analysis of adaptive control laws often entails assumptions on the dynamics of the plant. For example, a widely invoked assumption in adaptive control is passivity [90], which is restrictive and difficult to verify in practice. A related assumption is that the plant is minimum phase [33, 45], which may entail the same difficulties. In fact, sampled-data control may give rise to nonminimum-phase zeros whether or not the continuous-time system is minimum phase [8]. Beyond these assumptions, adaptive control laws are known to be sensitive to unmodeled dynamics and sensor noise [9, 104], which motivates robust adaptive control laws [50].

In addition to these basic issues, adaptive control laws may entail unaccept-
able transients during adaptation, which may be exacerbated by actuator limitations [60, 98, 135]. In fact, adaptive control under extremely limited modeling information such as uncertainty in the high-frequency gain [64, 69] may yield a transient response that exceeds the practical limits of the plant. Therefore, the type and quality of the available modeling information as well as the speed of adaptation must be considered in the analysis and implementation of adaptive control laws. These issues are discussed in [5].

Adaptive control laws have been developed in both continuous time and discrete time. In the present chapter we consider discrete-time adaptive control laws since these control laws can be implemented directly in embedded code without requiring an intermediate discretization step with potential loss of phase margin. Although discrete-time adaptive control laws are less developed than their continuous-time counterparts, the literature is substantial and growing [3, 32, 33, 35, 55, 77].

The goal of this chapter is to present a discrete-time adaptive control law that is effective for nonminimum-phase systems. In [33], a discrete-time adaptive control law with stability guarantees was developed under a minimum-phase assumption. Extensions given in Chapter 2 based on internal model control [44] and Lyapunov analysis also invoke this assumption. To circumvent the minimum-phase assumption, the zero annihilation periodic control law [10] uses lifting to move all of the plant’s zeros to the origin.

The present chapter is motivated by the adaptive control laws given in Chapter 2, [45], and [127]. The control law given in [127] lacks a proof of stability, but is known numerically to be effective on nonminimum-phase plants without recourse to lifting. Accordingly, we present an adaptive control law based on [45] and [127] for systems that are unstable, MIMO, and/or nonminimum phase. The adaptive control algorithm provides guidelines concerning the modeling information needed for implementation. This information includes a sufficient number of Markov parameters to
capture the sign of the high-frequency gain as well as the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the plant need be known.

The novel feature of this adaptive control law is the use of a retrospective correction filter (RCF). The RCF provides an inner loop to the adaptive control law by modifying the sensor measurements based on the difference between the actual past control inputs and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law. This technique is inherent in [127] in the use of the estimated performance variable, but is more fully developed in the present chapter.

The goal of the present chapter is to develop the RCF adaptive control algorithm and demonstrate its effectiveness in handling nonminimum-phase zeros. We thus present several numerical examples to illustrate the response of the algorithm under conditions of uncertainty in the relative degree and Markov parameters, measurement noise, and actuator and sensor saturations. To this end we systematically consider a sequence of examples of increasing complexity, ranging from SISO, minimum-phase plants to MIMO, nonminimum-phase plants, including stable and unstable cases. We then revisit these plants under off-nominal conditions, that is, with uncertainty in the required plant modeling information. In each case, we illuminate the role of the weighting parameter $\alpha$, which governs the rate of convergence. Our goal is thus to develop rules of thumb for choosing $\alpha$ based on the level of model fidelity.

5.2 Problem Formulation

Consider the MIMO discrete-time system

$$x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k) + D_1 w(k), \quad (5.1)$$
$$y(k) = Cx(k) + D_2 w(k), \quad (5.2)$$
$$z(k) = E_1 x(k) + E_0 w(k), \quad (5.3)$$
where \( x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_y} \), \( z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z} \), \( u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u} \), \( w(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_w} \), and \( k \geq 0 \). Our goal is to develop an adaptive output feedback controller under which the performance variable \( z \) is minimized in the presence of the exogenous signal \( w \). Note that \( w \) can represent either a command signal to be followed, an external disturbance to be rejected, or both. For example, if \( D_1 = 0 \) and \( E_0 \neq 0 \), then the objective is to have the output \( E_1x \) follow the command signal \(-E_0w\). On the other hand, if \( D_1 \neq 0 \) and \( E_0 = 0 \), then the objective is to reject the disturbance \( w \) from the performance measurement \( E_1x \). The combined command following and disturbance rejection problem is addressed when \( D_1 \) and \( E_0 \) are block matrices. More precisely, if \( D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{D}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \), \( E_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{E}_0 \end{bmatrix} \), and \( w(k) = \begin{bmatrix} w_1(k) \\ w_2(k) \end{bmatrix} \), then the objective is to have \( E_1x \) follow the command \(-\hat{E}_0w_2\) while rejecting the disturbance \( w_1 \). Lastly, if \( D_1 \) and \( E_0 \) are empty matrices, then the objective is output stabilization, that is, convergence of \( z \) to zero.

We assume that the open-loop system (5.1)-(5.3) is controllable and observable and that measurements of \( y \) and \( z \) are available for feedback.

Model reference adaptive control (MRAC) is a special case of (5.1)–(5.3) where \( z \triangleq y_1 - y_m \) is the difference between the measured output of the plant \( G \) and reference model \( G_m \). For MRAC, the exogenous command \( w \) is available to the controller as an additional measurement variable \( y_2 \), as shown in Figure 5.1.

![Figure 5.1](image-url)  
Figure 5.1  Model reference adaptive control problem.
5.3 Time-Series Modeling

Consider the time-series representation of (5.1)–(5.3) from $u$ to $z$, given by

$$ z(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i z(k-i) + \sum_{i=d}^{n} \beta_i u(k-i) + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \gamma_i w(k-i), \quad (5.4) $$

where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta_d, \ldots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z \times l_u}$, $\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z \times l_w}$, and the relative degree $d$ is the smallest positive integer $i$ such that the $i$th Markov parameter $H_i \triangleq E_1 A^{i-1} B$ is nonzero.

Replacing $k$ with $k-1$ in (5.4) and substituting the resulting relation back into (5.4) yields a 2-MARKOV model. Repeating this procedure $r-1$ times yields the $r$-MARKOV model of (5.1)–(5.3)

$$ z(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{r,i} z(k-r-i+1) + \sum_{i=d}^{r} H_i u(k-i) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \beta_{r,i} u(k-r-i+1) $$

$$ + \sum_{i=0}^{r} H_{zw,i} w(k-i) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \gamma_{r,i} w(k-r-i+1), \quad (5.5) $$

where $H_{zw,0} \triangleq E_0$, for all $i > 0$, $H_{zw,i} \triangleq E_1 A^{i-1} D_1$, and, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the coefficients $\alpha_{r,i} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta_{r,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z \times l_u}$, and $\gamma_{r,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z \times l_w}$ are given by

$$ \alpha_{1,i} \triangleq -\alpha_i, \quad \beta_{1,i} \triangleq \beta_i, \quad \gamma_{1,i} \triangleq \gamma_i, $$

$$ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots $$

$$ \alpha_{r,1} \triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \alpha_{1,i} + \alpha_{r-1,i+1}, \quad \beta_{r,1} \triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \beta_{1,i} + \beta_{r-1,i+1}, \quad \gamma_{r,1} \triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \gamma_{1,i} + \gamma_{r-1,i+1}, $$

$$ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots $$

$$ \alpha_{r,n} \triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \alpha_{1,n}, \quad \beta_{r,n} \triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \beta_{1,n}, \quad \gamma_{r,n} \triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \gamma_{1,n}. \quad (5.6) $$

Note that $H_r = \beta_{r,1}$ and $H_{zw,r} = \gamma_{r,1}$.

For a positive integer $p$, we define the extended performance vector $Z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{pl_z}$.
and the extended control vector \( U(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_c} \) by

\[
Z(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
  z(k) \\
  \vdots \\
  z(k-p+1)
\end{bmatrix}, \quad U(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
  u(k) \\
  \vdots \\
  u(k-p_c+1)
\end{bmatrix}.
\] (5.7)

where \( p_c \triangleq n + r + p - 1 \). Then, (5.4) can be written in the form

\[
Z(k) = W_{zw} \phi_{zw}(k) + B_{zu} U(k),
\] (5.8)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
W_{zw} & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
-\alpha_{r,1} I_z & \cdots & -\alpha_{r,n} I_z & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & H_{zw,0} & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & -\alpha_{r,1} I_z & \cdots & -\alpha_{r,n} I_z & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & H_d & \cdots & H_r & \beta_{r,2} & \cdots & \beta_{r,n} & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & H_d & \cdots & H_r & \beta_{r,2} & \cdots & \beta_{r,n}
\end{bmatrix},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
B_{zu} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & H_d & \cdots & H_r & \beta_{r,2} & \cdots & \beta_{r,n} & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & 0_{t_z} & \cdots & 0_{t_z} & H_d & \cdots & H_r & \beta_{r,2} & \cdots & \beta_{r,n}
\end{bmatrix},
\]
and

\[ \phi_{zw}(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} z(k - r) \\ \vdots \\ z(k - r - p - n + 2) \\ w(k) \\ \vdots \\ w(k - r - p - n + 2) \end{bmatrix}. \] (5.9)

### 5.4 Controller Construction

In this section we formulate an adaptive control algorithm for the general control problem represented by (5.1)–(5.3). We use a strictly proper time-series controller of order \( n_c \), such that the control \( u(k) \) is given by

\[ u(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} P_i(k) u(k - i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} Q_i(k) y(k - i), \] (5.10)

where, for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n_c \), \( P_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times l_u} \) and \( Q_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times l_y} \). The control (5.10) can be expressed as

\[ u(k) = \theta(k) \phi(k), \] (5.11)

where

\[ \theta(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} Q_1(k) & \cdots & Q_{n_c}(k) & P_1(k) & \cdots & P_{n_c}(k) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times n_c(l_u + l_y)} \] (5.12)
is the controller gain matrix, and the regressor vector $\phi(k)$ is given by

$$
\phi(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
y(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
y(k-n_c) \\
u(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
u(k-n_c)
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c(l_u+l_y)}.
$$

From (5.11), it follows that the extended control vector $U(k)$ can be written as

$$
U(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_c} L_i \theta(k - i + 1) \phi(k - i + 1),
$$

where

$$
L_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
0_{(i-1)l_u \times l_u} \\
I_{l_u} \\
0_{(p_c-i)l_u \times l_u}
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_c l_u \times l_u}.
$$

Next, we define the retrospective performance vector $\hat{Z}(\hat{\theta}, k) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_l z}$ by

$$
\hat{Z}(\hat{\theta}, k) \triangleq W_{zw} \phi_{zw}(k) + B_{zu} U(k) - B_{zu} \left[ U(k) - \hat{U}(\hat{\theta}, k) \right],
$$

where $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times n_c(l_u+l_y)}$, $B_{zu} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_l z \times p_c l_u}$ is the surrogate input matrix, and

$$
\hat{U}(\hat{\theta}, k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{p_c} L_i \hat{\theta} \phi(k - i + 1)
$$
is the recomputed extended control vector. In the special case $\bar{B}_{zu} = B_{zu}$, we have

$$\hat{Z}(k) = W_{zw}\phi_{zw}(k) + B_{zu}\hat{U}(k). \quad (5.18)$$

Substituting (5.8) into (5.16), yields

$$\hat{Z}(\hat{\theta}, k) = Z(k) - \bar{B}_{zu}\left[U(k) - \hat{U}(\hat{\theta}, k)\right]. \quad (5.19)$$

Taking the vec of $\bar{B}_{zu}\hat{U}(\hat{\theta}, k)$ yields

$$\hat{Z}(\hat{\theta}, k) = f(k) + D(k)\text{vec} \hat{\theta}, \quad (5.20)$$

where

$$f(k) \triangleq Z(k) - B_{zu}U(k), \quad (5.21)$$

$$D(k) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{pc} \phi^T(k - i + 1) \otimes (\bar{B}_{zu}L_i), \quad (5.22)$$

and $\otimes$ represents the Kronecker product.

Now, consider the retrospective cost function

$$J(\hat{\theta}, k) \triangleq \hat{Z}^T(\hat{\theta}, k)R_1(k)\hat{Z}(\hat{\theta}, k) + \hat{u}^T(\hat{\theta}, k + 1)R_2(k)\hat{u}(\hat{\theta}, k + 1)$$

$$\quad + \text{tr} \left[R_3(k) \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta(k)\right)^T R_4(k) \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta(k)\right)\right], \quad (5.23)$$

where $R_1(k) = R_1^T(k) \geq 0$, $R_2(k) \geq 0$, $R_3(k) = R_3^T(k) > 0$, $R_4(k) = R_4^T(k) > 0$, and

$$\hat{u}(\hat{\theta}, k) \triangleq \hat{\theta}\phi(k). \quad (5.24)$$
Substituting (5.20) into (5.23) yields

\[ J(\hat{\theta}, k) = c(k) + b^T(k)\text{vec} \hat{\theta} + \left( \text{vec} \hat{\theta} \right)^T M(k)\text{vec} \hat{\theta}, \quad (5.25) \]

where

\[ M(k) \triangleq D^T(k)R_1(k)D(k) + \left[ \phi^T(k)\phi(k) \right] \otimes R_2(k) + R_3(k) \otimes R_4(k), \quad (5.26) \]
\[ b(k) \triangleq 2D^T(k)R_1(k)f(k) - 2 \left[ R_3(k) \otimes R_4(k) \right] \text{vec} \theta(k), \quad (5.27) \]
\[ c(k) \triangleq f^T(k)R_1(k)f(k) + \text{tr} \left[ R_3(k)\theta^T(k)R_4(k)\theta(k) \right]. \quad (5.28) \]

Since \( M(k) \) is positive definite, \( J(\hat{\theta}, k) \) has the strict global minimizer \( \theta(k+1) \) given by

\[ \theta(k+1) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{vec}^{-1} \left[ M^{-1}(k)b(k) \right]. \quad (5.29) \]

For all future discussion, we specialize (5.26)–(5.28) with

\[ R_1(k) \triangleq I_{pl_x}, \quad R_2(k) \triangleq 0_{lu}, \quad R_3(k) \triangleq \alpha(k)I_{n_c(l_u+t_u)}, \quad R_4(k) \triangleq I_{lu}, \quad (5.30) \]

where \( \alpha(k) > 0 \) is a scalar, yielding

\[ M(k) = D^T(k)D(k) + \alpha(k)I, \quad (5.31) \]
\[ b(k) = 2D^T(k)f(k) - 2\alpha(k)\text{vec} \theta(k), \quad (5.32) \]
\[ c(k) = f^T(k)f(k) + \alpha(k)\text{tr} \left[ \theta^T(k)\theta(k) \right]. \quad (5.33) \]

The weighting parameter \( \alpha(k) \) introduced in (5.30) is called the \textit{learning rate} since it affects convergence speed of the adaptive control algorithm. As \( \alpha(k) \) is increased, a higher weight is placed on the difference between the previous control coefficients.
and the current control coefficients, and, as a result, convergence speed is lowered. Likewise, as $\alpha(k)$ is decreased, convergence speed is raised. By varying $\alpha(k)$, we study tradeoffs between transient performance and convergence speed.

In the particular case $z = y$, using the retrospective performance variable $\hat{z}$ in place of $y$ in the regressor vector (5.13) results in faster convergence. Therefore, for $z = y$, we redefine (5.13) as

$$
\phi(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{z}(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
\hat{z}(k-n_c) \\
u(k-1) \\
\vdots \\
u(k-n_c)
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(5.34)

The novel feature of the adaptive control algorithm (5.11), (5.29) is the use of the retrospective correction filter (RCF) (5.19), as shown in Figure 5.2 for $p = 1$. The RCF provides an inner loop to the adaptive control law by modifying the extended performance vector $Z(k)$ based on the difference between the actual past control inputs $U(k)$ and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law $\hat{U}(\hat{\theta},k)$.

5.5 Smith-McMillan-Based Update

If information about the plant's nonminimum-phase zeros is available, we can use that information to construct $\bar{B}_{zu}$ for the adaptive control algorithm. We first represent $G_{zu}$ (as given by (A.12) in Appendix A) in Smith-McMillan form. We then define the surrogate transfer function matrix $\hat{G}_{zu}$ to be identical to $G_{zu}$ in Smith-McMillan form except that the minimum-phase transmission zeros of $G_{zu}$ are replaced
\[ x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k) + D_1w(k) \]
\[ y(k) = Cx(k) + D_2w(k) \]
\[ z(k) = E_1x(k) + E_0w(k) \]

**Figure 5.2** Closed-loop system including adaptive control algorithm with the retrospective correction filter (dashed box) for \( p = 1 \).

by transmission zeros at the origin. Thus \( \hat{G}_{zu} \) has the form

\[
\hat{G}_{zu}(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{z^n + \alpha_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_n} \left( \hat{\beta}_d z^{n-d} + \hat{\beta}_{d+1} z^{n-d-1} + \cdots + \hat{\beta}_n \right), \quad (5.35)
\]

where \( \hat{\beta}_d, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u \times l_u} \) are the surrogate numerator coefficients and \( \hat{\beta}_d \triangleq H_d \).

Then, using the numerator coefficients of \( \hat{G}_{zu}(z) \), the Smith-McMillan-based con-
struction of $\tilde{B}_{zu}$ is given by

$$\tilde{B}_{zu} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \hat{\beta}_d & \cdots & \hat{\beta}_n & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} \\ 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \hat{\beta}_d & \cdots & \hat{\beta}_n & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} \end{bmatrix}.$$  

(5.36)

In the SISO case, this construction of $\tilde{B}_{zu}$ requires knowledge of the relative degree $d$, the first nonzero Markov parameter $H_d$, and the location of nonminimum-phase zeros, if any. The MIMO case is more subtle, but still requires knowledge of the relative degree, first nonzero Markov parameter, and the location of any nonminimum-phase transmission zeros. The advantage in using the surrogate numerator coefficients $\hat{\beta}_d, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_n$ of $\hat{G}_{zu}$ as opposed to the actual numerator coefficients $\beta_d, \ldots, \beta_n$ of $G_{zu}$ is faster convergence.

### 5.6 Markov Parameter-Based Update

In many cases, the number and location of any nonminimum-phase zeros may be difficult or even impossible to obtain. Therefore, an alternate construction of $B_{zu}$ is available that makes use of Markov parameters. It is shown in Appendix A that there exists a theoretical connection between Markov parameters and nonminimum-phase zeros. Details of this connection are available in Section A.3.

Using the methods developed in Appendix A and the numerator coefficients of
(A.20), it follows that the Markov parameter-based construction of $\bar{B}_{zu}$ is given by

$$
\bar{B}_{zu} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & H_d & \cdots & H_r & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} \\
0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & H_d & \cdots & H_r & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & 0_{l_z \times l_u} & \cdots & 0_{l_z \times l_u} 
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(5.37)

The leading zeros in the first row of $\bar{B}_{zu}$ account for the nonzero relative degree $d$. The advantage in constructing $\bar{B}_{zu}$ using the Markov parameters $H_i, i = d, \ldots, r$, as opposed to using all of the numerator coefficients of (A.15) is faster convergence and ease of identification. The algorithm places no constraints on either the value of $d$ or the rank of $H_d$ or $\bar{B}_{zu}$. Unless otherwise noted, we will use the Markov-parameter-based construction of $\bar{B}_{zu}$ given by (5.37) in the following examples.

### 5.7 Numerical Examples - Nominal Case

We now present numerical examples to illustrate the response of the RCF adaptive control algorithm under nominal conditions. We consider a sequence of examples of increasing complexity, ranging from SISO, minimum-phase plants to MIMO, nonminimum-phase plants, including stable and unstable cases. Each plant can be viewed as a sampled-data discretization of a continuous-time plant sampled at $T_s = 0.01$ sec. All examples assume $z = y$ and the adaptive controller gain matrix $\theta(k)$ is initialized to zero.

Unless otherwise noted, each example is taken to be a disturbance rejection simulation, that is, $E_0 = 0$, with unknown sinusoidal disturbance given by

$$
w(k) = \begin{bmatrix}
sin 2\pi \nu_1 kT_s \\
sin 2\pi \nu_2 kT_s
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(5.38)
where \( \nu_1 = 5 \text{ Hz} \) and \( \nu_2 = 13 \text{ Hz} \). The RCF adaptive control algorithm requires no information about \( w \). With each plant realized in controllable canonical form, we take \( D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \), and, therefore, the disturbance is not matched.

**Example 5.7.1** (SISO, Nonminimum Phase, FIR Plant). Consider an FIR plant of order \( n = 8 \) and zeros \( \{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 2 \pm 0.5j\} \). We take \( n_c = 15, p = 2, r = 8, \) and \( \alpha(k) \equiv 25 \). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.3. The control is turned on at \( t = 2 \text{ sec} \), and the performance variable reduces to zero within 3 sec.

![Figure 5.3](image)

**Figure 5.3** Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for an FIR, nonminimum phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at \( t = 2 \text{ sec} \). The controller order is \( n_c = 15 \) with parameters \( p = 2, r = 8, \alpha(k) \equiv 25 \).

**Example 5.7.2** (SISO, Minimum Phase, Stable Plant). Consider a plant with poles \( \{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.9, \pm 0.7j\} \) and zeros \( \{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 0.5\} \). We take \( n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3, \) and \( \alpha(k) \equiv 25 \). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.4. The control is turned on at \( t = 2 \text{ sec} \), and the performance variable reduces to zero within 1 sec. The control algorithm converges to an internal model controller with high gain at the disturbance frequencies, as seen in Figure 5.5.
Figure 5.4  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$.

Figure 5.5  Bode magnitude plot of the adaptive controller at $t = 10$ sec. The adaptive controller places poles at the disturbance frequencies $\nu_1 = 5$ Hz and $\nu_2 = 13$ Hz. The controller magnitude $|G_c(e^{j\omega T_s})|$ is plotted for $\omega$ up to the Nyquist frequency $\omega_{Nyq} = \frac{\pi}{T_s} = 314$ rad/sec.
Example 5.7.3 (SISO, Nonminimum Phase, Stable Plant). Consider a plant with poles \( \{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.9, \pm 0.7j\} \) and zeros \( \{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 2\} \). We take \( n_c = 15 \), \( p = 1 \), \( r = 7 \), and \( \alpha(k) \equiv 25 \). Note that the Markov parameter polynomial used to construct \( \bar{B}_{zu} \) is given by

\[
p_7(q) = q^4 - 1.2q^3 - 0.96q^2 - 0.56q - 0.75,
\]

with corresponding roots \( \{0.01 \pm 0.71j, -0.77, 1.94\} \). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.6. The control is turned on at \( t = 2 \) sec, and, after a slight transient, the performance variable reduces to zero.

![Figure 5.6](image)

Figure 5.6 Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at \( t = 2 \) sec. The controller order is \( n_c = 15 \) with parameters \( p = 1, r = 7, \alpha(k) \equiv 25 \).

Alternatively, consider the Smith-McMillan-based construction of \( \bar{B}_{zu} \) given by (5.36), which is constructed using the first nonzero Markov parameter \( H_3 = 1 \) and the location of the nonminimum-phase zero at \( z = 2 \). We take \( n_c = 15 \), \( p = 1 \), \( r = 1 \), and \( \alpha(k) \equiv 25 \). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.7. The control is turned on at \( t = 2 \) sec, and, after a transient, the performance variable reduces to...
zero. Note that the simulation using the Markov-parameter-based construction of $\bar{B}_{zu}$ (Figure 5.6) yields a better transient response than the simulation using the Smith-McMillan-based construction of $\bar{B}_{zu}$ (Figure 5.7).

![Figure 5.7](image)

**Figure 5.7** Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum phase, SISO plant using the Smith-McMillan-based construction of $\bar{B}_{zu}$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 1, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$.

**Example 5.7.4** (SISO, Minimum Phase, Unstable Plant). Consider a plant with poles $\{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 1.04, 0.1 \pm 1.025j\}$ and zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 0.5\}$. We take $n_c = 15$, $p = 1$, $r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.8. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and, after a transient, the performance variable reduces to zero.

**Example 5.7.5** (MIMO, Minimum Phase, Stable Plant). Consider a two-input, two-output plant with poles $\{-0.5 \pm 0.5j, 0.9, \pm 0.7j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, 0.9, \pm 0.7j\}$ and transmission zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, 0.5, 0.5\}$. We take $n_c = 15$, $p = 1$, $r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 1$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.9. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec,
Figure 5.8  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for an unstable, minimum phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 25.$

and the performance variable reduces to zero.

Figure 5.9  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum phase, two-input two-output plant. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 1.$
Example 5.7.6 (MIMO, Nonminimum Phase, Stable Plant). Consider a two-input, two-output plant with poles \{-0.5 \pm 0.5j, 0.9, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, 0.9\} and transmission zero \{2\}. We take \(n_c = 20\), \(p = 1\), \(r = 6\), and \(\alpha(k) \equiv 1\). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.10. The control is turned on at \(t = 2\) sec, and, after a slight transient, the performance variable reduces to zero.

![Figure 5.10](image)

Figure 5.10  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum phase, two-input two-output plant. The control is turned on at \(t = 2\) sec. The controller order is \(n_c = 20\) with parameters \(p = 1\), \(r = 6\), \(\alpha(k) \equiv 1\).

Example 5.7.7 (MIMO, Nonminimum Phase, Unstable Plant). Consider a two-input, two-output plant with poles \{-0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.7j, 0.1 \pm 1.025j, -0.4, 0.9\} and transmission zeros \{0.5, 2\}. We take \(n_c = 10\), \(p = 1\), \(r = 10\), and \(\alpha(k) \equiv 1\). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.11. The control is turned on at \(t = 2\) sec, and, after a slight transient, the performance variable reduces to zero.

Example 5.7.8 (Ex. 5.7.7 with Command Following and Disturbance Rejection). We consider a combined step-command following and disturbance rejection problem
Figure 5.11  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for an unstable, nonminimum phase, two-input two-output plant. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 10$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 1$.

with command and disturbance given by

$$w(k) = \begin{bmatrix} w_1(k) \\ w_2(k) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sin 2\pi \nu_1 kT_s \\ 5 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.39)$$

With the plant realized in controllable canonical form, we take $D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $E_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$. Therefore, $w_1$ is the disturbance to be rejected, while $w_2$ is the command to be followed.

We take $n_c = 20, p = 1, r = 3$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 50$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.12. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero, that is, the disturbance $w_1$ is rejected while the command $w_2$ is followed.

Example 5.7.9 (Command Following with Unstable Plant). We consider a dou-
Figure 5.12  Closed-loop response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant with a step command and sinusoidal disturbance. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 20$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 50$.

The SISO plant is unstable and minimum phase with poles $\{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, 1, 1\}$ and zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, 0.5\}$. We take $n_c = 10, p = 5, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 5$.

The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.13. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and, after a transient, the performance variable reduces to zero, that is, the step-command $w$ is followed.

\section{5.8 Numerical Examples - Off-nominal Cases}

We now present numerical examples to illustrate the response of the RCF adaptive control algorithm under conditions of uncertainty in the relative degree and Markov parameters, measurement noise, and actuator and sensor saturations. Therefore, we
Figure 5.13  Closed-loop response for an unstable, minimum phase, SISO plant with a step command. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 10$ with parameters $p = 5, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 5$.

revisit examples from the previous section under off-nominal conditions, that is, with uncertainty in the required plant modeling information. In each case, we illuminate the role of the learning rate $\alpha$, which governs the rate of convergence. Our goal is thus to develop rules of thumb for choosing $\alpha$ based on the level of model fidelity. Each example is taken to be a disturbance rejection simulation with $z = y$, as presented in Section 5.7. In each example below, the adaptive controller gain matrix $\theta(k)$ is initialized to zero.

Example 5.8.1 (Ex. 5.7.3 with Relative Degree Error and Unknown Latency - Phase Margin). Consider model error in the relative degree. The system has relative degree $d = 3$.

First, for controller implementation, we use the erroneous $\hat{d} = 2$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.14. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero.

Now let $\hat{d} = 4$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. The closed-
Figure 5.14  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum phase, relative degree $d = 3$ SISO plant where the controller is created assuming the plant has relative degree $d = 2$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. To compensate for uncertainty in the relative degree $d$, $\alpha$ is increased to slow down the adaptation.

The control input $u(k)$ and the performance variable $y(k)$ are shown in Figure 5.15. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable converges to zero.

These simulations show that the adaptive controller is sensitive to errors in relative degree, which is equivalent to an unknown latency, that is, implementation delay. However, the effect of a known latency of $l$ steps can be addressed by simply replacing $d$ by $d + l$ in the construction of $B_{zu}$. These simulations suggest that it is a natural extension to use relative degree error and latency as potential metrics for analyzing phase margins of discrete-time adaptive systems.

Example 5.8.2 (Ex. 5.7.2 with Uncertain $H_d$ - Gain Margin). We now assess the algorithm’s robustness to knowledge of the first nonzero Markov parameter $H_d$. The first nonzero Markov parameter is $H_3 = 1$.

We first assume that the first nonzero Markov parameter is $\hat{H}_3 = 0.05H_3$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 133.
Figure 5.15  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum phase, relative degree $d = 3$ SISO plant where the controller is created assuming the plant has relative degree $d = 4$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 1000$.

5.16. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable converges within 6 sec. In this case, the Markov parameter scaling is equivalent to at least a 26 dB downward adaptive gain margin.

Now, we assume that the first nonzero Markov parameter is $\hat{H}_3 = 20H_3$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3, \text{ and } \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.17. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable converges to zero. In this case, the Markov parameter scaling is equivalent to at least a 26 dB upward adaptive gain margin.

In the case where the sign of the first nonzero Markov parameter is wrong, that is, $\hat{H}_3 = -H_3$, the simulation fails. As the fidelity of $H_d$ decreases, convergence is slowed. From these results it is seen that increasing error in $H_d$ is equivalent to increasing $\alpha$, and thus slowing down the convergence. These simulations suggest that it is a natural extension to use linear Markov parameter scaling as a potential metric
Figure 5.16 Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant with $H_d = 1$ where the controller is created with $\tilde{H}_d = 0.05$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. With $H_d$ underestimated, the closed-loop converges more slowly than in the nominal case.

for analyzing gain margins of discrete-time adaptive systems.

Example 5.8.3 (Noisy Markov Parameters). We investigate model error in the Markov parameters.

First, consider Example 5.7.2. The system has relative degree $d = 3$ with $H_3 = 1$. For controller implementation, we perturb each Markov parameter $H_i, i = 1 \ldots r$, by adding zero-mean Gaussian white noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.25$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.18. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero.

Next, consider Example 5.7.3 with model error in the Markov parameters. The system has relative degree $d = 3$ with $H_3 = 1$. For controller implementation, we perturb each Markov parameter $H_i, i = 1 \ldots r$, by adding zero-mean Gaussian white noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.25$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. 
Figure 5.17 Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant with $H_d = 1$ where the controller is created with $\hat{H}_d = 20$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. With $H_d$ overestimated, the closed-loop converges more slowly than in the nominal case. \[ \alpha(k) \equiv 25. \] The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.19. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero.

These simulations show that the adaptive control algorithm is robust to errors in the Markov parameters.

Example 5.8.4 (Ex. 5.7.2 with Noisy Measurements). To assess the performance of the adaptive algorithm with added sensor noise, we modify the sensor equation (5.2) by

\[ y(k) = Cx(k) + D_2w(k) + v(k), \]  

where $v(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu}$ is zero-mean Gaussian white noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.1$.

We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.20. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable is reduced to the level of the additive sensor noise $v(k)$. Analogous results
are obtained for sinusoidal sensor noise and measurement bias, that is, constant measurement noise. Bursting was not observed in any of the simulations.

Example 5.8.5 (Ex. 5.7.2 with Actuator and Sensor Saturation). In addition to the issues discussed above, physical systems are constrained by actuator and sensor limitations. In particular, we consider the performance of the adaptive algorithm under actuator and sensor saturation.

The control input $u(k)$ is subject to saturation at $\pm 1.5$, while the sensor measurement $y(k)$ is subject to saturation at $\pm 2$. We take $n_c = 15$, $p = 1$, $r = 3$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.21. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable is reduced to a level consistent with what the saturated control can provide.
Figure 5.19  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum phase, relative degree $d = 3$, SISO plant where the controller is created with Markov parameters perturbed by zero-mean Gaussian white noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.25$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$.

Example 5.8.6 (Ex. 5.7.2 Command Following with Actuator Saturation). We consider a command given by $w(k) = 1$. With the plant realized in controllable canonical form, we take $D_1 = 0$ and $E_0 = -1$.

First, consider the case with no actuator saturation. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.22. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and, after a transient, the performance variable reduces to zero, that is, the step-command $w$ is followed.

Now, consider the case with actuator saturation at $\pm 0.1$. We take $n_c = 15, p = 1, r = 3$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.23. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to a level consistent with what the saturated control can provide.
Figure 5.20 Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant with random white noise added to the measurement. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The performance variable $y(k)$ is reduced to the level of the additive sensor noise $v(k)$.

Figure 5.21 Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable minimum phase SISO plant where the actuator is saturated at $\pm 1.5$ and the sensor is saturated at $\pm 2$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The saturations reduce overall steady-state performance.
Figure 5.22  Closed-loop response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant with a step command. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$.

Figure 5.23  Closed-loop response for a stable, minimum phase, SISO plant with a step command subject to actuator saturation at $\pm 0.1$. The control is turned on at $t = 2$ sec. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$. 
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5.9 Numerical Examples - Model Reference Adaptive Control

We now present numericals example to illustrate the response of the RCF adaptive control algorithm for model reference adaptive control (see Figure 5.1). Unless otherwise noted, the adaptive controller gain matrix $\theta(k)$ is initialized to zero.

5.9.1 Boeing 747 longitudinal dynamics

Consider the longitudinal dynamics of a Boeing 747 aircraft, linearized about steady flight at 40,000 ft and 774 ft/sec. The inputs to the dynamical system are taken to be elevator deflection and thrust. The output of the dynamical system is taken to be pitch angle. The continuous-time equations of motion are thus given by

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{u} \\
\dot{w} \\
\dot{q} \\
\dot{\theta}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
-0.003 & 0.039 & 0 & -0.322 \\
-0.065 & -0.319 & 7.74 & 0 \\
0.020 & -0.101 & -0.429 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
u \\
w \\
q \\
\theta
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
0.010 & 1 \\
-0.180 & -0.040 \\
-1.160 & 0.598 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta_e \\
\delta_T
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(5.41)

$$
y =
\begin{bmatrix}
y_1 \\
y_2
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
u \\
w \\
q \\
\theta
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
1
\end{bmatrix}
w,
$$

(5.42)

$$
z = y_1 - y_m,
$$

(5.43)

where $w$ is the exogenous command and $y_m$ is the output of the reference model

$$
G_m(s) = \frac{Y_m(s)}{W(s)} = \frac{0.0131}{s^2 + 0.16s + 0.0131}. 
$$

(5.44)
We discretize (5.41)–(5.44) using a zero-order hold and sampling time \( T_s = 0.01 \text{ sec} \). The reference command is taken to be a 1 deg step command in pitch angle. The controller order is \( n_c = 10 \) with parameters \( p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 40 \). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.24. The controller is turned on immediately and the performance variable reduces to zero within about 20 sec.

![Figure 5.24](image)

**Figure 5.24** Closed-loop model reference adaptive control of Boeing 747 longitudinal dynamics. The controller order is \( n_c = 10 \) with parameters \( p = 1, r = 10, \alpha(k) \equiv 40 \). The performance variable converges within about 20 sec.

### 5.9.2 Missile Longitudinal Dynamics

We now present numerical examples for MRAC of missile longitudinal dynamics under off-nominal or damage situations. The basic missile longitudinal plant [89] is derived from the short period approximation of the longitudinal equations of motion,
given by
\[
\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} -1.064 & 1 \\ 290.26 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \lambda \begin{bmatrix} -0.25 \\ -331.4 \end{bmatrix} u, \tag{5.45}
\]
\[
y = \begin{bmatrix} -123.34 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x + \lambda \begin{bmatrix} -13.51 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u, \tag{5.46}
\]
where
\[
x \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ q \end{bmatrix}, \quad y \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A_z \\ q \end{bmatrix},
\]
and \( \lambda \in (0, 1] \) represents the control effectiveness. Nominally \( \lambda = 1 \).

The open-loop system (5.45), (5.46) is statically unstable. To overcome this instability, a classical three-loop autopilot [89] is wrapped around the basic missile longitudinal plant. The adaptive controller then augments the closed-loop system to provide control in off-nominal cases, that is, when \( \lambda < 1 \). The autopilot and adaptive controller inputs are denoted \( u_{ap} \) and \( u_{ac} \), respectively. Thus, the total control input \( u = u_{ap} + u_{ac} \). The reference model \( G_m \) consists of the basic missile longitudinal plant with \( \lambda = 1 \) and the classical three-loop autopilot. An actuator saturation of \( \pm 30 \text{ deg} \) is included in the model, but no actuator or sensor dynamics are included.

Our goal is for the missile to follow a pitch acceleration command \( w \) consisting of a 1-g amplitude 1-Hz square wave. The performance variable \( z \) is the difference between the measured pitch acceleration \( A_z \) and the reference model pitch acceleration \( A_z^* \), that is, \( z \triangleq A_z - A_z^* \). The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 5.25 for \( \lambda = 1 \). Since the plant and reference model are identical in the nominal case, the adaptive control input \( u_{ac} = 0 \).

All of the following examples use the same adaptive controller parameters. The adaptive controller is implemented at a sampling rate of 300 Hz. We take \( n_c = 3 \), \( p = 1 \), and \( r = 20 \). A time-varying learning rate \( \alpha \) is used such that, initially, con-
controller adaptation is fast, and, as performance improves, the adaptation slows. The learning rate is identical for each simulation. System identification using the Observer/Kalman filter identification (OKID) algorithm [57] is used to obtain the 20 Markov parameters required for controller implementation. The offline identification procedure is performed with a nominal simulation ($\lambda = 1$) by injecting band-limited white noise at the adaptive controller input $u_{ac}$ and recording the performance variable $z$ while the autopilot is in-the-loop. No external disturbances are assumed to be present during the identification procedure.

**Example 5.9.1 (75% Control Effectiveness).** Consider $\lambda = 0.75$. First, Figure 5.26 shows simulation results with the adaptive controller turned off, that is, autopilot-only control.

Now, with the adaptive controller turned on, that is, augmented autopilot plus
Figure 5.26  Missile longitudinal dynamics with control effectiveness $\lambda = 0.75$ and adaptive controller turned off, that is, autopilot-only control.

adaptive controller, simulation results are shown in Figure 5.27. After a small transient, the augmented controllers result in better performance than the autopilot-only simulation.

Example 5.9.2 (50% Control Effectiveness). Consider $\lambda = 0.50$. First, Figure 5.28 shows simulation results with the adaptive controller turned off, that is, autopilot-only control.

Now, with the adaptive controller turned on, that is, augmented autopilot plus adaptive controller, simulation results are shown in Figure 5.29. After a transient, the augmented controllers result in better performance than the autopilot-only simulation.

Example 5.9.3 (25% Control Effectiveness). Consider $\lambda = 0.25$. With the adaptive controller turned off, that is, autopilot-only control, the simulation fails. With the adaptive controller turned on, that is, augmented autopilot plus adaptive con-
Figure 5.27 Closed-loop model reference adaptive control of missile longitudinal dynamics with control effectiveness $\lambda = 0.75$. The augmented controllers result in better performance than the autopilot-only simulation.

Figure 5.28 Missile longitudinal dynamics with control effectiveness $\lambda = 0.50$ and adaptive controller turned off, that is, autopilot-only control.
controller, simulation results are shown in Figure 5.30. After a transient, the augmented controllers stabilize the system whereas the autopilot-only simulation fails.

Figure 5.30 shows that the total control input $u$ reaches the actuator saturation level of ±30 deg. To reduce the initial transient, a more finely tuned learning rate can be implemented or the adaptive controller can be initialized with nonzero gains. Therefore, we now initialize the adaptive controller with the converged control gains $\theta$ from the 50% control effectiveness case. We use the gains of the 50% case since it is a median starting point. Simulation results are shown in Figure 5.31. The initial transient is reduced as compared with initializing the control gains to zero. In this case, the actuator saturation level is never reached.

**5.10 Algorithm Limitations**

For practical reasons such as sensor or actuator failure, control engineers can be reluctant to use unstable controllers for the purpose of stabilization. It thus follows
that we are interested in plants that are strongly stabilizable [129]. A dynamical system $G$ is said to be *strongly stabilizable* if there exists a stable controller $G_c$ that stabilizes the open-loop system $G$. It is well known that a stable controller which stabilizes the system exists if and only if the plant satisfies the parity interlacing property [133]. In SISO continuous-time systems, a plant satisfies the parity interlacing property if it has an even number of poles between each pair of zeros on the positive real axis. Similar results apply for both discrete-time and MIMO systems.

After gain convergence, every simulation presented in this chapter resulted in a stable adaptive controller. No simulations performed with the RCF adaptive control algorithm have resulted in an unstable controller after gain convergence. Without converging to an unstable controller, it follows that the simulation fails if the RCF adaptive control algorithm is used to stabilize a plant that is not strongly stabilizable. No other cases have been identified which cause the RCF adaptive control algorithm
Figure 5.31  Closed-loop model reference adaptive control of missile longitudinal dynamics with control effectiveness $\lambda = 0.25$. The adaptive controller is initialized with the converged gains from the 50% control effectiveness case. The initial transient is reduced as compared with initializing the control gains to zero. In this case, the actuator saturation level is never reached.

to fail. Obtaining a linear bound of the control inputs $u$ by the measurement variables $y$ (as required in Theorem 2.6.1) is not possible in general for nonminimum-phase systems. However, this linear bounding condition does hold for systems that are stabilized with a stable controller. Future work includes incorporating this strongly stabilizing property into a Lyapunov-based stability analysis of the RCF adaptive control algorithm.

Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) techniques have been shown to work well with broadband disturbances, but LQG controllers require complete knowledge of the system parameters. In practice, reliable knowledge of the system parameters may be impossible to obtain. Therefore, it is desirable to use adaptive controllers with minimal modeling requirements for broadband disturbance rejection. While the RCF adaptive control algorithm was shown to work well with commands and disturbances generated from Lyapunov-stable linear systems, that is, sums of discrete sinusoids and steps, it has been found to provide only marginal performance improvements for
broadband disturbance rejection applications. Future work includes the development of a theoretical foundation for analyzing broadband disturbance rejection properties of the controller.

5.11 Conclusion

We presented the RCF adaptive control algorithm and demonstrated its effectiveness in handling nonminimum-phase zeros through numerical examples illustrating the response of the algorithm under conditions of uncertainty in the relative degree and Markov parameters, measurement noise, and actuator and sensor saturations. We thus developed rules of thumb for choosing the learning rate $\alpha$ for stable response and acceptable transient behavior. Bursting was not observed in any of the simulations. We also developed preliminary metrics for analyzing the gain and phase margins for discrete-time adaptive systems. Future work includes the development of Lyapunov-based stability and robustness analysis of the RCF adaptive control algorithm as well as development of a theoretical foundation for analyzing broadband disturbance rejection properties of the controller.
Chapter 6

Indirect Retrospective-Cost-Based Adaptive Control with RLS-Based Estimation

In the previous chapter, we presented a direct adaptive control algorithm which required a priori information about the sign of the high-frequency gain as well as information about the locations of the nonminimum-phase zeros. In this chapter, we augment the adaptive controller developed in Chapter 5 with recursive least-squares estimation to form a discrete-time indirect adaptive control law that is effective for systems that are multi-input, multi-output, and/or nonminimum phase. Recursive least-squares estimation is used for concurrent Markov parameter updating. We present numerical examples to illustrate the algorithm’s effectiveness in handling nonminimum-phase zeros as plant changes occur. The results and methods of this chapter are published in [112].

6.1 Introduction

Adaptive control algorithms can be classified as either direct or indirect, depending on whether they employ an explicit parameter estimation algorithm within the overall adaptive scheme; see [32, 50, 77, 90]. Most direct adaptive control algorithms,
with the exception of universal adaptive control algorithms [46, 47, 64, 79, 81, 86, 87, 96, 106, 130, 132], require some prior modeling information, such as the sign of the high-frequency gain. By updating the required modeling information, perhaps through closed-loop identification, a direct adaptive control algorithm can be converted to an indirect adaptive control algorithm, which may have greater versatility in practice.

The goal of the present chapter is to present an indirect discrete-time adaptive control algorithm as an extension of the direct adaptive control algorithm developed in Chapter 5. This algorithm, based on a retrospective correction filter (RCF), requires prior estimates of the Markov parameters of the transfer function from the control inputs to the performance (error) variables. These Markov parameter estimates capture the sign of the high-frequency gain as well as the locations of the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any) in the relevant transfer function. Since no parameter estimation is performed online, the algorithm developed in Chapter 5 is a direct adaptive control algorithm. In some applications, however, prior modeling or identification is not possible, whereas, in other applications, the dynamics of the plant may change unexpectedly during operation. In both cases, the required Markov parameters must be estimated online.

With this motivation in mind, the present chapter investigates the performance of the RCF-based adaptive control algorithm with concurrent Markov-parameter estimation. The resulting adaptive control algorithm is thus indirect. For parameter estimation we use a standard recursive least-squares (RLS) algorithm. The scenario we consider begins with discrete-time RCF-based direct adaptive control with prior estimates of the Markov parameters. The RLS identification algorithm operates concurrently with the control adaptation to update the Markov parameters when a plant change occurs.

We demonstrate the indirect RCF algorithm on several numerical examples. Of
particular interest is the case in which a plant change occurs, in which a minimum phase zero becomes nonminimum phase. These results are noteworthy since nonminimum-phase zeros are known to be challenging for adaptive control algorithms [5]. Numerical results show that the algorithm is able to update the Markov parameters and maintain stabilization of the system. These numerical examples are intended to provide motivation for future proofs of stability and convergence.

6.2 Recursive Least-Squares Markov Parameter Update

To obtain the required Markov parameters for constructing $B_{zu}$, we implement the standard recursive least-squares algorithm as in [70] for the $r$-MARKOV plant structure (5.5). A forgetting factor is not used since no benefit was observed by including it. We initialize the parameter matrix to zero and the covariance matrix of the parameter estimation error to the identity matrix. At each time step, we take the computed Markov parameters $H_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, r$, and construct $\tilde{B}_{zu}$ as in (5.37). The identification input for RLS is taken to be the output of the adaptive controller, that is, the control input $u$ to the plant, while the identification output for RLS is taken to be the performance variable $z$. The closed-loop system including the RCF adaptive control algorithm with concurrent RLS identification for Markov parameter, and thus $\tilde{B}_{zu}$, updates is shown in Figure 6.1. No probing input is used to identify the Markov parameters, and disturbances are assumed to be present while the online identification takes place.

6.3 Numerical Examples

We now present numerical examples to illustrate the response of the RCF adaptive control algorithm with concurrent RLS identification. We consider a sequence of ex-
Examples of increasing complexity. In each case, we start with a nominal plant in closed loop with the RCF adaptive control algorithm and concurrent RLS identification. At some time during the simulation, a plant change occurs, which requires updating the Markov parameters for the adaptive controller. As RLS identification runs concurrently with the adaptive controller, the Markov parameters are updated in real time. Each plant can be viewed as a sampled-data discretization of a continuous-time plant sampled at $T_s = 0.01$ sec. All examples assume $z = y$ and the adaptive controller gain matrix $\theta(k)$ is initialized to zero.

For simplicity, each example, unless otherwise noted, is taken to be a disturbance rejection simulation, that is, $E_0 = 0$, with unknown sinusoidal disturbance given by

$$w(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \sin 2\pi \nu_1 k T_s \\ \sin 2\pi \nu_2 k T_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.1)$$
where $\nu_1 = 5$ Hz and $\nu_2 = 13$ Hz. The RCF adaptive control algorithm requires no information about $w$. With each plant realized in controllable canonical form, we take $D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and, therefore, the disturbance is not matched.

**Example 6.3.1** (Change in control effectiveness). Consider a stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant with poles $\{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.9, \pm 0.7j\}$ and zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, \pm 0.5\}$. We take $n_c = 15$, $p = 1$, $r = 3$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 6.2. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero within 2 sec. At $t = 15$ sec, the system suffers a 75% loss of control effectiveness, that is, the control input $u$ entering the plant is multiplied by a scaling factor $\lambda = 0.25$. The Markov parameters are updated online, and the adaptive control algorithm reduces the performance variable to zero within 2 sec. Figure 6.3 shows a time-history plot of the first 3 Markov parameters obtained from online RLS identification.

![Figure 6.2](image)

**Figure 6.2** Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and, at $t = 15$ sec, the system suffers a 75% loss of control effectiveness. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 3, \alpha(k) \equiv 25$.  
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Figure 6.3  Time history of the first 3 Markov parameters obtained from online RLS identification. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and, at $t = 15$ sec, the system suffers a 75% loss of control effectiveness. The estimated Markov parameters are used in the adaptive controller update law.

Example 6.3.2 (Change in zero characteristics). Consider a stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant with poles $\{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.9, \pm 0.7j\}$ and zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, \pm 0.5\}$. We take $n_c = 20$, $p = 1$, $r = 20$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 1000$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 6.4. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero. At $t = 15$ sec, the minimum-phase zero at $z = 0.5$ is changed to a nonminimum-phase zero at $z = 2$. After a transient, the adaptive control algorithm reduces the performance variable to zero.

Example 6.3.3 (Change in poles and zeros). Consider an order $n = 8$ FIR, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant with zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 0.5, 2\}$. We take $n_c = 15$, $p = 1$, $r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 25$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 6.5. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero. At $t = 15$ sec, the nonminimum-phase zero at $z = 2$ is changed to a minimum-phase zero at $z = 0.5$ and the plant’s poles are changed to
Figure 6.4  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, minimum-phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at $t = 5 \text{ sec}$, and, at $t = 15 \text{ sec}$, one of the plant’s minimum-phase zeros is replaced with a nonminimum-phase zero. The controller order is $n_c = 20$ with parameters $p = 1, r = 20, \alpha(k) \equiv 1000$.

\{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.7j\}. After a slight transient, the adaptive control algorithm reduces the performance variable to zero.

Example 6.3.4 (Change in relative degree). Consider a stable, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant with poles \{0.5\pm0.5j, -0.5\pm0.5j, \pm0.9, \pm0.7j\} and zeros \{0.3\pm0.7j, -0.7\pm0.3j, 0.5, 2\}. We take $n_c = 15, p = 2, r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 50$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 6.6. The control is turned on at $t = 5 \text{ sec}$, and the performance variable reduces to zero. At $t = 15 \text{ sec}$, the plant’s relative degree is changed from $d = 2$ to $d = 4$ by adding two poles at the origin. The RLS algorithm identifies the shifted Markov parameters due to latency and recovers performance. Without RLS, the RCF algorithm is shown in [114] to be sensitive to unknown delays.

Example 6.3.5 (Command following with change in zeros). We now consider a step-command following problem with command given by a square wave of frequency $2\pi\nu_1 T_s$.
cycles/sample, where $\nu_3 = 0.1$ Hz. With the plant realized in controllable canonical form, we take $D_1 = 0$ and $E_0 = -1$.

Consider a stable, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant with poles \{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, \pm 0.9, \pm 0.7j\} and zeros \{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 0.5, 2\}. We take $n_c = 15$, $p = 2$, $r = 25$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 250$. The closed-loop response is shown in Figure 6.7. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and the performance variable reduces to zero. At $t = 15$ sec, the minimum-phase zero at $z = 0.5$ disappears from the plant, while the nonminimum-phase zero at $z = 2$ is changed to a nonminimum-phase zero at $z = 2.5$. After a transient, the adaptive control algorithm reduces the performance variable to zero and follows the step command.

Example 6.3.6 (MRAC for Missile Longitudinal Dynamics). We now present a numerical example for MRAC of missile longitudinal dynamics under an off-nominal or damage situation. The MRAC control architecture is shown in Figure 5.1. The basic
Figure 6.6  Closed-loop disturbance rejection response for a stable, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and, at $t = 15$ sec, the plant’s relative degree changes from $d = 2$ to $d = 4$. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 2, r = 10$, and $\alpha(k) \equiv 50$.

Figure 6.7  Closed-loop command following response for a stable, nonminimum-phase, SISO plant. The control is turned on at $t = 5$ sec, and, at $t = 15$ sec, one of the plant’s minimum-phase zeros is removed while the location of the plant’s nonminimum-phase zero is changed. The controller order is $n_c = 15$ with parameters $p = 2, r = 25, \alpha(k) \equiv 250$. 
missile longitudinal plant of [89] is derived from the short period approximation of the longitudinal equations of motion, given by

\begin{align}
\dot{x} &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.064 & 1 \\ 290.26 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \lambda \begin{bmatrix} -0.25 \\ -331.4 \end{bmatrix} u, \\
y &= \begin{bmatrix} -123.34 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x + \lambda \begin{bmatrix} -13.51 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u,
\end{align}

(6.2)

(6.3)

where

\[ x \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ q \end{bmatrix}, \quad y \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A_z \\ q \end{bmatrix}, \]

and \( \lambda \in (0, 1] \) represents the control effectiveness. Nominally \( \lambda = 1 \).

The open-loop system (6.2), (6.3) is statically unstable. To overcome this instability, a classical three-loop autopilot from [89] is wrapped around the basic missile longitudinal plant. The adaptive controller then augments the closed-loop system to provide control in off-nominal cases, that is, when \( \lambda < 1 \). The autopilot and adaptive controller inputs are denoted \( u_{ap} \) and \( u_{ac} \), respectively. Thus, the total control input \( u = u_{ap} + u_{ac} \). The reference model \( G_m \) consists of the basic missile longitudinal plant with \( \lambda = 1 \) and the classical three-loop autopilot. An actuator saturation of \( \pm 30 \) deg is included in the model, but no actuator or sensor dynamics are included.

Our goal is to have the missile follow a pitch acceleration command \( w \) consisting of a 1-g amplitude, 1-Hz square wave. The performance variable \( z \) is the difference between the measured pitch acceleration \( A_z \) and the reference model pitch acceleration \( A^*_z \), that is, \( z \triangleq A_z - A^*_z \). The adaptive controller is implemented at a sampling rate of 300 Hz. We take \( n_c = 3 \), \( p = 1 \), and \( r = 20 \). A time-varying learning rate \( \alpha \) is used such that, initially, controller adaptation is fast, and, as performance improves, the adaptation slows.

Figure 6.8 shows closed-loop MRAC simulation results. Initially, \( \lambda = 1 \), and thus,
the adaptive controller is not used. At $t = 5\text{sec}$, we change $\lambda = 0.5$, but, to demonstrate autopilot-only control, we do not turn on the adaptive controller. At $t = 10\text{sec}$, the adaptive controller is turned on. After a transient, the augmented controllers result in better performance than the autopilot-only control.

![Figure 6.8](image)

**Figure 6.8** Closed-loop model reference adaptive control of missile longitudinal dynamics. Initially, $\lambda = 1$. At $t = 5\text{sec}$, we change $\lambda = 0.5$ but the adaptive controller remains off. At $t = 10\text{sec}$, the adaptive controller is turned on. After a transient, the augmented controllers result in better performance than the autopilot-only control.

### 6.4 Conclusion

We presented the indirect RCF adaptive control algorithm and demonstrated its effectiveness, through numerical examples, in handling nonminimum-phase zeros while plant changes occur. The adaptive control algorithm requires a sufficient number of Markov parameters to capture the sign of the high-frequency gain as well as the nonminimum-phase zeros. Recursive least-squares estimation was used for concurrent Markov parameter updating. Future work includes the development of Lyapunov-based stability and robustness analysis for the RCF adaptive control algorithm.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

This dissertation presented advances in adaptive control of multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems. Chapter 2 focused on gradient-based adaptive control, while Chapters 3-6 related to retrospective-cost-based adaptive control.

Chapter 2 provided an extension of the work presented in [36, Chapter VII], where an adaptive controller was developed that requires limited model information for stabilization, command following, and disturbance rejection for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, minimum-phase, discrete-time systems. Specifically, the controller requires knowledge of the open-loop system’s relative degree and a bound on the first nonzero Markov parameter. Notably, the controller does not require knowledge of the command or disturbance spectrum as long as the command and disturbance signals are generated by Lyapunov-stable linear systems. Thus the command and disturbance signals are combinations of discrete-time sinusoids and steps. We proved global asymptotic convergence for command following and disturbance rejection.

Chapter 2 incorporated a logarithmic Lyapunov function to prove Lyapunov stability for systems whose exogenous dynamics are unknown and unmeasured. In addition, the adaptive update law was constructed as a gradient-based adaptive control algo-
Since an ideal deadbeat internal model controller was proven to exist, the gradient-based construction allowed us to compute and implement an optimal gradient step size. Furthermore, the gradient-based construction provided a framework for directly analyzing tradeoffs between transient performance and modeling accuracy. Finally, an inverse system representation was derived for multi-input, multi-output, minimum-phase systems which was necessary for the proof of Theorem 2.6.1.

Since the adaptive control method presented in Chapter 2 has been shown to perform well in simulation on broadband disturbances that are not generated by Lyapunov-stable linear systems, future work includes developing a theoretical foundation for analyzing and proving the broadband disturbance rejection properties of the controller.

Chapter 3 began the main topic of this dissertation. Since the method of proof for the gradient-based adaptive control algorithm presented in Chapter 2 could not be extended to nonminimum-phase systems, we focused on retrospective-cost-based adaptive control. To review, retrospective cost optimization is a measure of performance at the current time based on a past window of data and without assumptions about the command or disturbance signals. In particular, retrospective cost optimization acts as an inner loop to the adaptive control algorithm by modifying the performance variables based on the difference between the actual past control inputs and the recomputed past control inputs based on the current control law.

In particular, Chapter 3 investigated full-state-feedback stabilization in multi-input, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems. The results of Chapter 3 supported and motivated the retrospective-cost-based adaptive controllers developed in Chapters 4 and 5 by providing a basis for retrospective cost optimization. Specifically, a retrospective-cost-based adaptive controller was developed for full-state-feedback stabilization. Furthermore, Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop error system was proven for a special case. Numerical examples illustrated the robustness of the algo-
algorithm under conditions of Markov-parameter uncertainty. Theoretical and numerical results suggested that the converged adaptive controller has a downward adaptive gain margin of 6 dB and an infinite upward adaptive gain margin, which is reminiscent of continuous-time fixed-gain LQR control.

Although the retrospective-cost-based full-state-feedback adaptive control algorithm developed in Chapter 3 was shown to work well in many cases with $r = 1$, there were situations that required $r > 1$. However, in all cases, $r = n + 1$ was found to stabilize the open-loop system. Although $r = n + 1$ requires more knowledge of the Markov parameters than with $r = 1$, it is still less information than required to reconstruct a system model through techniques such as the eigenstructure realization algorithm, which generally requires $2n$ Markov parameters. Future work includes extending the specialized Lyapunov-based stability and convergence proof to the more general case to include multi-input, multi-dimensional plants with $r > 1$.

As an extension to the results of Chapter 3, Chapter 4 investigated static-output-feedback stabilization in multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems with knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the poles or zeros need be known. In addition, a theoretical link between nonminimum-phase zero information and Markov parameters was developed and explored through simulation. Numerical examples illustrated the robustness of the algorithm under conditions of Markov parameter uncertainty.

The results of Chapter 4 suggest that $r = n + 1$ was sufficient to stabilize the open-loop system. However, future work includes the development of a Lyapunov-based stability and convergence proof for the adaptive control algorithm presented in Chapter 4. In addition, the theoretical link between nonminimum-phase zero information and Markov parameters needs to be explored further, especially for multi-input, multi-output systems, where the presence of transmission zeros complicates the anal-
Chapter 5 provided an extension to the work presented in [127] as well as Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 of this dissertation. Specifically, Chapter 5 generalized the results of Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 to dynamic compensation for stabilization, command following, disturbance rejection, and model reference adaptive control. A retrospective-cost-based adaptive controller was developed for multi-input, multi-output, linear, time-invariant, discrete-time systems with knowledge of the sign of the high-frequency gain and a sufficient number of Markov parameters to approximate the nonminimum-phase zeros (if any). No additional information about the poles or the zeros need be known.

The adaptive control algorithms developed in Chapters 3-5 of this dissertation incorporated an adjustable learning-rate parameter $\alpha$ which allowed us to develop Newton-step-based adaptive update laws. In addition, Chapter 5 further developed the theoretical link between Markov parameters and nonminimum-phase zeros. We also developed preliminary metrics for analyzing the gain and phase margins for discrete-time adaptive systems. Numerical robustness analysis with uncertainty in the required modeling information was presented for plants that are multi-input, multi-output, nonminimum phase, and possibly unstable. These numerical studies showed that the adaptive control algorithm is effective for handling nonminimum-phase zeros under minimal modeling assumptions. These numerical studies serve as guidance with regard to the future development of system identification algorithms that can estimate the required plant parameters with suitable accuracy.

Future work includes development of the learning-rate parameter $\alpha$ as a function of the performance objective $z$ as well as the development of Lyapunov-based stability and robustness analysis for the retrospective-cost-based adaptive control algorithm presented in Chapter 5. While the RCF adaptive control algorithm was shown to work well with commands and disturbances generated from Lyapunov-stable linear systems,
that is, sums of discrete sinusoids and steps, it was found to provide only marginal performance improvements for broadband disturbance rejection applications. Future work includes the development of a theoretical foundation for analyzing and proving the broadband disturbance rejection properties of the adaptive controller presented in Chapter 5.

Finally, Chapter 6 extended the results of Chapter 5. Specifically, the direct adaptive controller developed in Chapter 5 was augmented with recursive least-squares estimation to form a discrete-time indirect adaptive control law that is effective for systems that are multi-input, multi-output, and/or nonminimum phase. Recursive least-squares estimation was used for concurrent Markov parameter updating. Numerical examples illustrated the algorithm’s effectiveness in handling nonminimum-phase zeros as plant changes occurred. Numerical results showed that the algorithm was able to update the Markov parameters and maintain stabilization of the system.
Appendix A

Properties of the Markov Parameter Polynomial

A.1 Problem Formulation

Consider the MIMO discrete-time system

\[
\begin{align*}
    x(k + 1) &= Ax(k) + Bu(k), \\
    y(k) &= Cx(k), \\
    z(k) &= E_1x(k),
\end{align*}
\]

(A.1) (A.2) (A.3)

where \( x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( y(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_y \), \( z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_z \), \( u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^l_u \), and \( k \geq 0 \). For a positive integer \( r \), we define the extended performance vector \( Z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_zr} \) and the extended input vector \( U(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_u r} \) by

\[
Z(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
    z(k - r + 1) \\
    z(k - r + 2) \\
    \vdots \\
    z(k)
\end{bmatrix}, \quad U(k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
    u(k - r) \\
    u(k - r + 1) \\
    \vdots \\
    u(k - 1)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
Note that $Z(k)$, $U(k)$, and $x(k)$ are related by

$$Z(k) = \Gamma x(k - r) + \mathcal{H}U(k), \quad (A.4)$$

where $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{l_r \times r}$ and $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_r \times l_u \times r}$ are given by

$$\Gamma \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
E_1A \\
E_1A^2 \\
\vdots \\
E_1A^r
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{H} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
H_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
H_2 & H_1 & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
H_r & H_{r-1} & \cdots & H_1
\end{bmatrix},$$

and, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, the Markov parameters $H_i$ of the system (A.1)–(A.3) from $u$ to $z$ are

$$H_i \triangleq E_1A^{i-1}B. \quad (A.5)$$

Let $d$ denote the relative degree of $(A, B, E_1)$, that is, the smallest positive integer $i$ such that the $i$th Markov parameter $H_i$ is nonzero. Note that, if $r < d$, then $\mathcal{H} = 0$. Therefore, we assume that $r \geq d$.

### A.2 Markov Parameter Polynomial

From (A.4), the expression for $z(k)$ is

$$z(k) = E_1A^r x(k - r) + H_1u(k - 1) + H_2u(k - 2) + \cdots + H_r u(k - r). \quad (A.6)$$

In terms of the forward-shift operator $q$, (A.6) can be rewritten as

$$z(k) = E_1A^r q^{-r} x(k) + \left[ H_1 q^{-1} + H_2 q^{-2} + \cdots + H_r q^{-r} \right] u(k). \quad (A.7)$$
Shifting (A.7) forward by $r$ steps gives

$$z(k + r) = E_1 A^r x(k) + p_r(q) u(k), \quad \text{(A.8)}$$

where

$$p_r(q) \triangleq H_1 q^{r-1} + H_2 q^{r-2} + \cdots + H_r \quad \text{(A.9)}$$

is the Markov parameter polynomial. For $r < d$, note that $p_r(q) = 0$, whereas, if $r \geq d$, then

$$p_r(q) = H_d q^{r-d} + H_{d+1} q^{r-d-1} + \cdots + H_r. \quad \text{(A.10)}$$

The Markov parameter polynomial contains information about the system’s relative degree and sign of the high-frequency gain in the case $l_u = l_z = 1$.

The following fact states that, for SISO transfer functions, the roots of the Markov parameter polynomial include an estimate of each nonminimum-phase zero of the transfer function from $u$ to $z$. As $r$ increases, this approximation improves.

**Fact A.2.1.** Consider $l_u = l_z = 1$ and let $p$ be a zero of the transfer function from $u$ to $z$. For each $r$, let $\mathcal{R}_r \triangleq \{ p_{r,1}, \ldots, p_{r,r-d} \}$ be the set of roots of $p_r(q)$. Then, there exists a sequence $\{ p_{r,i_r} \}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ that converges to $p$ as $r \to \infty$.

### A.3 Time-Series Modeling

Consider the time-series representation of (A.1) - (A.3) from $u$ to $z$, given by

$$z(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} -\alpha_i z(k - i) + \sum_{i=d}^{n} \beta_i u(k - i), \quad \text{(A.11)}$$
where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta_d, \ldots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z \times l_u}$. The transfer function matrix $G_{zu}(z) \triangleq E_1(zI - A)^{-1}B$ from $u$ to $z$ can be equivalently represented by

$$
G_{zu}(z) = \frac{1}{z^n + \alpha_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_n} \cdot \left( \beta_d z^{n-d} + \beta_{d+1} z^{n-d-1} + \cdots + \beta_n \right) .
$$

(A.12)

It follows that $\beta_d = H_d$.

Replacing $k$ with $k - 1$ in (A.11) and substituting the resulting relation back into (A.11) yields a 2-MARKOV model. Repeating this procedure $r - 1$ times yields the $r$-MARKOV model from $u$ to $z$ of (A.1) - (A.3)

$$
z(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{r,i} z(k - r - i + 1) + \sum_{i=d}^{r} H_i u(k - i) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \beta_{r,i} u(k - r - i + 1),
$$

(A.13)

where, for $i = 1 \ldots n$, the coefficients $\alpha_{r,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta_{r,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_z \times l_u}$ are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha_{1,i} &\triangleq -\alpha_i, & \beta_{1,i} &\triangleq \beta_i, \\
&\vdots & &\vdots \\
\alpha_{r,i} &\triangleq \alpha_{r-1,i} \alpha_{1,i} + \alpha_{r-1,i+1}, & \beta_{r,i} &\triangleq \alpha_{r-1,i} \beta_{1,i} + \beta_{r-1,i+1}, \\
&\vdots & &\vdots \\
\alpha_{r,n} &\triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \alpha_{1,n}, & \beta_{r,n} &\triangleq \alpha_{r-1,1} \beta_{1,n} .
\end{align*}
$$

(A.14)

Note that $H_r = \beta_{r,1}$.

Equation (A.13) can be equivalently represented as the $r$-MARKOV transfer function

$$
G_{r,zu}(z) = \frac{1}{z^{r+n-1} + \alpha_{r,1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_{r,n}} \\
\cdot \left( H_d z^{r+n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + \beta_{r,n} \right) .
$$

(A.15)
This system representation is nonminimal, overparameterized, order \( n + r - 1 \), and the coefficients of the terms \( z^{n+r-2} \) through \( z^n \) in the denominator are zero. It follows that (A.15) can be rewritten as

\[
G_{r,zu}(z) = \frac{(z^{r-1} + \alpha_{1,1} z^{r-2} + \cdots + \alpha_{r-1,1}) \cdot (\beta_d z^{n-d} + \beta_{d+1} z^{n-d-1} + \cdots + \beta_n)}{(z^{r-1} + \alpha_{1,1} z^{r-2} + \cdots + \alpha_{r-1,1}) \cdot (z^n + \alpha_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_n)}
\]

\[
= \frac{R_r(z)}{R_r(z)} \cdot G_{zu}(z),
\]

(A.16)

where

\[
R_r(z) \triangleq z^{r-1} + \alpha_{1,1} z^{r-2} + \cdots + \alpha_{r-1,1}
\]

(A.17)

is the ring polynomial.

**Fact A.3.1** (SISO, zeros and ring). Consider \( l_u = l_z = 1 \) and let \( P(z) \) and \( Q(z) \) denote the polynomials whose roots are the minimum-phase and nonminimum-phase zeros from \( u \) to \( z \), respectively, of (A.1)-(A.3). Then

\[
\text{roots} \left[ H_d z^{+n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1} + \cdots + \beta_{r,n} \right]
\]

\[= \text{roots} \left[ P(z) \right] \cup \text{roots} \left[ Q(z) \right] \cup \text{roots} \left[ R_r(z) \right]. \]

(A.18)
The Laurent series expansion of $G_{zu}(z)$ about $z = \infty$ is given by

$$
G_{zu}(z) = E_1(zI - A)^{-1}B \\
= \frac{1}{z} E_1(I - \frac{1}{z}A)^{-1}B \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{z^i} E_1 A^{i-1}B \\
= \frac{1}{z} E_1 B + \frac{1}{z^2} E_1 A B + \cdots \\
= \frac{1}{z} H_1 + \frac{1}{z^2} H_2 + \cdots \\
= \frac{1}{z^d} H_d + \frac{1}{z^{d+1}} H_{d+1} + \cdots \\
= \sum_{i=d}^{\infty} z^{-i} H_i. \quad (A.19)
$$

Truncating the numerator and denominator of (A.15) is equivalent to the $r$-th order Laurent series expansion about $z = \infty$, given by

$$
\bar{G}_{r,zu}(z) = \frac{1}{z^{i+n-1}} \cdot (H_d z^{r+n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1}) \\
= \frac{1}{z^{i+n-1}} (H_d z^{r+n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + H_r z^{n-1}) \\
= \frac{1}{z^r} (H_d z^{r-d} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z + H_r) \\
= \sum_{i=d}^{r} z^{-i} H_i. \quad (A.20)
$$

Note that the numerator coefficients of the truncated transfer function (A.20) are identical to the coefficients of the Markov parameter polynomial (A.10). The following example and conjectures remark that, as $r$ is increased, some roots of the Markov parameter polynomial $p_r(q)$, and hence, the numerator of the truncated transfer function $\bar{G}_{r,zu}(z)$, approximate the locations of any nonminimum-phase zeros from $u$ to $z$ of (A.1)-(A.3). The remaining roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of the
Table A.1 Approximate nonminimum-phase zero locations obtained as roots of $p_r(q)$ as a function of $r$ for the stable, nonminimum-phase plant in Example A.3.1. As $r$ increases, the nonminimum-phase zeros are more accurately modeled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$\text{roots}_{\text{nmp}}(p_r(q))$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>${0.94, -1.54}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>${1.17, -1.50}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>${1.21, -1.50}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>${1.24, -1.50}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>${1.25, -1.50}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dynamics matrix $A$.

**Example A.3.1** (SISO, Nonminimum Phase, Stable Plant). Consider a plant with poles $\{0.5 \pm 0.5j, -0.5 \pm 0.5j, 0.95 \pm 0.7j\}$ and zeros $\{0.3 \pm 0.7j, -0.7 \pm 0.3j, 1.25, -1.5\}$. Table A.1 lists the approximated nonminimum-phase zero locations obtained as roots of $p_r(q)$ as a function of $r$. Note that as $r$ increases, the approximation of the nonminimum-phase zero locations improves.

Figure A.1 shows the roots of $p_{20}(q)$. The dotted line denotes $\text{sprad}(A) = 0.95$. Note that the approximated nonminimum-phase zero locations are close to the true locations. The remaining roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of the dynamics matrix $A$.

It follows from Example A.3.1 that, for each finite value of $r$, the roots of the Markov parameter polynomial $p_r(q)$ contain an approximation to the nonminimum-phase zeros of $G_{zu}(z)$. For increasing $r$, this approximation improves. In addition, Markov parameters may not be known exactly and therefore must be estimated. Hence, the estimated Markov parameters will introduce further error into the approximation of the nonminimum-phase zeros of $G_{zu}(z)$. Future work includes a study of sensitivity of the nonminimum-phase zero information to the number of Markov parameters in $p_r(q)$ as well as the Markov parameter estimation error.
Figure A.1  Roots of $p_{20}(q)$ for the stable, nonminimum-phase plant in Example A.3.1. The dotted line denotes $\text{sprad}(A) = 0.95$. Note that the approximated nonminimum-phase zero locations are close to the true locations. The remaining roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of the dynamics matrix $A$.

**Conjecture A.3.1** (SISO, stable, truncated polynomial). Consider $l_u = l_z = 1$, $\|\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\| < 1$, and let $P(z)$ and $Q(z)$ denote the polynomials whose roots are the minimum-phase and nonminimum-phase zeros from $u$ to $z$, respectively, of (A.1)-(A.3).

If $\max(\text{abs}(\text{roots}[P(z)])) < \|\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\|$, then

$$
\lim_{r \to \infty} \text{roots} \left[ H_d z^{r+n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1} \right] = \text{roots}[Q(z)] \cup \text{roots}[\bar{R}_r(z)] \cup 0_{n-1},
$$

(A.21)

where $\bar{R}_r(z)$ is a perturbed ring polynomial. The nonminimum phase zeros are retained while the remaining roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of $A$. A total of $n - 1$ roots are located at the origin.
Otherwise, if \( \max(\text{abs}(\text{roots}[P(z)])) > \|\lambda_{\max}(A)\| \), then

\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \text{roots} \left[ H_d z^{n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1} \right]
\]
\[= \text{roots} [Q(z)] \cup \text{roots} [\tilde{P}(z)] \cup \text{roots} [\tilde{R}_r(z)] \cup 0_{n-1}, \quad (A.22)
\]

where \( \tilde{P}(z) \) is a subset of \( P(z) \) containing all roots \( p_i \) of \( P(z) \) such that, for \( i = 1 \ldots n_p \), \( \|p_i\| > \|\lambda_{\max}(A)\| \), and \( \tilde{R}_r(z) \) is another perturbed ring polynomial. The nonminimum-phase zeros, as well as any minimum-phase zeros whose magnitude is greater than \( \|\lambda_{\max}(A)\| \), are retained, while the remaining roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of \( A \). A total of \( n - 1 \) roots are located at the origin.

**Conjecture A.3.2** (SISO, unstable, truncated polynomial). Consider \( l_u = l_z = 1 \), \( \|\lambda_{\max}(A)\| > 1 \), and let \( P(z) \) and \( Q(z) \) denote the polynomials whose roots are the minimum-phase and nonminimum-phase zeros from \( u \) to \( z \), respectively, of \((A.1)-(A.3)\).

If \( \max(\text{abs}(\text{roots}[Q(z)])) < \|\lambda_{\max}(A)\| \), then

\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \text{roots} \left[ H_d z^{n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1} \right]
\]
\[= \text{roots} [\tilde{R}_r(z)] \cup 0_{n-1}, \quad (A.23)
\]

where \( \tilde{R}_r(z) \) is a perturbed ring polynomial. The nonminimum-phase zeros are not retained. The roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of \( A \). A total of \( n - 1 \) roots are located at the origin.
Otherwise, if \( \max(\text{abs(roots}[Q(z)]) > \|\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\| \), then

\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \text{roots} \left[ H_d z^{i+n-d-1} + \cdots + H_{r-1} z^n + \beta_{r,1} z^{n-1} \right] \\
= \text{roots} \left[ \bar{Q}(z) \right] \cup \text{roots} \left[ \bar{R}_r(z) \right] \cup 0_{n-1},
\]

(A.24)

where \( \bar{Q}(z) \) is a subset of \( Q(z) \) containing all roots \( q_i \) of \( Q(z) \) such that, for \( i = 1 \ldots n_q, \|q_i\| > \|\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\| \), and \( \bar{R}_r(z) \) is another perturbed ring polynomial. The nonminimum-phase zeros whose magnitude is greater than \( \|\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\| \) are retained, while the remaining roots are either located at the origin or form an approximate ring close to a circle with radius equal to the spectral radius of \( A \). A total of \( n - 1 \) roots are located at the origin.

**Conjecture A.3.3** (SISO, truncated ring polynomial). Consider \( l_u = l_z = 1 \) and let \( \bar{R}_r(z) \) denote a perturbed ring polynomial, obtained as above. For each \( r \), let

\[
\mathcal{R}_r \triangleq \{z_{r,1}, \ldots, z_{r,r-1}\}
\]

be the set of roots of \( \bar{R}_r(z) \). Then, for each \( i = 1, \ldots, r - 1 \), the sequence \( \{z_{r,i}\}_{r=1}^{\infty} \) converges to \( \|\lambda_{\text{max}}(A)\| \) as \( r \to \infty \), that is, as \( r \to \infty \), the radius of each root \( z_{r,i} \) of the perturbed ring polynomial \( \bar{R}_r(z) \) approaches the spectral radius of the dynamics matrix \( A \).
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