Abstract—In this paper, we consider the two-stage compensator designs of SISO plants. As an investigation of the characteristics of the two-stage compensator designs, which is not well investigated yet, of SISO plants, we implement three-dimensional visualization systems of output signals and optimization system for SISO plants by the parametrization of stabilizing controllers based on the two-stage compensator design. The system runs on Mathematica by using “Three Dimensional Surface Plots,” so that the visualization can be interactively manipulated by users. In this paper, we use the discrete-time LTI system model. Even so, our approach is the factorization approach, so that the result can be applied to many linear models.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the two-stage compensator designs of SISO plants in the framework of the factorization approach. In the design, during the first stage, a new closed loop system selects stabilizing compensator for the plant. In the second stage, a stabilizing controller is selected for the new closed-loop system that also achieves some other design objectives such as decoupling and sensitive minimization.

Recently, we have given a parametrization of stabilizing controllers of the two stage compensator design based only on the factorization approach, which is in the form of the Youla-Kučera-parametrization [1], [12]-[14].

The factorization approach to control systems has the advantage that embraces, within a single framework, numerous linear systems such as continuous-time as well as discrete-time systems, lumped as well as distributed systems, one-dimensional as well as multidimensional systems, etc [1]-[3]. Hence, the result given in this paper will be able to a number of models in addition to the multidimensional systems. In the factorization approach, when problems such as feedback stabilization are studied, one can focus on the key aspects of the problem under study rather than be distracted by the special features of a particular class of linear systems. This approach leads to conceptually simple and computationally tractable solutions to many important and interesting problems [4]. A transfer matrix of this approach is considered as the ratio of two stable causal transfer matrices.
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In some design problems, one uses a so-called two-stage compensator design for selecting an appropriate stabilizing compensator. One of examples of two-stage compensator design is earthquake-resistant dumpers for a building shown in Fig. 1. Another example of two-stage compensator design is earthquake-resistant dumpers for a bridge shown in Fig. 2. By attaching resistant dumpers to these building and bridge, these building and bridge become strong against earthquake.

The problem of the two-stage compensator design is that the relationship between inputs and outputs are not theoretically clarified yet. Thus, we consider to make a software to present the relationship. Thus, the objective of this paper is to make systems to visualize the input-output relationship based on the two-stage compensator design. The systems are implemented on Mathematica [9]-[11], one of the most common computer algebra systems. By using visualization technique and Golden Section Method [15], we also consider the optimization of the system based on
the two-stage compensator design. To achieve this, we have implemented visualization systems of the parametrization of stabilizing controllers based on the two-stage compensator designs [16]-[18] and also implemented system, which present norms of output signals and optimize the system based on the two-stage compensator design. We call these system Visualization system and Optimization system, respectively.

In Visualization system, output signals can be visualized as 3D graphs. Because we use Mathematica, we can overlook Visualization system and Optimization system, respectively. The stabilization problem considered in this paper follows the papers [6], [7], in which the feedback system \( \Sigma \) [4] is as in Fig. 3. For further details the reader is referred to the literature [4], [6]-[8].

II. PRELIMINARY

The stabilization problem considered in this paper follows the papers [6], [7], in which the feedback system \( \Sigma \) [4] is as in Fig. 3. For further details the reader is referred to the literature [4], [6]-[8].

We consider that the set of stable causal transfer functions is an integral domain, denoted by \( \mathcal{A} \). The total ring of fractions of \( \mathcal{A} \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{F} \); that is, \( \mathcal{F} = \{n/d : n, d \in \mathcal{A}, d \neq 0\} \). This \( \mathcal{F} \) is considered as the set of all possible transfer functions, which is given as ratio of two stable causal transfer functions. Matrices over \( \mathcal{F} \) are transfer matrices. Let \( \mathcal{Z} \) be a prime ideal of \( \mathcal{A} \) with \( \mathcal{Z} \neq \mathcal{A} \). From these we construct the set \( \mathcal{P} \) of proper transfer functions, the set \( \mathcal{P} \), of strictly proper transfer functions. The reader can be found their definition in [5].

In this paper, we consider the discrete-time LTI system, then

\[
\mathcal{A} = \{u/v \mid u, v \in \mathbb{R}[d], \text{ all roots } r \text{ of } v \text{ are with } |r| > 1\},
\]

\[
\mathcal{Z} = \langle d \rangle,
\]

\( d \) is the unit delay operator.

Throughout the paper, we consider principally single-input single-output plants, and its transfer function, which is also called a plant itself simply. Even so, we will investigate multi-input multi-output plants as possible as we can. The plant is denoted by \( P \) and belongs to \( \mathcal{P}_{m \times n} \), which means that the plant has \( m \) inputs and \( n \) outputs. We can always represent \( P \) in the form of a fraction \( P = ND^{-1} \), where \( N \in \mathcal{A}_{n \times m} \) and \( D \in \mathcal{A}_{m \times m} \) with nonsingular.

The reader can found the notion of stabilization of \( P \) by \( C \) in [5]. In [5], a transfer matrix \( H(P, C) \in \mathcal{F}_{(m+n) \times (m+n)} \) is defined as follows:

\[
H(P, C) := \begin{bmatrix} (I_n + PC)^{-1} & -P(I_n + PC)^{-1} \\ C(I_n + PC)^{-1} & (I_n + PC)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}
\]

provided that \( I_n + PC \) is a nonzero of \( \mathcal{A} \). This \( H(P, C) \) is the transfer matrix from \( \begin{bmatrix} u_1' & u_2' \end{bmatrix} \) to \( \begin{bmatrix} e_1' & e_2' \end{bmatrix} \) of the feedback system \( \Sigma \). For the notions of “stabilizable” and “stabilizing controller”, the reader should refer to [5]. We will denote by \( S(P) \) the set of stabilizing controllers of \( P \).

The following is well known Youla-Kučera-parametrization (Theorem 1) to provide the set of all stabilizing controllers.

Theorem 1: ([11], [12]-[14]) Let \( P \) denote a causal plant of \( \mathcal{P}_{m \times n} \). Let \( P = ND^{-1} = \tilde{D}^{-1} \tilde{N} \). Select \( \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}, X \) and \( Y \) such that

\[
\tilde{Y}N + \tilde{X}D = I_m, \quad \tilde{N}Y + D\tilde{X} = I_n.
\]

Then the \( S(P) \) is given by

\[
S(P) = \{ (\tilde{X} - R\tilde{N})^{-1}(\tilde{Y} + R\tilde{D}) \mid R \in \mathcal{A}_{m \times n}, |\tilde{X} - R\tilde{N}| \neq 0 \} = \{ (\tilde{Y} + R\tilde{D})(X - NR)^{-1} \mid R \in \mathcal{A}_{m \times n}, |X - NR| \neq 0 \},
\]

where \( R \) is a parameter matrix.

III. TWO-STAGE COMPENSATOR DESIGN

The two-stage compensator design is for selecting an appropriate stabilizing compensator [4]. Given a plant \( P \), the first stage consists of selecting a stabilizing compensator for \( P \). Let \( C_0 \in S(P) \) denote a compensator of \( P \) (that is, an arbitrary but fixed compensator of \( P \)) and define \( P_1 = P(I_m + C_0P)^{-1} \). The second stage consists of selecting a stabilizing controller for \( P_1 \) that also achieves some other design objectives such as decoupling, sensitivity minimization,
We can obtain Theorem 3 by replacing parameter \( R \) with equality holding if and only if \( C \) appeared in \([4]\), the sum of controller of \( P \) and \( C_0 \) a causal stabilizing controller of \( P \) \((C_0 \in \mathbb{P}^{m \times n})\). Further let \( P_1 \) be \( P(I_m+C_D)P^{-1} \). Denote by \( C_0+S(P_1) \) the following set:

\[
\{ C_0 + C_1 | C_1 \in S(P_1) \}.
\]

Then

\[
C_0 + S(P_1) \subset S(P),
\]

with equality holding if and only if \( C_0 \in \mathbb{A}^{m \times n} \).

Fig. 4 cannot implement all controllers as the stabilizing controllers in general.
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\[
\{ C_0 + C_1 | C_1 \in S(P_1) \}.
\]

Then

\[
C_0 + S(P_1) \subset S(P),
\]

with equality holding if and only if \( C_0 \in \mathbb{A}^{m \times n} \).

We can obtain Theorem 3 by replacing parameter \( R \) of Theorem 1 with \( X_R \). The stabilizing controller \( C_0 \) is originally a stabilizing controller of \( P \). As well from Theorem 2, whose original is appeared in \([4]\), the sum of \( C_0 \) and a stabilizing controller of \( P_1 \). Letting \( C_1 \) be a stabilizing controller of \( P \), then \( C_0+C_1 \), which is parallelly allocated as in Fig. 5, is still a stabilizing controller.

The theorems were based on the feedback from \( y_2 \) to \( u_2 \) (cf. Figs. 3 and 4). Even so, we note that, from Fig. 3, we have two inputs \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) and two outputs \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \). Thus we can consider alternative two-stage compensator design based on other input(s) and other output(s). Let us consider the two-stage compensator design based on the feedback from \( y_1 \) to \( u_1 \). In this case, the feedback system is as in Fig. 6.

The configuration is as in Fig. 7. Based on this feedback, the following result has also been given in \([5]\).
factorization is given as

\[ N = \tilde{N} = \frac{1}{5}(d^2 + 1), \quad D = \tilde{D} = \frac{1}{3}(2 + 1)(3d - 1), \]
\[ Y = \tilde{Y} = 4 + \frac{3d}{2}, \quad X = \tilde{X} = -\frac{2 + d}{2}. \]

We consider two constants \(a\) and \(b\) and the form \(a + bd\) as a parameter. The visualization is based on “Three Dimensional Surface Plots” of Mathematica [10], [11].

Let \(-20 \leq a, b \leq 20\), \(R_1 = a + bd\), \(u_1 = 0\), and \(u_2 = 1\). Then outputs \(y_1\) and \(y_2\) based on Theorem 3 are visualized as Figs. 8 and 9, respectively. Also outputs \(y_1\) and \(y_2\) based on Corollary 1 are visualized as Figs. 10 and 11, respectively. In this visualization, the constant \(a\) is implemented by Slider Function of Mathematica. On the other hand, the constant \(b\) is one of three axes. Thus the figure changed by time (the value of the constant \(a\)), so that they are animations on Mathematica.

Next, we consider \(l_2\)-norms of signals. Again let \(-20 \leq a, b \leq 20\), \(R_1 = a + bd\), \(u_1 = 0\), and \(u_2 = 1\). Then the norms of \(y_1\) and \(y_2\) based on Theorem 3 are visualized as Figs. 12 and 13, respectively. Also the norms of \(y_1\) and \(y_2\) based on Corollary 1 are visualized as Figs. 14 and 15, respectively.

Minimum norms based on Golden Section Method [15] are shown in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Minimum norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 12</td>
<td>1.08397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 13</td>
<td>0.122474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 14</td>
<td>1.2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 15</td>
<td>0.316228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we have visualized the output signals for discrete-time LTI systems using parametrization of two-stage compensator design. Our approach is the factorization approach, so that the result can be also applied to many other linear models. We also visualize the norms of the outputs and obtained the optimization by using the golden section method.

The optimization by golden section method is to obtain the minimal or maximal values numerically, which is not theoretical. We will investigate alternative methods to obtain the optimal values by theoretical methods.

TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Norm of Figs. 12 - 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 12 Norms of Output Signal $y_1$ based on Theorem 3. $R_1$ form is $a + bd$. $a$ and $b$ range are $-20 \leq a, b \leq 20$

Fig. 13 Norms of Output Signal $y_2$ based on Theorem 3. $R_1$ form is $a + bd$. $a$ and $b$ range are $-20 \leq a, b \leq 20$

Fig. 14 Norms of Output Signal $y_1$ based on Corollary 1. $R_2$ form is $a + bd$. $a$ and $b$ range are $-20 \leq a, b \leq 20$

Fig. 15 Norms of Output Signal $y_2$ based on Corollary 1. $R_2$ form is $a + bd$. $a$ and $b$ range are $-20 \leq a, b \leq 20$
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