



ROBUST CONTROL DESIGN USING  
MODERN CONSTRAINED OPTIMIZATION  
TECHNIQUES

BY

MAHMUD IWAN SOLIHIN

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for  
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering

Kulliyyah of Engineering  
International Islamic University  
Malaysia

AUGUST 2012

## ABSTRACT

Robust control design is commonly a difficult task that requires complicated mathematical formulation and heuristic parameters tuning. In addition, it often results in a high order controller. Motivated by the need to reduce complexity, a robust state feedback control design using modern constrained optimization algorithms is proposed in this thesis. Combining the advantages of robust control theory and computational intelligence makes the task more straightforward and automatic. Basically, a robust control design requires a set of goals to be achieved such as good transient response, zero steady state error for a constant input and most importantly, robustness to parameter uncertainty. A single-objective constrained optimization technique is used in the proposed method to handle these requirements. Searching for a set of robust controller gains that maximizes the stability radius of the closed-loop system is the objective. The constraint of the optimization is the region for the closed-loop poles that represents the desired time-domain control performance. In the beginning, the study is focused to find the suitable modern optimization tool(s) among the commonly used optimization tools such as Genetic Algorithm, Particle Swarm Optimization and Differential Evolution. The study further investigates the optimization features, such as constraint handling, stopping criterion and choice of optimization parameters. The result shows that Differential Evolution (with mutation factor=0.5 and crossover constant=0.9) outperforms Clerc's Particle Swarm Optimization and Genetic Algorithm in constrained optimization problems. At the end of the study, the proposed robust control design using Particle Swarm Optimization and Differential Evolution are applied to pendulum-like systems, such as gantry crane, flexible joint and inverted pendulum. A set of laboratory experiments are carried out to evaluate the performance of the designed controller. LQR-based controller and  $H_\infty$  loop-shaping controller are also designed for comparison with the proposed controller. The advantage of the proposed controller design is the automated tuning process for the controller parameters as compared to the benchmark controllers. Another contribution of the thesis is the dynamics modeling of the pendulum-like systems where a generic model structure for the pendulum-like systems is developed. The generic model structure is obtained by linearization around equilibrium and simplification where the dynamics effect of vibration to actuator dynamics is neglected. As a result, the parameters of the pendulum-like systems model can be easily identified by decoupling of vibration model and actuator model in the experiment.

## خلاصة البحث

تصميم السيطرة المتينة هو عمل صعب لأنه يطلب إفراط أعمل الرياضى و تقوم توليف البارامتر تجريبيا. يُدفع بالحاجة لِيُخَفَّفَ التعقيد يقترح في هذا البحث تصميم التحكم الغذية المرتدة المتينة باستخدام الغورتم الحديثة لتحقيق الوضع الأمثل. الأجماع بين فضائل النظرية السيطرة المتينة و الأستخبارات الإحتسابى ييسِّط الأعمال. في جوهر الأمر تصميم السيطرة المتينة يحتاج إلى اداء مجموعة من الأهداف مثل الإستجابة الإنتقالية الصالحة و صفر غلظة حالة مستقرة لإدخال ثابت و أهم هدف هو المتانة إلى إرتياب البارامتر. ليحقق هذا المنطلب يُستعمل في الطريقة المقترحة التقنيات لتحقيق الوضع الأمثل المقيدة بهدف واحد. فلهذا تحقيق الوضع الأمثل هدف و قيد. هدفه البحث عن مجموعة من نتائج جهاز التحكم المتينة التى تعلّى ذراع إستقرار البرنامج المختوم الذاتى و قيده ناحية الأعمدة المختوم الذاتى التى تصوّر تحكم الأداء المطلوب. في أول البحث يركّز الاهتمام في إجادة أصلح الأداة الحديثة من الأدوات الحديثات التى يعود إستعمالها لتحقيق الوضع الأمثل مثل الغارتم الوراثة و تحقيق الوضع الأمثل 'سرب الجزئ' و التطور التفاضلى. فضلا عن ذلك يحقق البحث معالم تحقيق الوضع الأمثل و هي تصرف القيد و نظام الإيقاف و إختيار بارامتر تحقيق الوضع الأمثل. تعرض النتائج أن التطور التفاضلى (عامل التحويل = 0.5 و مقدار ثابت للتحويل = 0.9) هو أحسن من تحقيق الوضع الأمثل 'سرب الجزئ' لكلك و التطور التفاضلى في مشكلة تحقيق الوضع الأمثل المقيدة. في آخر البحث تصميم السيطرة المتينة المقترح باستخدام تحقيق الوضع الأمثل 'سرب الجزئ' و التطور التفاضلى يُطبق في أنظمة تشبه الرقاص مثل مرفاع قنطرى متحرك و وصلة مرنة و رقاص منعكس. تقوم التجربات العملية ليحلل أداء التحكم المتصم. فضيلة تصميم التحكم المقترح هو توليف البارامتر تلقائيا. و مساهمة هذا البحث الأخرى هي صيغة الأنظمة الديناميكية تشبه الرقاص أينما تطور تركيب الصيغة الشاملة لأنظمة تشبه الرقاص. تحصل تركيب الصيغة الشاملة بتخطيط التوازن و تبسيط أينما تحمل أثر ديناميكى عند ديناميات الأهتزاز إلى وحدة التشغيل . و النتيجة هي تحقق بارامتر الأنظمة القاص سهلا بطريق فك إقتران صيغة الأهتزاز و صيغة الوحدة التشغيل في التجربة.

## **APPROVAL PAGE**

The thesis of Mahmud Iwan Solihin has been approved by the following:

---

**Rini Akmeliawati**  
Supervisor

---

**Ari Legowo**  
Co-Supervisor

---

**Momoh-Jimoh E. Salami**  
Internal Examiner

---

**Nahrul Khair Alang Rashid**  
Internal Examiner

---

**Mohd Nasir Taib**  
External Examiner

---

**Nasr El Din Ibrahim Ahmed**  
Chairman

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted as a whole for any other degrees at IIUM or other institutions.

Mahmud Iwan Solihin

Signature:.....

Date: .....

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

**DECLARATION OF COPYRIGHT AND  
AFFIRMATION OF FAIR USE OF UNPUBLISHED  
RESEARCH**

Copyright © 2012 by Mahmud Iwan Solihin. All rights reserved.

**ROBUST CONTROL DESIGN USING  
MODERN CONSTRAINED OPTIMIZATION TECHNIQUES**

No part of this unpublished research may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior written permission of the copyright holder except as provided below.

1. Any material contained in or derived from this unpublished research may only be used by others in their writing with due acknowledgement.
2. IIUM or its library will have the right to make and transmit copies (print or electronic) for institutional and academic purpose.
3. The IIUM library will have the right to make, store in a retrieval system and supply copies of this unpublished research if requested by other universities and research libraries.

Affirmed by: Mahmud Iwan Solihin

.....  
Signature

.....  
Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise be to Allah, the Lord of worlds, for His mercy and limitless help and guidance. May peace and blessings be upon Mohammed, the last of the messengers.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Rini Akmeliawati for her kind guidance and continuous encouragement to complete my thesis. I admire her knowledge and passion in research. I am grateful to my co-supervisor, Dr Ari Legowo for his assistance. I am also grateful to Prof. Momoh for his useful feedbacks and patience to review my thesis.

My lovely thanks are due to my wife Mersita for taking care of myself and our lovely son Qozy Abdulfattah Mahmud. My special gratitude is due to my parents for their endless encouragement, love and prayers.

My thanks are due to all my colleagues in IMSRU in Mechatronics Engineering IIUM, especially Bro Tijani for his useful discussions and Sis Winda for her assistance.

Finally, I am indebted to my first supervisor the late Prof Wahyudi (May Allah Forgive Him) who was important to the realization of my thesis for his inspiration and assistance in the beginning of my work.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Abstract in Arabic .....	iii
Approval Page .....	iv
Declaration Page .....	v
Copyright Page .....	vi
Acknowledgements .....	vii
List of Tables .....	xii
List of Figures .....	xv
List of Abbreviations .....	xviii
List of Symbols .....	xx

<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Overview .....	1
1.2 Problem Statement and Its Significance .....	3
1.3 Research Philosophy .....	5
1.4 Research Objectives .....	6
1.5 Research Methodology.....	6
1.6 Research Scope .....	9
1.7 Thesis Outline .....	9

<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	11
2.2 Brief Overview of Robust Control .....	11
2.2.1 Uncertainty .....	13
2.2.2 Frequency Domain Uncertainty Models .....	14
2.2.3 Performance Specifications .....	16
2.3 $H_\infty$ Control Design .....	18
2.3.1 Mixed Sensitivity $H_\infty$ Design Approach .....	20
2.3.2 $H_\infty$ Loop Shaping Design Approach .....	21
2.3.3 $\mu$ - Synthesis and D-K Iteration .....	23
2.3.4 Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) Approach to $H_\infty$ Control .....	24
2.4 Other Control Techniques .....	25
2.4.1 Adaptive Control .....	25
2.4.2 Sliding Mode Control .....	25
2.5 Modern Optimization and Applications in Robust Control .....	26
2.5.1 Fundamentals of Optimization .....	27
2.5.2 Modern Optimization Algorithms .....	29
2.5.3 No Free Lunch Theorem .....	31
2.5.4 Evolutionary Algorithm .....	32
2.5.5 Genetic Algorithm (GA) .....	33
2.5.6 Differential Evolution (DE) .....	34



2.5.7 Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) .....	36
2.5.8 Constrained Optimization Using Modern Optimization Algorithms .....	39
2.5.9 Applications of GA, DE and PSO in Robust Control Design .....	42
2.6 Control of Pendulum-like Systems .....	44
2.7 Summary .....	46

**CHAPTER THREE: CONSTRAINED OPTIMIZATION USING MODERN OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHMS ..... 48**

3.1 Introduction .....	48
3.2 Constrained Optimization Using GA, DE and PSO Approaches .....	49
3.2.1 Stopping Criterion .....	49
3.2.2 Constraint Handling .....	50
3.2.3 Choice of Parameters for PSO, DE, and GA .....	51
3.2.3.1 PSO Parameters .....	51
3.2.3.2 DE Parameters .....	53
3.2.3.3 GA Parameters .....	54
3.3 Example of Benchmark Functions .....	54
3.4 Optimization Results for Benchmark Functions .....	56
3.4.1 Results for PSO-based Optimization .....	56
3.4.2 Results for DE-based Optimization .....	58
3.4.3 Results for GA-based Optimization .....	61
3.5 Summary .....	62

**CHAPTER FOUR: MATHEMATICAL MODEL OF PENDULUM-LIKE SYSTEMS ..... 63**

4.1 Introduction .....	63
4.2 Systems Description .....	64
4.3 Dynamics Model of Pendulum .....	66
4.4 Dynamics Model of Pendulum-like Systems .....	67
4.4.1 Gantry Crane .....	67
4.4.2 Flexible Joint Manipulator .....	71
4.4.3 Rotary Inverted Pendulum .....	74
4.5 Model Structure and Parameters Identification .....	76
4.5.1 Parameter Identification of $G_1(s)$ .....	77
4.5.2 Physical Parameters of $G_2(s)$ .....	78
4.6 State-space Representation and Parametric Uncertainty .....	79
4.7 Summary .....	80

**CHAPTER FIVE: ROBUST CONTROLLER DESIGN USING PROPOSED TECHNIQUES ..... 81**

5.1 Introduction .....	81
5.2 State Feedback Control Design .....	81
5.3 Proposed Robust State Feedback Control Design .....	83
5.4 PSO-based Robust Controller Design.....	86
5.4.1 Objective Function.....	87

5.4.2 Constraint and Its Handling .....	88
5.4.3 Stopping Criterion .....	90
5.5 DE-Based Robust Controller Design .....	93
5.6 Summary .....	94

**CHAPTER SIX: APPLICATION OF THE PROPOSED ROBUST  
CONTROLLER DESIGN FOR PENDULUM-LIKE  
SYSTEMS .....**

<b>6.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>96</b>
6.2 PSOFC Design for Anti-swing Gantry Crane Control .....	96
6.2.1 Optimization Setup .....	98
6.2.2 Optimization Result for PSOFC .....	100
6.2.3 LQR-based Controller .....	101
6.2.4 $H_\infty$ loop-shaping Controller .....	103
6.2.5 Experimental Results .....	105
6.2.6 Robustness Analysis .....	108
6.3 PSOFC for Control of Flexible Joint Manipulator .....	110
6.3.1 Optimization Setup .....	112
6.3.2 Optimization Result for PSOFC .....	112
6.3.3 LQR-based Controller .....	113
6.3.4 $H_\infty$ loop-shaping Controller .....	115
6.3.5 Simulation Results .....	117
6.3.6 Experimental Results .....	120
6.4 PSOFC for Rotary Inverted Pendulum Stabilization .....	123
6.4.1 Optimization Result for PSOFC .....	125
6.4.2 LQR-based Controller .....	127
6.4.3 $H_\infty$ loop-shaping Controller .....	128
6.4.4 Simulation Results .....	130
6.4.5 Experimental Results .....	132
6.5 DEFC Design for Anti-swing Gantry Crane Control.....	134
6.5.1 Optimization Results .....	135
6.5.2 Experimental Results .....	139
6.6 DEFC for Control of Flexible Joint Manipulator .....	141
6.6.1 Optimization and Simulation Results .....	141
6.6.2 Experimental Results .....	145
6.7 DEFC for Rotary Inverted Pendulum Stabilization .....	147
6.7.1 Optimization and Simulation Results .....	147
6.7.2 Experimental Results .....	150
6.8 Effect of “Transient Margin” ( $\rho$ ).....	151
6.9 Summary .....	156

**CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION .....**

7.1 Summary .....	157
7.2 Main Contributions .....	158
7.3 Recommendations .....	159

<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>PUBLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>169</b>
APPENDIX I: Summary of the Reviewed Robust Control Design .....	171
APPENDIX II: Flowchart of Robust Controller Design Using PSO and DE .....	173
APPENDIX III: Simulation Results for FJM and RIP .....	175

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
2.1	Comparison of modern optimization algorithms	31
2.2	Velocity clamping mechanism	38
2.3	Bound handling mechanism	39
2.4	Control objectives of PLS	45
3.1	PSO-based optimization parameters	57
3.2	Comparison of the constraint handling methods for PSO-based optimization	58
3.3	DE-based optimization parameters	59
3.4	Effect of $F_m$ and $C_r$ value for DE-based optimization (30 independent runs)	60
3.5	Effect of $N_p$ for GA-based optimization (30 independent runs)	61
4.1	Physical parameters for PLS	64
4.2	Identified parameters for $G_1(s)$	78
4.3	Calculated parameters for $G_2(s)$	79
4.4	Varying parameters of pendulum-like systems	80
4.5	Variability of the parameters in the model	80
5.1	Constraint handling with DOCHM for robust control optimization	91
5.2	Robust controller design via constrained optimization	91
5.3	PSO-based algorithm for robust controller design	93
5.4	Robust controller design via constrained optimization using DE	95
5.5	Stopping criterion for DE-based optimization	95

5.6	DE-based algorithm for robust controller design	96
6.1	Nominal plant parameters and their variability (AGC)	100
6.2	PSO-based optimization parameters	101
6.3	Constraint parameters of PSOFC optimization for AGC	102
6.4	Statistics for 30 runs of PSOFC optimization (AGC)	102
6.5	PSOFC and LQRFC gains for AGC	104
6.6	Eigenvalues of AGC with different values of $R$ in the LQRFC design	104
6.7	Positioning performance for AGC	108
6.8	Anti-swing performance for AGC	108
6.9	Nominal plant parameters and their variability (FJM)	114
6.10	Constraint parameters for optimization (FJM)	114
6.11	Statistics for PSOFC optimization (FJM)	115
6.12	PSOFC and LQRFC gains (FJM)	115
6.13	Performance comparison for FJM (simulation)	122
6.14	Conditions for plant uncertainty used in Table 6.15	124
6.15	Performance comparison for FJM (experiment)	125
6.16	Nominal plant parameters and their variability (RIP)	126
6.17	Constraint parameters of PSOFC optimization for RIP stabilization	127
6.18	Statistics for 30 runs of PSOFC optimization (RIP)	128
6.19	PSOFC and LQRFC gains for RIP stabilization	130
6.20	Performance comparison for RIP stabilization (simulation)	134
6.21	Parameters for DEFC optimization (AGC)	138
6.22	Statistics for DEFC optimization with different values of $F_m$ & $C_r$ (AGC)	138
6.23	DEFC and PSOFC gains for AGC	142
6.24	Parameters for DEFC optimization (FJM)	145

6.25	Optimization results for DEFC with different values of $F_m$ and $C_r$ (FJM)	145
6.26	DEFC and PSOFC gains (FJM)	146
6.27	Performance comparison for FJM control using PSOFC and DEFC (experiment)	149
6.28	Parameters for DEFC optimization (RIP)	150
6.29	Optimization results for DEFC with different values of $F_m$ and $C_r$ (RIP)	151
6.30	DEFC and PSOFC gains for RIP stabilizing controller	151
6.31	DEFC gains obtained with different value of $\rho$ (AGC and FJM)	155
6.32	Eigenvalue of the nominal plant with DEFC (AGC and FJM)	156
I.1	Summary of the relevant robust controller design techniques using modern optimizations	174

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	
1.1	Flowchart of the research methodology	8
2.1	Additive uncertainty model	15
2.2	Multiplicative uncertainty model	15
2.3	Feedback system configuration	16
2.4	Desired loop gain	18
2.5	Block diagram of generalized plant model	19
2.6	$H_\infty$ loop shaping feedback control scheme	23
2.7	Algorithm classification	30
2.8	GA flowchart	34
3.1	Illustration of the feasible and infeasible region	51
4.1	Lab-scale gantry crane	65
4.2	Flexible joint manipulator	65
4.3	Rotary inverted pendulum	65
4.4	A downward pendulum	66
4.5	2-D gantry crane model	68
4.6	Simplified model of 2-D gantry crane	71
4.7	Top view diagram of rotary flexible joint module	72
4.8	Simplified model of rotary flexible joint	74
4.9	Schematic diagram of rotary inverted pendulum	75
4.10	Generalized model structure for PLS	77
4.11	Assumed speed response of actuator	78

5.1	State feedback controller with a feed-forward integral gain	83
5.2	Wedge region and eigenvalue distance in complex plane	89
5.3	Flowchart of PSO with specific stopping criterion	94
6.1	Simulated response of AGC (nominal plant) with different LQRFCs	105
6.2	Singular value plot of the open-loop ( $G$ ), shaped plant ( $G_s$ ) and shaped plant with controller ( $KG_s$ ) for AGC	107
6.3	Response to 0.7m position reference; $l=0.6\text{m}$ , $m_1=1\text{kg}$ (AGC-experiment)	109
6.4	Structured singular value ( $\mu$ ) plots (upper bound) for AGC	111
6.5	Simulated response of FJM (nominal plant) with different LQRFCs	116
6.6	Singular value plot of the open-loop plant ( $G$ ), shaped plant ( $G_s$ ), and shaped plant with controller ( $KG_s$ ) for FJM	119
6.7	20 random step responses for FJM control using PSOFC	120
6.8	20 random step responses for FJM control using LQRFC	120
6.9	20 random step responses for FJM control using HINF	121
6.10	Response to $90^\circ$ step input (FJM – experiment, condition-1 in Table 6.14)	123
6.11	Response to $90^\circ$ step input (FJM - experiment, condition-2 in Table 6.14)	124
6.12	Control scheme of self-erecting inverted pendulum	126
6.13	Distribution of closed-loop poles using PSOFC for 30 runs (RIP)	129
6.14	Simulated response of RIP (nominal plant) with different LQRFCs	130
6.15	Singular value plot of the open-loop plant, shaped plant and shaped plant with controller (RIP stabilization)	131
6.16	20 random step responses for RIP stabilization using PSOFC	133
6.17	Singular value plot for 20 random responses in Figure 6.16	133
6.18	Self-erecting RIP response	136
6.19	Distribution of eigenvalue for DEFC with $F_m = 0.5$ and $C_r = 0.9$ (AGC)	140



6.20	Distribution of eigenvalue for DEFC with $F_m = 0.9$ and $C_r = 0.9$ (AGC)	140
6.21	Distribution of eigenvalue for DEFC with $F_m = 0.9$ and $C_r = 0.5$ (AGC)	141
6.22	Distribution of eigenvalue for PSOFC for AGC control in section 6.2.2	141
6.23	Response to 0.1m command; $l=0.2m$ , $m_1=1kg$ for AGC	143
6.24	Response to 0.7m command; $l=0.6m$ , $m_1=1kg$ for AGC	144
6.25	20 random step responses for FJM control using DEFC	147
6.26	Singular value plot for 20 random responses in Figure 6.25	148
6.27	Step response of FJM control using DEFC and PSOFC (experiment)	149
6.28	Plot of 20 random step responses for RIP stabilization using DEFC (simulation)	152
6.29	Singular value plot of 20 random step responses of Figure 6.28	153
6.30	Self-erecting RIP response using DEFC response (experiment)	154
6.31	AGC response using DEFC obtained with different value of $\rho$	157
6.32	FJM response using DEFC obtained with different value of $\rho$	158
I.1	PSO-based optimization for robust controller design	176
II.2	DE-based optimization for robust controller design	177
III.1	Singular value plot for the system with PSOFC (FJM)	178
III.2	Singular value plot for the system with LQRFC (FJM)	178
III.3	Singular value plot for the system with HINF controller (FJM)	179
III.4	20 random step responses for RIP stabilization using LQRFC	179
III.5	20 random step responses for RIP stabilization using HINF	180
III.6	Singular value plot for 20 random responses using LQRFC (RIP)	180
III.7	Singular value plot for 20 random responses using HINF (RIP)	167

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AGC	Anti-swing gantry crane
ALPSO	Augmented Lagrangian PSO
CI	Computational Intelligence
DC	Direct Current
DE	Differential Evolution
DEFC	DE-based State Feedback Controller
DOCHM	Dynamic Objective Constraint Handling Method
EA	Evolutionary Algorithm
FA	Firefly Algorithm
FE	Number of Function Evaluations
FJM	Flexible Joint Manipulator
GA	Genetic Algorithm
HS	Harmony Search
LMI	Linear Matrix Inequality
LQG	Linear Quadratic Gaussian
LQR	Linear Quadratic Regulator
LQRFC	LQR-based Feedback Controller
MIMO	Multi-input Multi-Output
PID	Proportional-Integral-Derivatives
PLS	Pendulum-like Systems
PO	Percentage of Overshoot
PSO	Particle Swarm Optimization

PSOFC	PSO-based State Feedback Controller
RIP	Rotary Inverted Pendulum
SA	Simulated Annealing
SISO	Single-input and Single-output

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$C_r$	crossover constant for DE
$\hat{E}$	row scale matrix of perturbation structure for closed-loop system
$F_{crit}$	critical value of $F_m$ for DE
$F_i$	force input for gantry crane
$F_m$	mutation factor for DE
$G_d(s)$	disturbance transfer function
$G_p(s)$	peturbed plant transfer function
$G_s(s)$	shaped plant transfer function
$\hat{H}$	column scale matrix of perturbation structure for closed-loop system
$J_{arm}$	moment of inertia of the arm for flexible joint
$J_{eq}$	equivalent moment of inertia at the motor output for flexible joint
$K_e$	electric constant for DC motor
$K_{stiff}$	stiffness constant for flexible joint
$K_t$	torque constant for DC motor
$L_a$	inductance of armature for DC motor
$N_p$	number of population (population size)
$N_{bit}$	number of bits for GA
$P_c$	crossover rate for GA
$P_m$	mutation rate for GA
$R_a$	resistance of armature for DC motor
$T_m$	motor output torque

$V_{max}$	maximum velocity of particle for PSO
$W_1(s)$	weighting function for shaped plant
$W_2(s)$	weighting function for shaped plant
$a_0$	numerator constant for $G_1$
$a_2$	numerator constant for $G_2$
$b_0$	denominator constant for $G_2$
$b_1$	denominator constant for $G_1$
$b_2$	denominator constant for $G_2$
$b_{eq}$	equivalent friction coefficient
$c_1$	constant for "cognition" part of PSO
$c_2$	constant for "social" part of PSO
$f_1$	benchmark function 1
$f_2$	benchmark function 2
$f_3$	benchmark function 3
$i_a$	armature current of DC motor
$j_{max}$	maximum number of iteration
$l_b$	lower bound of solutions
$m_1$	payload mass for gantry crane
$m_2$	cart mass for gantry crane
$r_a$	length of the arm for flexible joint
$r_c$	complex stability radius
$r_p$	combined radius of gear and pulley for gantry crane
$u_b$	upper bound of solutions
$\sigma_d$	standard deviation
$b$	friction coefficient

$\mathbb{C}$	set of complex numbers
$\mathcal{F}$	fractional transformation
$h$	horizontal position of trolley/cart of gantry crane
$\mathcal{L}$	Lagrangian equation
$\mathbb{R}$	set of real numbers
$D$	dimension of optimization problem
$E$	row scale matrix of perturbation structure
$F$	auxiliary function
$G(s)$	nominal plant transfer function
$H$	column scale matrix of perturbation structure
$J$	performance index function
$K$	controller gain vector
$L$	length of pendulum
$Q$	state weighting matrix of LQR
$R$	input weighting matrix of LQR
$S(s)$	sensitivity function
$T(s)$	complimentary sensitivity function
$X$	solution vector in optimization
$b$	friction coefficient
$f$	fitness/objective function
$g$	gravitational acceleration
$j$	index for iterations
$l$	length of payload cable for gantry crane
$m$	mass of pendulum
$q$	generalized notation for linear position or angular position

$v$	voltage input for motor
$w$	inertia weight of PSO
$x$	state variable vector for state space representation
$\mathcal{T}$	kinetic energy
$\mathcal{V}$	potential energy
$\mathbb{F}$	feasible region in optimization
$\mathbb{S}$	search space in optimization
$\Delta$	perturbation model to linear system
$\alpha$	angular position of rotating arm (inverted pendulum and flexible joint)
$\gamma$	tip angular position of flexible joint
$\varepsilon$	standard deviation threshold for stopping criterion in optimization
$\zeta$	damping ratio
$\eta$	number of iteration for which stopping criterion applies in optimization
$\theta$	swing angle (deflection angle)
$\lambda$	eigenvalue
$\mu$	structured singular value
$\rho$	"transient margin"
$\sigma$	singular value
$\varphi$	angle in closed-loop poles region where $\varphi = \cos^{-1}(\zeta)$
$\psi$	wedge region for closed-loop poles
$\epsilon$	stability margin
$\vartheta$	robust performance level

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 OVERVIEW

In classical control design techniques, difficulties arise when the plant dynamics are complex and poorly modeled, or when the performance specifications are particularly stringent (Green and Limebeer, 1995). Even if an optimal solution is eventually found, the process is likely to be time-consuming.

Hence, model error has been an important issue in linear control theory. Robust control theory has been used to deal with this particular issue besides robust stability and robust performance issues. A successfully designed controller should be also able to maintain stability and performance level in spite of uncertainties in system dynamics and/or disturbances to a certain degree.

Various robust controller design techniques have been proposed such as  $H_\infty$ ,  $\mu$ -synthesis, etc. The robustness issue was just prominently considered in early 1980s with the pioneering work on robust control theory (Zames, 1981; Zames and Francis, 1983). This robust control is now popularly known as  $H_\infty$  robust control. This approach to date is commonly used with techniques such as  $H_\infty$  loop shaping (McFarlane and Glover, 1990) and  $\mu$ -synthesis/analysis. However, the theory behind the approach is not trivial. It is not straightforward to formulate a practical design problem into  $H_\infty$  or  $\mu$  design framework. In addition, standard robust control design can result in high order and complicated controller structure, which is difficult to implement in practice (Lin et al., 2009).