Control Systems

Nyquist stability criterion L. Lanari

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Informatica Automatica e Gestionale Antonio Ruberti



Outline

- polar plots when $F(j\omega)$ has no poles on the imaginary axis
- Nyquist stability criterion (first version)
- what happens when $F(j\omega)$ has poles on the imaginary axis
- Nyquist stability criterion (general case)
- general feedback system
- stability margins (gain and phase margin)
- Bode stability criterion
- effect of a delay in a feedback loop

Goal: establish a necessary and sufficient stability criterion for the asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system based on the information (Nyquist plot) of the open-loop system

Unit negative feedback



we have seen that

- in a unit feedback system, the closed-loop system has hidden modes if and only if the open loop has them
- the open-loop hidden modes are inherited **unchanged** by the closed loop

therefore we make the hypothesis that there exists

no open-loop hidden eigenvalue with non-negative real part

(since these would be inherited by the closed-loop system)

stability of the closed loop is only determined by the closed-loop poles

We are going to determine the

stability of the closed-loop system from the open-loop system features

(i.e. the graphical representation of the open-loop frequency response $F(j\omega)$)

Nyquist diagram: (closed) polar plot of $F(j\omega)$ with $\omega \in (-\infty, \infty)$

we plot the magnitude and phase on the same plot using the frequency as a parameter, that is we use the polar form for the complex number $F(j\omega)$

being F(s) a rational function (or rational function + delay)

$$F(-j\omega) = F^*(j\omega)$$

and therefore the plot for negative angular frequencies ω is the **symmetric** wrt the real axis of the one obtained for positive ω



$$F(-j\omega) = F^*(j\omega) \longrightarrow |F'(j\omega)| = |F'(-j\omega)|$$
$$\angle F(j\omega) = -\angle F(-j\omega)$$

Hyp. no open-loop poles on the imaginary axis (i.e. with Re[.] = 0)

some **polar plots**

polar plot of $F(j\omega)$ can be obtained from the Bode diagrams (magnitude and phase information)



Lanari: CS - **Stability - Nyquist**

fact I

The closed-loop system W(s) has poles with Re[.] = 0if anf only if the Nyquist plot of $F(j\omega)$ passes through the critical point (-1,0)

Proof.

Nyquist plot intersects the real axis in -1 therefore $\exists \bar{\omega}$ such that $F(j\bar{\omega}) = -1$

that is $F(j\bar{\omega}) + 1 = 0$ Being the closed-loop transfer function given by

$$W(s) = rac{F(s)}{1+F(s)}$$
 this shows that $s = j\bar{\omega}$ is a pole of $W(s)$

(and vice versa).

example:
$$F(s) = \frac{1}{s-1}$$

fact II Hyp. no open-loop poles on the imaginary axis (i.e. with Re[.] = 0)

let us define

- n_F^+ the number of open-loop poles with positive real part
- n_W^+ the number of closed-loop poles with positive real part
- N_{cc} the number of encirclements the Nyquist plot of $F(j\omega)$ makes around the point (-1, 0) counted positive if counter-clockwise

a direct application of Cauchy's principle of argument gives

$$N_{cc} = n_F + - n_W +$$

Obviously if the encirclements are defined positive clockwise, let them be N_c , the relationship changes sign and becomes $N_c = n_W^+ - n_F^+$

Hyp. no open-loop poles on the imaginary axis (i.e. with Re[.] = 0)

(this hypothesis guarantees that, if F(s) is strictly proper, the polar plot of $F(j\omega)$ is a closed contour and therefore we can determine the number of encirclements)

In order to guarantee closed-loop stability, we need $n_W^+ = 0$ (no closed-loop poles with positive real part) and no poles with zero real part (which we saw being equivalent to asking that the Nyquist plot of $F(j\omega)$ does not pass through the point (-1, 0))

Nyquist stability criterion (first version)

If the open-loop system has no poles on the imaginary axis, the unit negative feedback system is **asymptotically stable**

if and only if

i) the Nyquist plot does not pass through the point (-1, 0)

ii) the number of encirclements around the point (-1, 0), counted positive if counter-

clockwise, is equal to the number of open-loop poles with positive real part, i.e.

$$N_{cc} = n_F^+$$

Remarks

- if the open-loop system has no positive real part poles ($n_F^+ = 0$) then we obtain the simple N&S condition $N_{cc} = 0$ which requires the Nyquist plot not to encircle (-1, 0)
- if the stability condition is not satisfied (and N_{cc} exists) then we have an **unstable** closed-loop system with $n_W^+ = n_F^+ N_{cc}$ positive real part poles
- condition i), which ensures that the closed-loop system does not have poles with zero real part, could be omitted by noting that if the Nyquist plot goes through the critical point (-1, 0) then the number of encirclements is not well defined

examples on the number of encirclements depending on where is the critical point





Lanari: CS - Stability - Nyquist



Lanari: CS - **Stability - Nyquist**



Lanari: CS - **Stability - Nyquist**



Let's remove the hypothesis of "no open-loop poles on the imaginary axis" (i.e. with Re[.] = 0)

open-loop poles on the imaginary axis (i.e. with Re[.] = 0) come from:

- one or more integrators (pole in s = 0)
- resonance (imaginary poles in $s = +/-j\omega_n$) and give a discontinuity in the phase
- passing from $\pi/2$ to $-\pi/2$ when ω switches from 0^- to 0^+
- or from 0 to $-\pi$ when ω switches from ω_n^- to ω_n^+

while the magnitude is at infinity

In order to obtain a closed polar plot, we introduce **closures at infinity** which consists in rotating of π **clockwise** with an infinite radius (for every pole with Re[.] = 0) for increasing frequencies, at those values of the frequency corresponding to singularities of the transfer function F(s) lying on the imaginary axis (poles of the open-loop system with Re[.] = 0)



closures at infinity examples

$$\begin{split} F(s) &= \frac{K}{s(1+\tau_1 s)} & \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = 0^{+} \\ \hline F(s) &= \frac{K}{s^2(1+\tau_1 s)} & 2\pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = 0^{+} \\ \hline F(s) &= \frac{K(1+\tau_2 s)}{s^3(1+\tau_1 s)} & 3\pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = 0^{+} \\ \hline F(s) &= \frac{K}{(s^2+\omega_1^2)(1+\tau_1 s)} & \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline F(s) &= \frac{K}{(s^2+\omega_1^2)^2(1+\tau_1 s)} & 2\pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline F(s) &= \frac{K}{(s^2+\omega_1^2)^2(1+\tau_1 s)} & 2\pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline F(s) &= \frac{K(1+\tau_2 s)}{s^2(s^2+\omega_1^2)(1+\tau_1 s)} & \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = -\omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = 0^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = 0^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = 0^{-} \text{ to } \omega = 0^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = -\omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = \omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = \omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = \omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = \omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = \omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega = \omega_1^{-} \text{ to } \omega = \omega_1^{+} \\ \hline \pi \text{ clockwise at infinity from } \omega$$

Nyquist stability criterion (no restriction on open-loop poles)

Let the open-loop system have n_F^+ poles with positive real part.

The unit negative feedback system is **asymptotically stable**

if and only if

i) the Nyquist plot does not pass through the point $(-1,\,0)$

ii) the number of encirclements around the point (-1, 0) counted positive if counter-

clockwise is equal to the number of open-loop poles with positive real part, i.e.

 $N_{cc} = n_F^+$

That is the result shown before, valid under the hypothesis of no open-loop poles on the imaginary axis (i.e. with Re[.] = 0), still holds provided we define how to obtain the closures at infinity.





Lanari: CS - Stability - Nyquist

example VI

 $+\infty$

 $\omega = 0$

 $\omega = -1^+$

Re

 $\omega = 1^{-1}$







Lanari: CS - **Stability - Nyquist**

general negative feedback



for **stability** these two schemes are equivalent

 $egin{aligned} F_1(s) &= N_1(s)/D_1(s) \ F_2(s) &= N_2(s)/D_2(s) \end{aligned}$



$$W_{1}(s) = \frac{F_{1}(s)}{1 + F_{1}(s)F_{2}(s)} \qquad W_{2}(s) = \frac{F_{1}(s)F_{2}(s)}{1 + F_{1}(s)F_{2}(s)}$$
$$= \frac{N_{1}(s)D_{2}(s)}{D_{2}(s)D_{1}(s) + N_{1}(s)N_{2}(s)} \qquad = \frac{N_{1}(s)N_{2}(s)}{D_{2}(s)D_{1}(s) + N_{1}(s)N_{2}(s)}$$

same denominator same poles same stability properties

Typical pattern for a control system:

open-loop system with no positive real part poles $n_F^+ = 0$, therefore the closed-loop system will be asymptotically stable if and only if the Nyquist plot makes **no encirclements** around the point (-1, 0). We want to explore how the closed-loop stability varies as a gain K in the open-loop system increases.



As K increases over a critical value the closed-loop system goes from asymptotically stable to unstable



In this context, the proximity to the critical point (-1, 0) is an indicator of the proximity of the closed-loop system to instability.

We can define two quantities:

gain margin k_{GM}

If we multiply $F(j\omega)$ by the quantity $k_{\rm GM}$ the Nyquist diagram will pass through the critical point

the gain margin k_{GM} is the smallest gain factor that the closed-loop system can tolerate (strictly) before it becomes unstable

$$\omega_{\pi} : \angle F(j\omega_{\pi}) = -\pi$$

$$k_{\mathrm{G}M} = \frac{1}{|F(j\omega_{\pi})|}$$

$$k_{\mathrm{G}M}|_{dB} = -|F(j\omega_{\pi})|_{dB}$$



only positive angular frequencies are shown for ease of exposition

phase margin PM

the phase margin PM is the amount of lag the closed-loop system can tolerate (strictly) before it becomes unstable

 ω_c angular frequency at which the gain is unity is defined as **crossover frequency** (or gain crossover frequency)

 $\omega_c : |F(j\omega_c)| = 1$

$$\omega_c : |F(j\omega_c)|_{dB} = 0 \, dB$$

$$PM = \pi + \angle F(j\omega_c)$$





stability margins on Bode



$$k_{\mathrm{G}M}|_{dB} = -|F(j\omega_{\pi})|_{dB}$$
$$PM = \pi + \angle F(j\omega_{c})$$

$$F(s) = \frac{1000}{s(s+10)^2}$$







Bode stability theorem

Let the open-loop system F(s) be with no positive real part poles (i.e. $n_{F^+} = 0$) and such that there exists a unique crossover frequency ω_c (i.e. such that $|F(j\omega_c)| = 1$) then the closed-loop system is asymptotically stable if and only if the open-loop system's generalized gain is positive & the phase margin (*PM*) is positive



Lanari: CS - **Stability - Nyquist**

Bode stability theorem

- stability margins are useful to evaluate stability **robustness** wrt parameters variations (for example the gain margin directly states how much gain variation we can tolerate)
- phase margin is also useful to evaluate stability **robustness** wrt delays in the feedback loop. Recall that, from the time shifting property of the Laplace transform, a delay is modeled by e^{-sT} and that

$$\xrightarrow{+} \overbrace{e^{-sT}} \xrightarrow{F(s)} \overbrace{F(s)} \xrightarrow{} 2e^{-j\omega T} = -\omega T \qquad \text{delay} \\ |e^{-j\omega T}| = 1 \qquad \text{of } T \text{ sec}$$

$$\angle e^{-j\omega T} = -\omega T \longrightarrow$$

a delay introduces a phase lag and therefore it can easily "destabilize" a system (note that the abscissa in the Bode diagrams is in log₁₀ scale so the phase decreases very fast)

$$|e^{-j\omega T}| = 1 \qquad \longrightarrow \qquad$$

a delay in the loop does not alter the magnitude (0 dB contribution)

Special cases

• infinite gain margin



• infinite phase margin



Particular example

good gain and phase margins but close to critical point

