ME 599/699 Robot Modeling & Control Fall 2021

Gravity-Compensated PD Control

Hasan A. Poonawala

Department of Mechanical Engineering University of Kentucky

Email: hasan.poonawala@uky.edu Web: https://www.engr.uky.edu/~hap

Recap

▶ Plan trajectory $q_d(t)$ for robot configuration q

Recap

- ▶ Plan trajectory $q_d(t)$ for robot configuration q
- Goal: Trajectory Tracking
 Choose torques τ (or motor voltages u) so that

 $q(t)
ightarrow q_d(t)$

Recap

- ▶ Plan trajectory $q_d(t)$ for robot configuration q
- Goal: Trajectory Tracking
 Choose torques τ (or motor voltages u) so that

$$q(t)
ightarrow q_d(t)$$

When

$$q_d(t) \equiv q_d,$$

a constant, we get set-point regulation or goal-reaching task

Independent Joint Control.

Some robots allow us to get away with controlling each joint individually

- Some robots allow us to get away with controlling each joint individually
- Use PID controllers and frequency-domain analysis

- Some robots allow us to get away with controlling each joint individually
- Use PID controllers and frequency-domain analysis
- Works for set-point regulation / slow trajectories

- Some robots allow us to get away with controlling each joint individually
- Use PID controllers and frequency-domain analysis
- Works for set-point regulation / slow trajectories
- Model-based Control

Independent Joint Control.

- Some robots allow us to get away with controlling each joint individually
- Use PID controllers and frequency-domain analysis
- Works for set-point regulation / slow trajectories
- Model-based Control
 - Use model

 $M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t) + C(q(t), \dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t) + G(q(t)) = u(t)$

Independent Joint Control.

- Some robots allow us to get away with controlling each joint individually
- Use PID controllers and frequency-domain analysis
- Works for set-point regulation / slow trajectories
- Model-based Control
 - Use model

 $M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t) + C(q(t), \dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t) + G(q(t)) = u(t)$

When: Want to regulate the robot config to a set-point q_d

When: Want to regulate the robot config to a set-point q_d

Assuming no gravity (or that we canceled it out using u):

 $M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t)+C(q(t),\dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t)=u(t)$

When: Want to regulate the robot config to a set-point q_d

Assuming no gravity (or that we canceled it out using u):

 $M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t)+C(q(t),\dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t)=u(t)$

Use PD control:

$$u(t) = K_P(q_d - q(t)) - K_D(\dot{q}(t))$$

When: Want to regulate the robot config to a set-point q_d

Assuming no gravity (or that we canceled it out using u):

 $M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t)+C(q(t),\dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t)=u(t)$

Use PD control:

$$u(t) = K_P(q_d - q(t)) - K_D(\dot{q}(t))$$

Closed-loop:

$$\begin{split} &M(q(t))\ddot{q}(t) + C(q(t), \dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t) = K_P(q_d - q(t)) - K_D \dot{q}(t) \\ \implies \ddot{q}(t) = M^{-1}(q(t)) \left(-C(q(t), \dot{q}(t))\dot{q}(t) + K_P(q_d - q(t)) - K_D \dot{q}(t) \right) \\ &\text{dropping } t \ , \ \ddot{q} = M^{-1}(q) \left(-C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + K_P(q_d - q) - K_D \dot{q} \right) \end{split}$$

$$\ddot{q} = M^{-1}(q) \left(-C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + K_P(q_d - q) - K_D(\dot{q}) \right)$$

Equilibrium occurs when $\dot{q} = \ddot{q} = 0 \implies q_{eq} = q_d$.

$$\ddot{q}=M^{-1}(q)\left(-C(q,\dot{q})\dot{q}+\mathcal{K}_{P}(q_{d}-q)-\mathcal{K}_{D}(\dot{q})
ight)$$
Equilibrium occurs when $\dot{q}=\ddot{q}=0\implies q_{eq}=q_{d}.$

We want $q
ightarrow q_d$, or asymptotic stability of equilibrium q_d

$$\ddot{q}=M^{-1}(q)\left(-C(q,\dot{q})\dot{q}+K_P(q_d-q)-K_D(\dot{q})
ight)$$

Equilibrium occurs when $\dot{q} = \ddot{q} = 0 \implies q_{eq} = q_d$.

We want $q \rightarrow q_d$, or asymptotic stability of equilibrium q_d

Can't use methods for linear systems, simulation of all cases is infeasible.

$$\ddot{q}=M^{-1}(q)\left(-\mathcal{C}(q,\dot{q})\dot{q}+\mathcal{K}_{P}(q_{d}-q)-\mathcal{K}_{D}(\dot{q})
ight)$$

Equilibrium occurs when $\dot{q} = \ddot{q} = 0 \implies q_{eq} = q_d$.

We want $q \rightarrow q_d$, or asymptotic stability of equilibrium q_d

Can't use methods for linear systems, simulation of all cases is infeasible.

Solution: Lyapunov methods

Lyapunov Function

For this mechanical system, we choose

V(x) = actual Kinetic Energy+ Virtual Potential Energy due to error

Lyapunov Function

For this mechanical system, we choose

V(x) = actual Kinetic Energy+ Virtual Potential Energy due to error

$$V(x) = V(q, \dot{q}) = rac{1}{2} \dot{q}^T M(q) \dot{q} + rac{1}{2} (q - q_d)^T K_P(q - q_d)$$

Potential is spring-like with spring constant K_P .

Lyapunov Function

For this mechanical system, we choose

V(x) = actual Kinetic Energy+ Virtual Potential Energy due to error

$$V(x) = V(q, \dot{q}) = rac{1}{2} \dot{q}^T M(q) \dot{q} + rac{1}{2} (q - q_d)^T K_P(q - q_d)$$

Potential is spring-like with spring constant K_P .

Is this a proper candidate Lyapunov function?

▶ Need $K_P > 0$, M(q) > 0 (positive definite)

M(q) > 0 is true for any valid Euler-Lagrangian mechanical system!

Directional Derivative of Lyapunov Function

$$V(x) = V(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^T M(q) \dot{q} + \frac{1}{2} (q - q_d)^T K_P(q - q_d)$$

How does V(x) change along solutions $\bar{x}(t)$?

$$\dot{V}(t) = rac{\partial V}{\partial x} \dot{x}$$

$$=\dot{q}^{T}M(q)\ddot{q}+rac{1}{2}\dot{q}^{T}\dot{M}(q)\dot{q}+(q-q_{d})^{T}K_{P}\dot{q}$$

Next: substitute for \ddot{q}

$$\ddot{q}=M^{-1}(q)\left(-C(q,\dot{q})\dot{q}+K_P(q_d-q)-K_D\dot{q}
ight)$$

$$\dot{V}(t) = \dot{q}^{T} M(q) \ddot{q} + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^{T} \dot{M}(q) \dot{q} + (q - q_d)^{T} K_P \dot{q}$$

$$\tag{1}$$

$$= \dot{q}^{T} M(q) \left(M^{-1}(q) \left(-C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + K_{P}(q_{d} - q) - K_{D}\dot{q} \right) \right) (2) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^{T} \dot{M}(q) \dot{q} + (q - q_{d})^{T} K_{P} \dot{q}$$

The mass-matrix terms cancel, so does the term involving K_P . Exercise: confirm that you get from the equation above to:

$$\dot{V}(t) = rac{1}{2} \dot{q}^{T} \left(\dot{M}(q) - 2C(q, \dot{q})
ight) \dot{q} - \dot{q}^{T} K_{D} \dot{q}$$

Skew Symmetry Property

$$\dot{V}(t) = -\dot{q}^T K_D \dot{q},$$

because for any EL-system, $\dot{M}(q) - 2C(q, \dot{q})$ is a skew-symmetric matrix!

(See Section 5.2.1 in 07_Manipulator_Kinematics_Dynamics.pdf)

So, if $\dot{q} \neq 0$, then $\dot{V} < 0$. To apply Lyapunov's conclusions, we actually want $q \rightarrow q_d$ is that when $q \neq q_d, \dot{q} \neq 0$, THEN $\dot{V} < 0$.

Skew Symmetry Property

$$\dot{V}(t) = -\dot{q}^T K_D \dot{q},$$

because for any EL-system, $\dot{M}(q) - 2C(q, \dot{q})$ is a skew-symmetric matrix!

(See Section 5.2.1 in 07_Manipulator_Kinematics_Dynamics.pdf)

So, if $\dot{q} \neq 0$, then $\dot{V} < 0$. To apply Lyapunov's conclusions, we actually want $q \rightarrow q_d$ is that when $q \neq q_d, \dot{q} \neq 0$, THEN $\dot{V} < 0$.

A solution comes through La Salle's invariance principle (Hello again, ME 672).

Intuition: When its impossible for $\dot{V}(t) = 0$ forever at any state where $V(q) \neq 0$, then $q \rightarrow q_d$.

Summary

- For set-point regulation,
- Assuming gravity isn't affecting dynamics, no external forces,
- PD control is enough to get q → q_d. no coupled model issues !!!

Summary

- For set-point regulation,
- Assuming gravity isn't affecting dynamics, no external forces,
- PD control is enough to get q → q_d. no coupled model issues !!!

Furthermore:

• if
$$G(q) \neq 0$$
, then q_{eq} satisfies

$$G(q_{eq}) = K_P(q_d - q_{eq}),$$

and this equilibrium $(\neq q_d)$ is locally asymptotically stable.

Summary

For set-point regulation,

Assuming gravity isn't affecting dynamics, no external forces,

PD control is enough to get q → q_d. no coupled model issues !!!

Furthermore:

• if $G(q) \neq 0$, then q_{eq} satisfies

$$G(q_{eq}) = K_P(q_d - q_{eq}),$$

and this equilibrium $(\neq q_d)$ is locally asymptotically stable.

To reduce error, increase
$$K_P$$
!

Question: Will an integrator work to handle gravity, like in the case of independent joint control?